

**GLI** GLOBAL  
LEGAL  
INSIGHTS

# Fund Finance 2023

**Seventh Edition**

Contributing Editors: **Wes Misson & Sam Hutchinson**

**glg** global legal group



# CONTENTS

<b>Introduction</b>	Wes Misson & Sam Hutchinson, <i>Cadwalader, Wickersham &amp; Taft LLP</i>	
<b>Expert analysis chapters</b>	<i>NAV and hybrid fund finance facilities</i> Leon Stephenson, <i>Reed Smith LLP</i>	1
	<i>Collateral damage: What not to overlook in subscription line and management fee line facility diligence</i> Anthony Pirraglia, Peter Beardsley & Richard Facundo, <i>Loeb &amp; Loeb LLP</i>	15
	<i>Derivatives at fund level</i> Jonathan Gilmour, Peter Hughes & Joseph Wren, <i>Travers Smith LLP</i>	27
	<i>Subscription facilities: Through the Looking Glass and into Wonderland</i> Jan Sysel, Jons Lehmann & Kathryn Cecil, <i>Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver &amp; Jacobson LLP</i>	39
	<i>A fund borrower's guide to NAV and Hybrid Facilities: Considerations for a "bankable" partnership agreement for fund-level leverage beyond the sub line</i> Julia Kohen, Ashley Belton Gold & Jakarri Hamlin, <i>Simpson Thacher &amp; Bartlett LLP</i>	50
	<i>Sharpest tool in the shed: A primer on asset-backed leverage facilities</i> Patricia Lynch, Patricia Teixeira & Douglas Hollins, <i>Ropes &amp; Gray LLP</i>	58
	<i>Enforcement: Analysis of lender remedies under U.S. law in subscription-secured credit facilities</i> Ellen G. McGinnis & Richard D. Anigian, <i>Haynes and Boone, LLP</i>	68
	<i>The rise of Hybrid Facilities and increasing use of capital commitments in NAV Facilities</i> Meyer C. Dworkin & Kwesi Larbi-Siaw, <i>Davis Polk &amp; Wardwell LLP</i>	90
	<i>Assessing and mitigating "bad acts" risk in NAV loans</i> Angie Batterson, Brian Foster & Patrick Calves, <i>Cadwalader, Wickersham &amp; Taft LLP</i>	96
	<i>Comparing the European, U.S. and Asian fund finance markets</i> Emma Russell & Emily Fuller, <i>Haynes and Boone, LLP</i>	104
	<i>Umbrella facilities: Pros and cons for a sponsor</i> Richard Fletcher & Yagmur Yazar, <i>Macfarlanes LLP</i>	114
	<i>Side letters: Pitfalls and perils for a financing</i> Thomas Smith, Margaret O'Neill & John W. Rife III, <i>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</i>	124
	<i>Fund finance lending: A practical checklist</i> James Heinicke, David Nelson & Daniel Richards, <i>Ogier</i>	134
	<i>Assessing lender risk in fund finance markets</i> Robin Smith, Alistair Russell & Holly Brown, <i>Carey Olsen Jersey LLP</i>	146

<b>Expert analysis chapters cont'd</b>	<i>Fund finance meets securitisation</i>	
	Richard Day & Julia Tsybina, <i>Clifford Chance LLP</i>	158
	<i>Fund finance in Ireland and Luxembourg: A comparative analysis</i>	
	Jad Nader, <i>Ogier, Luxembourg</i>	
	Phil Cody, <i>Arthur Cox LLP, Ireland</i>	166
	<i>Fund finance facilities: A cradle to grave timeline</i>	
	Bronwen Jones, Kevin-Paul Deveau & Brendan Gallen, <i>Reed Smith LLP</i>	178
	<i>Newer liquidity solutions for alternative asset fund managers – increasingly core</i>	
	Jamie Parish, Danny Peel & Katie McMenamin, <i>Travers Smith LLP</i>	188
	<i>The rise of ESG and green fund finance</i>	
	Briony Holcombe, Robert Andrews & Lorraine Johnston, <i>Ashurst LLP</i>	196
	<i>Robust liquidity solutions for complex Cayman Islands fund structures</i>	
	Agnes Molnar, Richard Mansi & Catharina von Finckenhagen, <i>Travers Thorp Alberga</i>	205
	<i>More than a decade of global fund finance transactions</i>	
	Michael Mbayi, <i>Pinsent Masons Luxembourg</i>	217
<i>NAV's meet margin loans: The rise in single asset financings</i>		
Sherri Snelson & Juliesa Edwards, <i>White &amp; Case LLP</i>	224	
<i>Regime change but business as usual – updates to sanctions and restructuring regimes in the Cayman Islands</i>		
Alexandra Woodcock & Danielle Roman, <i>Mourant</i>	235	
<i>VC vs PE: Comparing the venture capital and private equity fund financing markets</i>		
Cindy Lovering & Corinne Musa, <i>Cooley LLP</i>	245	
<i>Subscription facilities: Key considerations for borrowers – a global experience</i>		
Jean-Louis Frognet, Caroline M. Lee & Eng-Lye Ong, <i>Dechert LLP</i>	251	
<i>Innovative rated note structures spur insurance investments in private equity</i>		
Pierre Maugüé, Ramya Tiller & Christine Gilleland, <i>Debevoise &amp; Plimpton LLP</i>	261	
<i>Financing secondary fund acquisitions</i>		
Ron D. Franklin, Jinyoung Joo & Allison F. Saltstein, <i>Proskauer</i>	269	
<b>Jurisdiction chapters</b>		
<b>Australia</b>	Tom Highnam, Rita Pang & Jialu Xu, <i>Allens</i>	278
<b>Bermuda</b>	Matthew Ebbs-Brewer & Arielle DeSilva, <i>Appleby</i>	290
<b>British Virgin Islands</b>	Andrew Jowett & Johanna Murphy, <i>Appleby</i>	298
<b>Canada</b>	Michael Henriques, Alexandra North & Kenneth D. Kraft, <i>Dentons Canada LLP</i>	307
<b>Cayman Islands</b>	Simon Raftopoulos & Georgina Pullinger, <i>Appleby</i>	314

<b>England &amp; Wales</b>	Sam Hutchinson & Nathan Parker, <i>Cadwalader, Wickersham &amp; Taft LLP</i>	324
<b>France</b>	Philippe Max & Meryll Aloro, <i>Dentons Europe, AARPI</i>	331
<b>Guernsey</b>	Jeremy Berchem, <i>Appleby</i>	338
<b>Hong Kong</b>	James Ford, Patrick Wong & Charlotte Robins, <i>Allen &amp; Overy</i>	346
<b>Ireland</b>	Kevin Lynch, Ian Dillon & Ben Rayner, <i>Arthur Cox LLP</i>	359
<b>Italy</b>	Alessandro Fosco Fagotto, Edoardo Galeotti & Valerio Lemma, <i>Dentons Europe Studio Legale Tributario</i>	374
<b>Jersey</b>	James Gaudin, Paul Worsnop & Daniel Healy, <i>Appleby (Jersey) LLP</i>	384
<b>Luxembourg</b>	Vassiliyan Zanev, Marc Meyers & Maude Royer, <i>Loyens &amp; Loeff Luxembourg SARL</i>	389
<b>Mauritius</b>	Malcolm Moller, <i>Appleby</i>	400
<b>Netherlands</b>	Gianluca Kreuze, Michaël Maters & Ruben den Hollander, <i>Loyens &amp; Loeff N.V.</i>	407
<b>Norway</b>	Snorre Nordmo, Ole Andenæs & Karoline Angell, <i>Wikborg Rein Advokatfirma AS</i>	415
<b>Singapore</b>	Jean Woo, Danny Tan & Cara Stevens, <i>Ashurst LLP</i>	422
<b>Spain</b>	Jabier Badiola Bergara, <i>Dentons Europe Abogados, S.L. (Sociedad Unipersonal)</i>	431
<b>USA</b>	Jan Sysel, Flora Go & Duncan McKay, <i>Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver &amp; Jacobson LLP</i>	439

# Netherlands

Gianluca Kreuze, Michaël Maters & Ruben den Hollander  
Loyens & Loeff N.V.

## Overview

The Netherlands is widely recognised as a leading international financial centre and has a mature investment funds industry with an attractive investment environment due to, amongst others, flexible corporate legislation, various tax structuring options, and an extensive network of bilateral investment treaties and tax treaties.

In terms of both fundraising and invested capital, 2021 and 2022 were successful years for market participants in the Netherlands. The most recent research conducted by the *Nederlandse Vereniging van Participatiemaatschappijen* (the Dutch Association of Private Equity Firms)<sup>1</sup> shows that in 2021 alone, Dutch private equity firms raised around €6.3 billion in new funds, of which approximately €1.6 billion was raised by Dutch venture capitalists. In 2021, 206 Dutch private equity and venture capital firms managed approximately €37.9 billion (committed capital) in 466 funds, and over €8.1 billion was invested by national and international private equity and venture capital firms in Dutch companies.

We have seen a continued and significant increase in the number of fundraisings, investor appetite and fund financings in the Netherlands. The markets for fundraising, fund finance and private equity investments have proven to be resilient (for example, during the COVID-19 pandemic), although it is yet to be seen what impact geopolitical, macroeconomic and interest rate developments will have.

The evolving fund finance market has proven to be of interest to both Dutch and foreign lenders over the past couple of years, and market participants are more actively exploring other (more structural) fund finance solutions on top of the traditional capital call facilities.

Consequently, we are looking forward to an exciting 2023, which will potentially provide for a great investment environment for fund managers and fund finance lenders.

In view of the aforementioned relevance of the Dutch fund formation and fund finance market, this chapter seeks to provide further background on the following relevant aspects: (a) fund formation and the most commonly used Dutch fund vehicles; (b) regulation of fundraising and fund managers; (c) fund finance in the Netherlands; (d) structuring the security package; and (e) the year ahead.

## Fund formation and the most commonly used Dutch fund vehicles

A Dutch alternative investment fund (an AIF)<sup>2</sup> may be structured in various ways, both as corporate and contractual entities. Corporate entities have legal personality (*rechtspersoonlijkheid*), enabling them to hold legal title to assets, and are governed by mandatory corporate law, whereas contractual entities lack such legal personality and are unable to hold legal title, but enjoy the benefit of more contractual freedom. The most

frequently used corporate investment vehicles are the private limited liability company (*besloten vennootschap met beperkte aansprakelijkheid*) and the cooperative with excluded liability (*coöperatie met uitgesloten aansprakelijkheid*). Contractual investment vehicles are most commonly established in the form of a limited partnership (*commanditaire vennootschap*) or a mutual fund (*fonds voor gemene rekening*).<sup>3</sup> The ultimate selection strongly depends on the outcome of relevant tax and legal structuring analyses.

Regardless of whether a contractual or legal entity is selected, an AIF established in the Netherlands should take into account that the European Alternative Investment Fund Managers Directive 2011/61/EU (the **AIFMD**) is applicable and has been implemented into the Dutch Act on Financial Supervision (*Wet op het financieel toezicht*, or the **AFS**). Consequently, the AIFMD and all rules and regulations promulgated thereunder (including Delegated Regulation (EU) 231/2013, the **Delegated Regulation**) must be complied with in the Netherlands by any alternative investment fund manager (an **AIFM**), unless an AIFM can benefit from exemptions (such as, *inter alia*, AIFMs managing AIFs below the Threshold (as defined below)).

In the event that a Dutch licensed AIFM establishes an AIF as a contractual investment vehicle (lacking legal personality), it is – in principle – required under the AFS to also establish a single-purpose corporate entity to hold the assets of one or more of such AIFs set up by the licensed AIFM.

### Regulation of fundraising and fund managers

The management or marketing of AIFs in the Netherlands by ‘large’ AIFMs triggers the obligation to obtain a licence in the Netherlands, subject to certain exemptions and grandfathering rules. AIFMs are considered ‘large’ if they, directly or indirectly, manage portfolios of AIFs whose assets under management amount to €500 million or more, or – when open-ended or leveraged – €100 million or more (together, the **Threshold**). An AIFM is deemed to manage an AIF in the Netherlands if such AIFM is established in the Netherlands, or if the AIF managed by it is established in the Netherlands.

Dutch AIFMs that fall below the Threshold may manage and market their AIFs without an AIFMD licence in the Netherlands, provided that:

- a) the AIF’s units or shares are exclusively offered to professional investors within the meaning of the AFS (e.g. banks, insurers, pension funds, brokers, AIFMs, AIFs, or qualifying large corporates); or
- b) the AIF’s units or shares are offered to fewer than 150 persons, or have a nominal value of, or are offered for a consideration payable per investor of, at least €100,000, provided that a banner or selling legend as to the AIFM’s unregulated status (in a predefined size and layout) is printed on the AIF’s offering documents; and
- c) in each case, the relevant AIFM is registered with the Dutch competent authority, the AIFM. The aim of said registration is (amongst others) to ensure that the AIFM can assess whether or not the sub-Threshold regime is legitimately relied upon, and to effectively monitor any build-up of systemic risks. Such Dutch AIFMs are required to disclose to the Dutch Central Bank (*De Nederlandsche Bank*), amongst others, information on the main instruments in which the AIFs are trading, the principal exposures, and the most important concentration of the AIFs managed.

Dutch AIFMs that do not require a licence for managing and marketing their AIFs in the Netherlands may voluntarily apply for such licence, provided such AIFM complies with all applicable AIFMD requirements (as implemented into Dutch law). Not many Dutch AIFMs have chosen to apply for an AIFMD licence voluntarily.

Additionally, considering that AIFs making private equity investments are not excluded from the scope of the venture capital regulation (Regulation 345/2013/EC, or **EuVECA**), EU-based managers of (EU) AIFs that comply with the conditions of EuVECA may benefit from an EU marketing passport as introduced therein. Such passport allows for the marketing of units or shares to potential investors investing at least €100,000 or to investors that are treated as professional clients (within the meaning of Directive 2014/65/EU), in each case provided that they have confirmed their awareness of the risks associated with their investment. Potential investors that do not otherwise qualify as professional investors may opt to be treated as such. Both licensed AIFMs and sub-Threshold AIFMs can benefit from EuVECA: enabling licensed AIFMs to use the EuVECA marketing passport to also market interests to investors that commit to invest at least €100,000 (and not only to professional investors as allowed under Article 32 of the AIFMD). We see that an increasing number of (sub-Threshold) Dutch AIFMs obtain EuVECA labels to benefit from the marketing passport (providing market access in a transparent manner).

Finally, in 2021, two new sets of European laws entered into force that affect how AIFMs can market their AIFs to investors. The first being Regulation (EU) 2019/2088 on sustainability-related disclosures in the financial services sector (the **SFDR**) aimed at prohibiting AIFMs from ‘greenwashing’ their product through subjecting them to comprehensive disclosure requirements. Both licensed and sub-Threshold AIFMs are required to satisfy the disclosure requirements prescribed by the SFDR. The character of the disclosures that an AIFM is required to make in respect of an AIF depends on how such AIF is categorised (*i.e.* as an AIF promoting environmental or social characteristics, an AIF having a sustainable objective or an AIF that does none of the foregoing). The second being a new set of rules on the cross-border marketing of AIFs, Cross-Border Distribution Directive (EU) 2019/1160 and Cross-Border Distribution Regulation (EU) 2019/1156 (together, the **Cross Border Distribution Rules**). On the basis of the Cross Border Distribution Rules, licensed AIFMs and AIFMs managing EuVECA-labelled AIFs can now benefit, for instance, from an EU harmonised pre-marketing regime, additional rules for marketing to retail investors, transparency on cross-border supervision costs, and the de-notification process of AIFs marketed under the passport. Under the framework of the Cross Border Distribution Rules, the rules applicable to marketing communications issued by AIFMs in respect of their AIFs are also replaced by new, more comprehensive rules that are supplemented by the European Securities and Markets Authority’s Guidelines on marketing communications. Since February 2022, qualifying AIFMs’ marketing communications must comply with these new requirements.

## Fund finance in the Netherlands

With increasing availability of capital for investments and demands for high returns by investors, the need for financing solutions by Dutch AIFMs and AIFs is expected to continue its upturn. Depending on the type of AIF, the need for financing can vary, but is typically limited to (i) the more traditional capital call facilities, and (ii) credit facilities to provide leverage or liquidity for the AIF (often based on the net asset value (**NAV**) of investments). There is limited data publicly available on the use of the various types of fund financing in the Netherlands, which makes it difficult to assess the size of the Dutch fund finance market. In our experience, traditional secured capital call facilities continue to be the main type of financing selected by AIFMs. It has become customary to explicitly refer in the relevant fund documentation to the possibility to take out this type of financing and the creation of security by the AIF on its assets (including receivables that investors owe to the fund).

The purpose and use of traditional capital call financings are expected to further expand. In addition to bridging capital calls, those financing arrangements are also being used to ‘bridge’ the third-party financing to be arranged for at the level of the portfolio company (*i.e.* at bidco level) and thus speed up acquisition processes. Recently, there has also been an increasing interest in the ability to obtain NAV or hybrid facilities at fund level, but given that this is a recent development in the Dutch market, the ability to incur (structural) leverage at the level of the fund is not always catered for in fund documents.

An important consequence of incurring such leverage at the level of a Dutch AIF is that, depending on the details of the financing, the relevant AIFM managing such AIF may be required to obtain an AIFMD licence in the Netherlands, as further discussed below.

Whether or not an AIF incurs leverage may affect the relevant AIFM’s regulatory status (*i.e.* it may lead to a lower Threshold being applied for purposes of determining whether an AIFMD licence is required in the Netherlands). Additionally, if AIFs deploy leverage, the AIFMD (and rules and regulations promulgated thereunder) imposes additional obligations on an AIFM managing such AIF. Consequently, incurring leverage may affect an AIFM.

The term ‘leverage’ is defined by the AIFMD as any method by which an AIFM increases the exposure of an AIF it manages, whether through borrowing of cash or securities, or leverage embedded in derivative positions, or by any other means.

While determining whether an AIF deploys leverage within the meaning of the AIFMD and when calculating exposure, the Delegated Regulation dictates that AIFs should ‘look through’ corporate structures. Therefore, exposure that is included in any financial and/or legal structures involving third parties controlled by the relevant AIF, where those structures are specifically set up to increase, directly or indirectly, the exposure at the level of the AIF, should be included in the calculation. However, for AIFs whose core investment policy is to acquire control of non-listed companies or issuers, AIFMs should not include in the calculation any leverage that exists at the level of those non-listed companies and issuers, provided that the relevant AIF does not have to bear potential losses beyond its capital share in the respective company or issuer.

On the other hand, borrowing arrangements entered into by the AIF are excluded under any of the abovementioned methods if these are:

- a) temporary in nature; and
- b) fully covered by ‘capital commitments’ from investors (*i.e.* the contractual commitment of an investor to provide the AIF with an agreed amount of investment on demand by the AIFM).

Even though the Delegated Regulation considers in its recitals that revolving credit facilities (**RCFs**) should *not* be considered as being temporary in nature, it is the prevailing view that capital call facilities (by way of an RCF or otherwise) can be structured as being temporary in nature if certain requirements otherwise applicable to non-RCFs are similarly complied with. In order to structure these facilities as temporary in nature, certain features can be implemented, such as: (i) a mandatory clean down to occur once every 12 months (followed by a period during which the facility is not used); and/or (ii) an obligation to repay each loan, with the proceeds of capital contributions, within 12 months of drawing such loan.

Structuring these capital call facilities as temporary in nature typically fits their purpose, as these facilities are typically utilised to bridge the liquidity gap at the level of the AIF to be funded ultimately out of the proceeds of capital contributions. Such a time gap between inflowing money from investors and outflowing money for investments can be caused by: (a) the period, often 10 business days, it takes before capital drawn by the AIFM is



actually contributed to the AIF; (b) the desire of the AIFM to bundle capital calls (so not to burden the investors with drawdowns of smaller amounts); (c) a defaulting investor not contributing; and (d) the AIFM delaying certain capital calls, as this may boost the internal rate of return for investments in and by the AIF.

### **Structuring the security package**

Credit facilities to be granted to AIFs can be secured in a variety of ways. For example, security may be granted over the assets in which an AIF would (indirectly) invest, which is usually the case for NAV facilities. Typically, capital call credit facilities granted to AIFs are secured by a right of pledge over (i) the bank account (which is considered a receivable on the account bank under Dutch law) on which capital contributions are made by the AIF's investors, and (ii) all receivables or contractual obligations that the investors owe to the AIF, such as the right to make drawdowns from the capital commitments.

#### Bank accounts

Dutch funds are usually set up with one single Dutch bank account per fund entity. With respect to creating a right of pledge over Dutch bank accounts, the applicable general terms and conditions are of relevance. The general terms and conditions used by most Dutch account banks create a first-ranking right of pledge over such bank account for the benefit of the account bank, and state that the bank account cannot be (further) pledged. Consequently, the cooperation of such account bank is required to create a (first-ranking) right of pledge over a Dutch bank account. It is becoming increasingly difficult to convince Dutch account banks to cooperate and consent to the creation of a right of pledge over bank accounts for the benefit of third-party lenders.

#### Investor receivables

Pursuant to Dutch law, security over receivables can be established by way of a disclosed right of pledge, or by way of an undisclosed right of pledge. A disclosed right of pledge is created by way of a security agreement (or notarial deed) and notification of the right of pledge to the relevant debtors of the receivables that are being pledged. An undisclosed right of pledge is created either by way of a notarial deed or by way of a security agreement that is registered with the Dutch tax authorities for date-stamping purposes. A disclosed right of pledge can be created over present and future receivables, whilst an undisclosed right of pledge can only be created over present receivables and future receivables arising from legal relationships existing at the time of creation of such undisclosed right of pledge. Therefore, for an undisclosed right of pledge, it is common practice to periodically file supplemental security agreements with the Dutch tax authorities to also secure present and future receivables resulting from legal relationships that have been entered into after the date of the initial security agreement (or notarial deed).

With respect to creating a disclosed or undisclosed right of pledge over receivables of the AIF on its investors, choosing one form of pledge over the other depends, to some extent, on whether it is commercially desirable to disclose the right of pledge to the relevant investors, and whether an undisclosed right of pledge is acceptable to the beneficiary of the right of pledge. With pledge notices customary to be sent to investors in key jurisdictions such as Luxembourg, the United Kingdom and the United States, it has become common over the last few years to notify investors of a right of pledge over the investor receivables in the Netherlands as well. Dutch law allows for sufficient flexibility as to the form of such notification to be made; consequently, such notification can be made by uploading the notice to the AIF's investor portal or referencing the right of pledge in any investor reporting

document, making the process of serving notice a fairly effortless procedure. Therefore, in the majority of transactions, there will be a disclosed right of pledge over investor receivables notifying the investors not by separate pledge notice, but via the investor portal of periodic investor reports.

The qualification of the receivable owed by the investor to the AIF as either an existing but conditional claim or a provisory future claim is important for determining whether the receivable can be made subject to a bankruptcy proof right of pledge. If the claim is considered a future claim, any right of pledge that is created in advance will only take effect if such claim comes into existence prior to the pledgor being bankrupt; any claim that comes into existence after bankruptcy will fall within the bankruptcy estate of the pledgor.

In Dutch literature and case law, the prevailing view is that the receivable owed by the investor to the AIF qualifies as a future receivable arising from an existing legal relationship, which receivable comes into existence once the AIFM sends the relevant capital call notice to the relevant investor and therefore can also be made subject to an undisclosed right of pledge as of the date of the capital call notice (without periodical supplemental security being required, unless the investor base changes as that will be considered a new legal relationship between the fund and the new investor – in case of a disclosed right of pledge, a change to the investor base will typically require notification to be served on the new investor). However, if the AIFM sends the capital call notice after the pledgor's (the AIF's) bankruptcy, then the receivable comes into existence after such pledgor's bankruptcy and therefore forms part of the pledgor's bankruptcy estate unencumbered by any right of pledge. It is, however, the prevailing view in Dutch legal literature that the parties may agree on the qualification of a receivable – as such, fund documentation will typically contain a clause that explicitly states that any receivable owed by the investor to the AIF is considered an existing but conditional claim, conditional upon the capital call being made. A right of pledge created over an existing but conditional receivable is also valid if the condition (the capital call) is met after the pledgor's bankruptcy.

However, there is limited case law confirming that such a provision would work to avoid any of the aforementioned issues. There is also some debate in literature on whether a pledgee may issue capital call notices solely based on its right of pledge. To mitigate those risks, the pledgee may request to be granted a direct, independent right to issue capital call notices in default situations. Often, a direct agreement to be entered into between the pledgee and the investors is not (commercially) feasible. Nowadays, we do see that fund documentation caters for the possibility for the pledgee (as an independent right) to make capital calls by submitting capital call notices (to avoid the need to arrange this at a later stage via direct agreements). Alternatively, the AIFM may grant a power of attorney to the pledgee to issue, in certain default situations, a capital call notice in the AIFM's name to the investors (again, this right is often acknowledged in the fund documentation). However, as a power of attorney is terminated, by operation of law, in the event of bankruptcy of the entity that has granted the power of attorney, the latter option is less favourable to the pledgee.

Another element to take into consideration when structuring the security over the AIF's assets is that receivables and contractual rights may, through a clause in (the general conditions to) the contract from which such receivables or contractual rights arise, be made non-assignable/transferrable or 'non-pledgeable'. Depending on the wording of the relevant provision of the contract, such non-assignability clause could have an effect *in rem*, in which case creating a right of pledge over such receivable or right will simply not be possible. The fund documentation should be carefully checked on this.

## The year ahead

As emphasised, 2021 and 2022 have been interesting and important years for Dutch fund formation and fund finance markets. With current national and international political developments confirming and strengthening the Netherlands' position as a mature and well-equipped jurisdiction for funds and investments, we expect that 2023 will be another important year for the Dutch private equity and venture capital markets. With the Dutch fund finance markets maturing, we expect to see an increase in the diversity and volume of the fund finance products offered in the Netherlands; for example, by an increase in the number of hybrid facilities, general partner solutions and co-investment facilities offered. We are seeing an increasing number of fund managers exploring NAV facilities as well and expect that trend to continue in 2023. We are also seeing an increasing number of non-Dutch lenders showing interest in the Dutch market. In view of, amongst other things, the evolving legislation in this respect (such as the SFDR), a key development will likely be the integration of ESG factors in fund facilities, whereby measurable ESG performance indicators can directly impact the applicable interest margin.

\* \* \*

## Endnotes

1. An interactive graphic providing an overview of the NVP's findings can be found on its website: <https://nvp.nl/feiten-cijfers/marktcijfers> (this reference is accurate on the date of this publication).
2. We note that this chapter does not focus on collective investment undertakings that require a licence pursuant to Article 5 of Directive 2009/65/EC (UCITS).
3. It is noted that the Dutch partnership law is currently under review and that a second preliminary draft bill at civil service level (*Tweede Ambtelijk voorontwerp Wet modernisering personenvennootschappen*) was presented on 10 October 2022. If this second preliminary draft bill is implemented in its current form, Dutch (limited) partnerships will be granted legal personality. Having legal personality may affect the treatment of Dutch (limited) partnerships, *inter alia*, from a regulatory perspective (as, for example, a separate entity holding legal title to the assets of an AIF may no longer be necessary).

\* \* \*

## Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge with thanks the contribution to this chapter by Vilmar Feenstra, a partner in the Investment Management practice group.

**Gianluca Kreuze****Tel: +31 20 578 55 12 / Email: [Gianluca.Kreuze@loyensloeff.com](mailto:Gianluca.Kreuze@loyensloeff.com)**

Gianluca Kreuze, attorney at law, is a partner of the Finance practice group and co-head of the Private Equity team. Gianluca advises lenders, borrowers and “originators” with structuring and documenting finance transactions. Gianluca is specialised in domestic and international private equity matters and his particular expertise concentrates on debt finance transactions with an emphasis on acquisition finance and follow-on recapitalisations and other corporate finance transaction. Gianluca formerly worked at the Loyens & Loeff office in London, where he mainly dealt with structured finance transactions.

**Michaël Maters****Tel: +31 20 578 58 64 / Email: [Michael.Maters@loyensloeff.com](mailto:Michael.Maters@loyensloeff.com)**

Michaël Maters, attorney at law, is a senior associate of the Investment Management practice group and member of the Private Equity team. Michaël focuses on investment management, Dutch partnerships, corporate fund structures and AIFMD-related matters, specialising, in particular, in the civil, corporate and regulatory aspects of (international) fund formation. He acts both on behalf of managers in the formation of their alternative investment funds as well as on behalf of (institutional) investors, assisting them with their investments in such alternative investment funds. Additionally, Michaël also publishes on the various civil, corporate and regulatory aspects of fund formation (such as asset segregation and management participation structures). Michaël was seconded to the Loyens & Loeff office in Zürich in 2017.

**Ruben den Hollander****Tel: +31 6 10 90 14 82 / Email: [Ruben.den.Hollander@loyensloeff.com](mailto:Ruben.den.Hollander@loyensloeff.com)**

Ruben den Hollander, attorney at law, is an associate of the Finance practice group and member of the Private Equity team. Ruben specialises in secured lending, advising both financial institutions and private investors on structuring and documentation. He focuses on leveraged finance and fund finance. Ruben worked in the firm’s Investment Management practice group in 2016 and 2017 where he assisted managers with the formation of their funds and institutional investors in respect of their investments in funds. Ruben worked in the firm’s New York office from 2020 to 2021 and was seconded to Mayer Brown (Banking & Finance) in New York in 2020.

**Loyens & Loeff N.V.**

Parnassusweg 300, 1081 LC Amsterdam, Netherlands

Tel: +31 20 578 57 85 / URL: [www.loyensloeff.com](http://www.loyensloeff.com)

[www.globallegalinsights.com](http://www.globallegalinsights.com)

Other titles in the **Global Legal Insights** series include:

**AI, Machine Learning & Big Data**

**Banking Regulation**

**Blockchain & Cryptocurrency**

**Bribery & Corruption**

**Cartels**

**Corporate Tax**

**Employment & Labour Law**

**Energy**

**Fintech**

**Initial Public Offerings**

**International Arbitration**

**Litigation & Dispute Resolution**

**Merger Control**

**Mergers & Acquisitions**

**Pricing & Reimbursement**