



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to: **Lending & Secured Finance 2016**

4th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into lending and secured finance

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

Advokatfirma Ræder DA
Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro
Allen & Overy LLP
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune
Asia Pacific Loan Market Association
Brulc, Gaberščik in Kikelj o.p., d.o.o.
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP
Carey
CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz
Cordero & Cordero Abogados
Criales, Urcullo & Antezana
Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira
Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
Drew & Napier LLC
E & G Economides LLC
Ferraiuoli LLC
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP

Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.
JŠK, advokátní kancelář, s.r.o.
Khan Corporate Law
King & Spalding LLP
King & Wood Mallesons
KPP Law Offices
Latham & Watkins LLP
Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law
Linklaters LLP
Loan Market Association
Loan Syndications and Trading Association
Maples and Calder
Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal
McCann FitzGerald
McMillan LLP
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP
Miranda & Amado Abogados
MJM Limited

Montel&Manciet Advocats
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Mosgo & Partners
Paksoy
Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd
Pinheiro Neto Advogados
QUIROZ SANTRONI Abogados Consultores
Reff & Associates SCA
Rodner, Martínez & Asociados
Shearman & Sterling LLP
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Tonucci & Partners
White & Case LLP



Contributing Editor
Thomas Mellor, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Sales Director
Florjan Osmani

Account Directors
Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

Sales Support Manager
Toni Hayward

Sub Editor
Sam Friend

Senior Editor
Rachel Williams

Chief Operating Officer
Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor
Alan Falach

Group Publisher
Richard Firth

Published by
Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design
F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source
iStockphoto

Printed by
Stephens & George
Print Group
April 2016

Copyright © 2016
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-910083-90-1
ISSN 2050-9847

Strategic Partners



Editorial Chapters:

1	Loan Syndications and Trading: An Overview of the Syndicated Loan Market – Bridget Marsh & Ted Basta, Loan Syndications and Trading Association	1
2	Loan Market Association – An Overview – Nigel Houghton, Loan Market Association	7
3	An Overview of the APLMA – Janet Field & Katy Chan, Asia Pacific Loan Market Association	12

General Chapters:

4	An Introduction to Legal Risk and Structuring Cross-Border Lending Transactions – Thomas Mellor & Marcus Marsh, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	15
5	Global Trends in Leveraged Lending – Joshua W. Thompson & Caroline Leeds Ruby, Shearman & Sterling LLP	20
6	Similar But Not The Same: Some Ways in Which Bonds and Loans Will Differ in a Restructuring – Kenneth J. Steinberg & Darren S. Klein, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	26
7	Yankee Loans – “Lost in Translation” – a Look Back at Market Trends in 2015 – Alan Rockwell & Martin Forbes, White & Case LLP	32
8	Commercial Lending in the Developing Global Regulatory Environment: 2016 and Beyond – Bill Satchell & Elizabeth Leckie, Allen & Overy LLP	40
9	Acquisition Financing in the United States: Will the Boom Continue? – Geoffrey R. Peck & Mark S. Wojciechowski, Morrison & Foerster LLP	45
10	A Comparative Overview of Transatlantic Intercreditor Agreements – Lauren Hanrahan & Suhrod Mehta, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP	50
11	A Comparison of Key Provisions in U.S. and European Leveraged Loan Agreements – Sarah M. Ward & Mark L. Darley, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	57
12	The Global Subscription Credit Facility and Fund Finance Markets – Key Trends and Forecasting 2016 – Michael C. Mascia & Wesley A. Misson, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP	66
13	Recent Trends and Developments in U.S. Term Loan B – David Almroth & Denise Ryan, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP	69
14	The Continued Migration of US Covenant-Lite Structures into the European Leveraged Loan Market – Jane Summers & James Chesterman, Latham & Watkins LLP	74
15	Unitranche Financing: UK vs. US Models – Stuart Brinkworth & Julian S.H. Chung, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP	77
16	Recent Developments in Islamic Finance – Andrew Metcalf & Leroy Levy, King & Spalding LLP	82
17	Translating High Yield to Leveraged Loans: Avoiding Covenant Convergence Confusion – Jeff Norton & Danelle Le Cren, Linklaters LLP	86

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

18	Albania	Tonucci & Partners: Neritan Kallfa & Blerina Nikolla	91
19	Andorra	Montel&Manciet Advocats: Audrey Montel Rossell & Liliana Ranaldi González	97
20	Argentina	Marval, O’Farrell & Mairal: Juan M. Diehl Moreno & Diego A. Chighizola	103
21	Australia	King & Wood Mallesons: Yuen-Yee Cho & Richard Hayes	112
22	Bermuda	MJM Limited: Jeremy Leese	120
23	Bolivia	Criales, Urcullo & Antezana: Andrea Mariah Urcullo Pereira & Daniel Mariaca Alvarez	130
24	Botswana	Khan Corporate Law: Shakila Khan	137
25	Brazil	Pinheiro Neto Advogados: Ricardo Simões Russo & Leonardo Baptista Rodrigues Cruz	145
26	British Virgin Islands	Maples and Calder: Michael Gagie & Matthew Gilbert	153
27	Canada	McMillan LLP: Jeff Rogers & Don Waters	160
28	Cayman Islands	Maples and Calder: Tina Meigh & Nick Herrod	169

Continued Overleaf →

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

29	Chile	Carey: Diego Peralta & Elena Yubero	176
30	China	King & Wood Mallesons: Jack Wang & Stanley Zhou	183
31	Costa Rica	Cordero & Cordero Abogados: Hernán Cordero Maduro & Ricardo Cordero Baltodano	190
32	Cyprus	E & G Economides LLC: Marinella Kilikitas & George Economides	198
33	Czech Republic	JŠK, advokátní kancelář, s.r.o.: Roman Šťastný & Patrik Müller	206
34	Dominican Republic	QUIROZ SANTRONI Abogados Consultores: Hipólito García C.	212
35	England	Allen & Overy LLP: Philip Bowden & Darren Hanwell	219
36	France	Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP: Emmanuel Ringeval & Cristina Radu	227
37	Germany	King & Spalding LLP: Dr. Werner Meier & Dr. Axel J. Schilder	237
38	Greece	KPP Law Offices: George N. Kerameus & Pinelopi N. Tsagkari	248
39	Hong Kong	King & Wood Mallesons: Richard Mazzochi & David Lam	255
40	Indonesia	Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro: Theodoor Bakker & Ayik Candrawulan Gunadi	262
41	Ireland	McCann FitzGerald: Fergus Gillen & Martin O'Neill	270
42	Japan	Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Taro Awataguchi & Yuki Kohmaru	278
43	Mexico	Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.: José Ignacio Rivero Andere & Samuel Campos Leal	286
44	Norway	Advokatfirma Ræder DA: Marit E. Kirkhusmo & Kyrre W. Kielland	293
45	Peru	Miranda & Amado Abogados: Juan Luis Avendaño C. & Jose Miguel Puiggros O.	302
46	Puerto Rico	Ferraiuoli LLC: José Fernando Rovira Rullán & Carlos M. Lamoutte-Navas	312
47	Romania	Reff & Associates SCA: Andrei Burz-Pinzaru & Mihaela Maxim	319
48	Russia	Mosgo & Partners: Oleg Mosgo & Anton Shamatov	327
49	Singapore	Drew & Napier LLC: Valerie Kwok & Blossom Hing	334
50	Slovenia	Brule, Gaberščik in Kikelj o.p., d.o.o.: Luka Gaberščik & Mina Kržišnik	343
51	Spain	Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira: Manuel Follia & María Lérica	352
52	Sweden	White & Case LLP: Carl Hugo Parment & Tobias Johansson	361
53	Switzerland	Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd: Oliver Widmer & Urs Klöti	368
54	Taiwan	Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Hsin-Lan Hsu & Cyun-Ren Jhou	377
55	Turkey	Paksoy: Sera Somay & Esen Irtem	385
56	Ukraine	CMS Reich-Rohrwig Hainz: Anna Pogrebna & Kateryna Soroka	392
57	UAE	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Ayman A. Khaleq & Amanjit K. Fagura	399
58	USA	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Thomas Mellor & Rick Eisenbiegler	410
59	Venezuela	Rodner, Martínez & Asociados: Jaime Martínez Estévez	421

Acquisition Financing in the United States: Will the Boom Continue?



Geoffrey R. Peck



Mark S. Wojciechowski

Morrison & Foerster LLP

Global M&A hit a new high in 2015 with roughly \$5 trillion of M&A deals struck. Deal volumes in North America surged, with strong growth in the Asia-Pacific and Middle East regions. Europe saw moderate growth, with Latin America being the only area with less deal volume than 2014.

Mega deals drove aggregate deal volumes, including Pfizer's announced \$160 billion merger with Allergan, AB InBev's \$107 billion acquisition of SAB Miller, and Kraft Food's \$55 billion merger with Heinz. While in 2015 deals were seen across all industries, consumer, energy, TMT and healthcare were particularly active. Cross-border deal flow continued to be strong.

For deals with debt financing, banks were the dominant providers of loans. Yet non-banks were strong in middle market M&A financings, where many deals were structured as unitranche.

Indicators suggest that the boom should continue in 2016. Private equity firms and corporations continue to have large amounts of cash on hand. Many industries, such as a healthcare and energy, continue to be ripe for consolidation. Mega deals should continue to be struck, including tax inversion deals.

Yet there are factors that warrant caution including: choppy economic markets; China's economy; falling oil prices; continued talk of Britain leaving the European Union; and the uncertainties of a volatile U.S. presidential election.

Regardless of 2016 M&A volume, the need for acquisition financing will continue to be strong. It is important to review the fundamentals of U.S. acquisition financing using secured loans and monitor trends in this regularly changing area of financing.

The Commitment Letter is Key

The commitment letter for a financing sets forth the material terms of the lenders' obligations to fund the loans and the conditions precedent to such obligations. Obtaining a suitable commitment letter from one or more lenders is of particular importance to acquisition financing and can be the deciding factor as to whether a seller will sign an acquisition agreement with a particular buyer where the buyer cannot otherwise prove itself able to fund the acquisition from its own funds. As in all committed financings, the borrower wants an enforceable commitment from its lenders which obligates the lenders to extend the loans, subject to certain conditions that have been mutually agreed upon. In acquisition financing, where the proceeds of the loans will be used by the borrower to pay the purchase price for the target company, in whole or in part, the seller will also be concerned whether the buyer has strong funding commitments from its lenders. If the buyer's lenders do not fund the loans, a failed acquisition could result.

In a typical timeline of an acquisition, especially one involving public companies, the buyer and seller execute the definitive agreement for the acquisition weeks, if not months, in advance of the acquisition. Following execution, the buyer and seller work to obtain regulatory approvals and other third-party consents that may be needed to consummate the acquisition, execute a tender offer if required, complete remaining due diligence, finalise the financing documentation and take other required actions. Signing an acquisition agreement often results in the seller not pursuing other potential buyers for a period of time while the parties work to complete the items noted in the prior sentence. For example, acquisition agreements routinely contain covenants forbidding the seller from soliciting or otherwise facilitating other bids and requiring the parties to work diligently towards closing. Further, many acquisition agreements either do not give the buyer a right to terminate the agreement if its financing falls through (known as a "financing-out" provision), or require a substantial penalty payment to be made by the buyer if the transaction fails to proceed, including as a result of the financing falling through (known as a "reverse break-up fee"). Accordingly, at the signing of the acquisition agreement, and as consideration for the buyer's efforts and costs to close the acquisition, the buyer will want the lenders to have strong contractual obligations to fund the loans needed to close the acquisition.

Who Drafts the Commitment Letter?

Private equity funds (also known as sponsors) are some of the most active participants in M&A transactions and related financings. With their sizeable volumes of business that can be offered to banks, sponsors often have greater leverage in negotiations with lenders than non-sponsor-owned companies. Sponsors and their advisors monitor acquisition financings in the market and insist that their deals have the same, if not better, terms. As economic tides shift, the ability of sponsors to leverage their large books of banking business grows and wanes, and the favourability for sponsors of acquisition financing terms shift as well.

Who drafts the commitment papers is one area where sponsors are often treated more favourably than other borrowers. While lenders in most cases expect to draft commitment papers, the larger sponsors are now regularly preparing their own forms of commitment papers and requiring the lenders to use them. From the sponsors' perspective, controlling the drafts can result in standardised commitment letters across deals, and a more efficient and quick process to finalise commitment letters. To get the best terms, the sponsors often simultaneously negotiate with a number of potential lenders and then award the lead role in an acquisition financing to the lender willing to accept the most sponsor-favourable terms.

Conditionality

The buyer's need for certainty of funds to pay the purchase price puts sharp focus on the conditions that must be met before the lenders are contractually obligated to fund the loans. As a result, a buyer has a strong preference to limit the number of conditions precedent in a commitment letter, and to make sure that the commitment letter is explicit as to the included conditions, in order to enhance funding certainty. The buyer and seller want to avoid a scenario where the conditions precedent to the buyer's obligation to close the acquisition have been met but the lenders' obligation to fund the loans have not. Particularly in the scenario where no financing-out clause is included in the acquisition agreement, if the acquisition financing falls through because the buyer cannot satisfy the conditions in the commitment letter, the buyer may not be able to close the acquisition and could be required to pay the seller sizeable contractual break-up fees and be subject to lawsuits from the seller. Certain conditions discussed below are commonly subject to heavy negotiation in an acquisition financing.

Conditions Precedent, Covenants and Defaults

Commitment letters for general financings often contain vague and partial lists of documents and conditions that the lenders will require before funding the loans. Phrases like "customary conditions precedent" are often seen. In contrast, a commitment letter for an acquisition financing typically has an explicit, detailed and often lengthy list of conditions.

If the lenders are permitted to require satisfaction of conditions precedent to funding that are not expressly set forth in the signed commitment letter (whether customary conditions or not), this increases the risk to the borrower that these additional conditions cannot be met. It is common in an acquisition financing to see an express statement from the lenders that the list of conditions precedent in the commitment letter are the only conditions that will be required for funding. In some cases, the list of conditions precedent in commitment letters for acquisition finance are so detailed that they are copied directly into the final forms of loan agreements.

Similarly, vague references to "customary covenants" and "customary events of default" in a commitment letter present similar risks, particularly the proposed inclusion of unreasonable provisions which could not be met by the borrower. To limit this risk, commitment letters for acquisition financings often include fully negotiated covenant and default packages (which may include pages of detailed definitions to be used in calculation of any financial covenants).

Form of Loan Documents

Some sponsors even require that the form of the loan agreement be consistent with "sponsor precedent", meaning that the loan documentation from the sponsor's prior acquisition financing will be used as a model for the new financing. Agreeing to use or be guided by "sponsor precedent" limits the risk to the sponsor that the financing will be delayed or not close because the lender and its counsel produce a draft loan agreement with unexpected terms and provisions.

Many acquisition financings, particularly in the middle market, involve multiple classes of loans with complex intercreditor arrangements. These financings include 1st/2nd lien, split-collateral, *pari passu* collateral, subordinated, holdco and unitranche financings. In complex and technical intercreditor agreements, lenders agree on many issues relating to their respective classes of loans, including priority of liens, priority of debt, control of remedies and certain

technical bankruptcy issues. Negotiation of these agreements among different classes of creditors can be lengthy and frustrate closing time frames. As middle market M&A continues to grow, and more deals have complex intercreditor arrangements, some sponsors are also requiring lenders to use a specified form of intercreditor agreement.

Representations and Warranties

Loan agreements typically require that the included representations and warranties be accurate as a condition to funding. Lenders financing the acquisition also want the representations with respect to the target in the acquisition agreement to be accurate. This is reasonable because after consummation of the acquisition, the target is likely to be obligated on the loans (either as the borrower or a guarantor) and thus part of the credit against which the lenders are funding.

"SunGard" (named for an acquisition financing that included these terms) or "certain funds" provisions are now common in commitment letters for acquisition financings. These clauses are relevant to several provisions in a typical commitment letter. With respect to representations and warranties, these clauses provide that on the closing date of the loan, as a condition to the lenders' funding obligations, only certain representations need to be accurate. Strong sponsors even negotiate the precise meaning of the term "accurate". The representations required to be accurate as a condition to the lenders' funding obligation in a typical SunGard clause include the following:

- The only representations and warranties relating to the target are those that, were they untrue, would be material to the lenders and for which the buyer has a right under the acquisition agreement to decline to close the acquisition. While providing certainty of funding, this standard avoids a scenario where the loan agreement has different representations with respect to the target than the acquisition agreement.
- Only certain representations with respect to the borrower set forth in the loan agreement must be accurate (the "specified representations"). These can include those with respect to corporate existence, power and authority to enter into the financing, enforceability of the loan documents, margin regulations, no conflicts with law or other contracts, solvency, status of liens (see below regarding this topic) and certain anti-terrorism and money laundering laws. A financial covenant could also be included as a specified representation in some deals. What are included as specified representations change with changing economic conditions and relative bargaining strength of companies and sponsors. As financial markets have improved and the leverage of sponsors has increased, the typical list of specified representations has shrunk and may well continue to weaken, benefitting sponsors.

These are the only representations applicable as conditions precedent to the initial funding of the loans. Even if the other representations in the loan agreement could not be truthfully made at the time of the initial funding, the lenders nonetheless are contractually obligated to fund the loans.

Company MAC

Company material adverse change (MAC), sometimes referred to as a "company MAC" or a "business MAC", is a type of representation included in some acquisition agreements and loan agreements. This is a representation that no material adverse change in the business of the target has occurred. Inability to make the representations in the acquisition agreement typically permits the buyer to terminate the acquisition agreement and in the loan agreement it excuses the

lenders from their funding obligations. A customary MAC definition in an acquisition agreement differs from that in a loan agreement. Acquisition agreement MAC clauses are often more limited in scope and time frame covered, and have more exceptions (including for general market and economic conditions impacting the target). Like other representations, buyers and sellers often require that the MAC definition in loan agreements mirror the definition in acquisition agreements, but solely for purposes of the initial funding of the acquisition loans (and not for ongoing draws under a working capital revolver or a delayed draw term loan, for instance).

Market MAC and Flex

“Market MAC” is another type of MAC representation in some commitment letters. Seen more in economic down-cycles, these clauses allow the lenders to terminate their commitments if there has been a material adverse change in the loan and syndication markets generally. Strong borrowers and sponsors have had success with excluding these clauses in their commitment letters over the last several years as the economy has continued to improve.

As discussed above, the time between signing the commitment letter, on one hand, and closing the acquisition and funding the loans on the other, is often a lengthy period. Lenders whose commitment letters do not have a market MAC, especially those lenders who fully underwrite the commitments, are subject to deteriorating financial markets during the syndication of the commitments and the risk that they will not be able to sell down the commitments to other lenders. “Flex” provisions limit this risk and allow for amendments to the terms of the financing without certain agreed-upon borrower’s consent when necessary to allow the lenders arranging the loan to sell down their commitments.

If, during syndication, there is no market for the loans at the price or terms provided in the commitment letter and term sheet, a flex provision will allow the committed lenders to “flex” the pricing terms (by increasing the interest rate, fees or both) within pre-agreed limits or make other pre-agreed changes to the structure of the loans (such as call protections, shorter maturities, etc.). While these changes provide some comfort to committed lenders in gradually deteriorating financial markets, they may not be as helpful in a dramatic downturn where there is little to no market for loans on any terms.

Just after the financial crisis, not surprisingly, flex clauses often became broader in scope and gave lenders greater flexibility to change key terms of a financing. The types of provisions that can be subject to flex include interest rate margins, negative covenant baskets, financial covenant ratios, the allocation of credit between first lien, second lien and high yield bonds and the amount and type of fees. As markets continue to improve, sponsors are using their leverage to limit the breadth of flex provisions, and to require greater limits on the scope of the changes that can be made without their consent.

Some sponsors have even turned the tables on their lenders and required “reverse flex” arrangements. These provisions require the lenders to amend the financing terms under the commitment letters to be more favourable to the borrower if syndication of the loans is “oversubscribed”, meaning that there is more demand from potential lenders than available loans.

Perfection of Liens

As in all secured financings, lenders in an acquisition financing need evidence that their liens on the borrower’s assets are perfected and enforceable, preferably as a condition precedent to the initial funding under the loan agreement. However, ensuring perfection of the liens is often highly technical and can be a time-consuming process

depending on the nature and location of the borrower’s assets and the specific legal requirements for perfection. The technical nature of lien perfection raises the risk (to the borrower and the seller) that lenders will delay or withhold funding for the loans because insufficient steps were taken to perfect the liens, and in an acquisition financing timing and certainty are at a premium.

Typical SunGard provisions limit this risk by requiring delivery at funding of only (i) Uniform Commercial Code financing statements which perfect a security interest in personal property that can be perfected by filing, and (ii) original stock certificates for any pledged shares. Perfecting a security interest in other asset classes is required on a post-funding basis by a covenant detailing what perfection steps are required. The sorts of collateral perfected on a post-closing basis can include real estate, deposit and securities accounts, intellectual property, foreign assets and other more esoteric collateral requiring more complicated efforts.

As financial markets continue to improve, sponsors are likely to continue pushing lenders to increase the time frames to complete post-closing collateral deliverables, give the administrative agent greater flexibility to extend these time frames without lender consent and limit efforts by lenders to increase the collateral deliverables required at closing.

The Acquisition Agreement Matters

Delivery of the executed acquisition agreement is a condition precedent to the lenders’ obligation to fund the loans. As discussed in more detail below, as a fallback, lenders sometimes accept a near final draft of the acquisition agreement, coupled with a covenant from the buyer that there will be no material changes. The terms of the acquisition agreement are important to lenders in a number of respects, beyond understanding the structure and business of the borrower after consummation of the acquisition. Lenders also regularly require inclusion of certain provisions in acquisition agreements.

Structure of the Acquisition

The structure of the acquisition is important to the lenders as it will dictate a number of issues for the financing, including collateral perfection, identity of the guarantors and borrowers and timing of the acquisition (*i.e.*, how long the lenders need to have their commitments outstanding). There are a number of common acquisition structures. While the specifics of those structures are beyond the scope of this article, these include stock purchases (with or without a tender offer), mergers (including forward, forward triangular and reverse triangular mergers) and asset purchases. Each has its own unique structuring issues for the lenders.

Representations and Company MAC

As described above, the lenders often rely on the representations and warranties in the acquisition agreement, including the definition of material adverse change, and incorporate those terms into the loan agreement.

Obligation to Continue Operating

Lenders often review whether the seller is contractually obligated in the acquisition agreement to continue operating the business in the ordinary course and not to make material changes to the business. Again, the target is a part of the lenders’ credit and the lenders do not want to discover after consummation of the acquisition that the target has been restructured in a way that results in its business being different than the lenders’ understanding.

Indemnity

Lenders also typically consider the indemnities provided by the seller in the acquisition agreement. If, after the acquisition is consummated, it is discovered that the seller made a misrepresentation or, worse, committed fraud or other wrongdoing as part of the acquisition, those indemnities could affect the buyer's ability to recover against the seller. If the misrepresentation or wrongdoing results in the lenders foreclosing on the assets of the borrower, the indemnities could be inherited by the lenders if the rights of the borrower under the acquisition agreement are part of the collateral. Acquisition agreements typically contain anti-assignment and transfer provisions. It is important that those provisions expressly permit the lenders to take a lien on the acquisition agreement.

Purchase Price Adjustments and Earn-Outs

Any payments to be made to the seller by the buyer after consummation of the acquisition are important to the lenders. Many loan agreements define these payments, whether based on performance of the target or other factors, as debt and their payment needs to be specifically permitted by the loan agreement. Beyond technically drafting the loan agreement to permit payment of these amounts, the proceeds to be used to make these payments should be viewed as assets of the buyer that are not available to the lenders to repay the loans and this may impact the credit review of the loan facility.

Xerox Provisions

When a proposed acquisition terminates, the commitment letters for the acquisition financing typically state that the lenders' commitments also terminate. That is not always the end of the lenders' concerns. Many terminated acquisitions result in accusations of breach of contract, wrongdoing or bad faith by the parties. Litigation is not uncommon. Lenders want to make sure that any litigation brought by the seller does not look to the lenders for damages.

Xerox provisions (named for a financing with Xerox where these clauses were first seen) give lenders this protection in the form of an acknowledgment by the seller in the acquisition agreement that the seller's sole remedy against the buyer and its lenders for termination of the acquisition is the break-up fee specified in the acquisition agreement. If the acquisition terminates because the lenders fail to fund their commitments, the lenders may be subject to a breach of contract suit brought by the buyer. But the lenders in any termination scenario often seek to restrict suits brought against them by the seller. Conversely, sellers' focus on certainty of the financing have caused some sellers to push back on inclusion of these provisions. Some sellers with strong leverage even negotiate for the right to enforce remedies (or cause the buyer to enforce remedies) against the lenders under a commitment letter.

Since the lenders are not party to the acquisition agreement, applicable law creates hurdles for the lenders to enforce the Xerox provisions. To address these hurdles, lenders seek to be expressly named as third-party beneficiaries of the Xerox provisions. In the event that the lenders have claims against the seller for breach of the Xerox provisions, lenders will have customary concerns about the venue and forum of any claims brought by the lenders under the acquisition agreement. Like in loan agreements, lenders often seek to have New York as the exclusive location for these suits and seek jury trial waivers in the acquisition agreement.

Efforts to Obtain the Financing

Lenders will consider provisions in the acquisition agreement regarding the buyer's obligations to obtain financing. Typically, buyers agree to use "reasonable best efforts" or "commercially reasonable efforts" to obtain the financing in the commitment letter. These provisions may include a requirement to maintain the commitment letter, not to permit any modification to the terms of commitment letter without the seller's consent (with some exceptions), to give notice to the seller upon the occurrence of certain events under the commitment letter, and obtain alternative financing, if necessary. As noted above, acquisition agreements may also contain provisions obligating the buyer to enforce its rights against the lender under the commitment letter, or even pursue litigation against the lender. Buyers with strong leverage will want to limit provisions in the acquisition agreement requiring specific actions against the lenders.

Cooperation with the Financing

As discussed above, the lenders have an interest in understanding the acquisition and the nature of the target's business. Further, the conditions precedent will require deliverables from the target and the lenders' regulatory, credit and legal requirements demand that they receive certain diligence information about the target and its business. None of this can be accomplished if the seller does not agree to assist the buyer and its lenders. Lenders often require that the acquisition agreement include a clause that the seller will cooperate with the lenders' diligence and other requirements relating to the acquisition financing.

Amendments to the Acquisition Agreement

Lenders usually have the opportunity to review the acquisition agreement, or at least a near final version, prior to executing their commitment letters. The buyer and seller will want the lenders to acknowledge that the final agreement or draft is acceptable. The lenders, on the other hand, will want to receive notice of any amendments to the acquisition agreement and ensure they do not adversely impact the financing. To avoid the lenders' refusal to fund the loans because of an amendment to the acquisition agreement, buyers and sellers are often careful to ensure that no amendments to the acquisition agreement will be required. Some amendments are unavoidable and commitment letters often contain express provisions as to the nature of those amendments that need lender approval. If lender approval is not needed, then the lenders cannot use the amendment as a reason to refuse funding.

Negotiations of the "no-amendment" condition focus on the materiality of the amendments and whether the change has to be adverse or materially adverse, with some lenders negotiating consent rights for any material change in the acquisition agreement. Lenders often seek to negotiate express provisions that would be deemed material or adverse, including some of the above clauses that were included in the acquisition agreement at the requirement of the lenders. Some lenders with strong negotiating leverage even negotiate for a clause in the acquisition agreement that any amendments will require the lenders' consent.

Conclusion

Leveraged acquisitions in the United States raise unique structuring issues and techniques, only some of which are discussed here. As global financial markets continue to improve, expect to see greater volumes of acquisition financings and sponsors exercising greater leverage over their lenders to loosen acquisition financing terms.

**Geoffrey R. Peck**

Morrison & Foerster LLP
250 West 55th Street
New York, NY 10019-5201
USA

Tel: +1 212 336 4183
Fax: +1 212 468 7900
Email: gpeck@mof.com
URL: www.mof.com

Geoffrey Peck is a Partner in Morrison & Foerster's New York office. Mr. Peck specialises in financial transactions and restructurings, representing banks, funds, issuers and borrowers in a broad spectrum of financings, including syndicated and asset-based loans, acquisition, subscription-backed, debtor-in possession, mezzanine, structured commodity and project financings, and secondary market trading. His practice is both domestic and cross-border. Mr. Peck received his B.A. and B.S. from Boston University and his J.D. from the University of Pennsylvania.

**Mark S. Wojciechowski**

Morrison & Foerster LLP
250 West 55th Street
New York, NY 10019-5201
USA

Tel: +1 212 468 8079
Fax: +1 212 468 7900
Email: mwojciechowski@mof.com
URL: www.mof.com

Mark Wojciechowski is a Partner at Morrison & Foerster LLP. Mr. Wojciechowski focuses on leveraged and acquisition finance, mergers and acquisitions and hybrid transactions involving structured debt and equity investments. His clients include major foreign and domestic commercial banks and investment banks, as well as public and private corporations and investment funds. Mr. Wojciechowski routinely advises these clients on both transactional and regulatory matters. Mr. Wojciechowski is recognised as a leading lawyer by *Chambers USA* 2013 for excellence in the field of M&A/Corporate work.

MORRISON FOERSTER

Morrison & Foerster is a global firm of exceptional credentials and clients, including some of the most successful financial institutions, asset managers, investment funds and companies. With over 1,000 lawyers in 17 offices in the world's key financial and business centres, MoFo handles some of the world's largest and most complex domestic and cross-border financial, restructuring, acquisition and corporate transactions. MoFo is committed to provide the best customer service to our clients, while providing innovative and business-minded results. *Chambers Global* named MoFo its 2013 USA Law Firm of the Year. Visit us at www.mof.com.

Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks

glg global legal group

59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: sales@glgroup.co.uk

www.iclg.co.uk