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## I. Pricing (current as of September 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1L: 175 – 225 bps</th>
<th>2L: 200-225 bps</th>
<th>1L: 150-175 bps</th>
<th>2L: 175-200 bps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrangement Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OID to the market</td>
<td>Pre-Covid: typically 50 bps</td>
<td>Post Covid: 100-250 bps</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening Margin</td>
<td>3.125-4.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 0.15-0.25 bps higher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin Ratchet</td>
<td>1L: often 1 or no step down (occasionally up to 3), starting first full quarter after closing</td>
<td>2L: 1 or no step down</td>
<td>1L: often 3 or 4 step downs, starting 6-12 months after closing</td>
<td>2L: 1 or no step down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBOR Floor</td>
<td>0-100 bps</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing Flex</td>
<td>Often c. 150 bps; up to c. 1/2 OID on 4 yr convention</td>
<td></td>
<td>Often c. 150 bps; up to c. 1/2 can be OID on 3 yr convention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default rate on overdue amounts</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Market Conventions

**ISSUE**

- **Currency requirement**: US$ only - US institutional investors have limited ability to fund other currencies
- **Withholding tax**: Not a practical concern
- **Permitted lender issues for non-banks**: Can be a concern in certain states e.g. California particularly if active in the state
- **Co-borrower required for syndication purposes**: Additional liquidity is available if there is a US borrower or co-borrower; when this becomes a pricing concern is a syndication judgment but kicks in when raising somewhere north of US$700m

**US institutional investors**

- Different currencies available but liquidity varies: € (most liquid), £ (next), CHF, etc. (but US$ tranche/placement generally would need to comply with US market requirements)
- Country of borrower specific issue – certain European countries require reliance on tax treaty networks to reduce withholding to zero, which practically excludes tax haven lenders (consider CLOs)
- Varies per country but the issue arises more frequently – e.g. issue to consider/structure around in France, Germany, Italy, Norway; no issue in UK, Luxembourg, Netherlands, etc.

**Not a requirement**
II. Market Conventions (cont’d)

**ISSUE**

- **Public/private side IM/information requirements**
  - Required even for private companies; credit agreement is normally public side and often a public document
  - Not required for private companies; credit agreement is normally private side and not public

- **Amortisation requirement**
  - 1% per annum payable quarterly is norm as many US investors have increased ability to invest in amortising debt
  - Not a requirement

- **Change of Control**
  - Event of Default
  - Mandatory prepayment (top tier standard is Lender put right at 100)

- **Repeating reps**
  - Only when new funds are drawn
  - Also at the end of each Interest Period
II. Market Conventions (cont’d)

**ISSUE**

- **RCF maturity** (typically provided by banks, not institutional lenders):
  - **US**: 5 years
  - **EU**: Often 6 or 6.5 years in an acquisition financing

- **RCF sub-limits**
  - **Limit on LCs/Swinglines**
  - **US**: Often none
  - **EU**: Often none

- **RCF springing level**
  - **US**: 30% typical
  - **EU**: 35% or now increasingly 40% for top tier

- **Interest payments when Interest Period longer than 3 months, in which case also at 3 months**
  - **US**: At end of Interest Period unless longer than 3 months, in which case also at 3 months (although this is often disregarded in US placements of European loans)
  - **EU**: At end of Interest Period unless longer than 6 months, in which case also at 6 months
### III. Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees/Security cover substantially all assets and are relatively cheap to obtain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Often no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate benefit and financial assistance limitations are a meaningful limitation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Often – depends on use of proceeds; corporate form of borrower/guarantor and jurisdiction – results in detailed “Agreed Security Principles”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantor coverage test</td>
<td>No – as minimal on shore non-Guarantors; offshore entities may or may not be required, subject to tax issues</td>
<td>Yes – may be 80% of Group EBITDA or 80% of EBITDA in Agreed Security Jurisdictions/capital maintenance, usually excluding negative EBITDA companies and companies that can’t guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural seniority results in favorable treatment in bankruptcy</td>
<td>No – outcome generally determined by which entities there is a claim against, and whether the claim is secured, not where the entity is in a structure</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## III. Structure (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy laws deal with creditor standstills and releases of</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No – so replicated to a degree in ICAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guarantees/security/debt claims when the operating business is sold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation on debt at non-Guarantors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes increasingly (inherited from US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold above which lenders of debt to Group must accede to ICA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Formerly yes; now not always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankruptcy laws deal with each legal entity on an entity by entity</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtor in possession financing or similar is available</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Structure (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security is given to the hedging</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standstill applies to hedging</td>
<td>Yes (because provided for in Chapter 11)</td>
<td>Yes (because provided for in ICA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes for hedging in security/security enforcement</td>
<td>No (except sometimes for certain commodity hedging)</td>
<td>Yes; may be limited to unpaid termination amounts or voting of mark to market, as negotiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option to purchase in favor of junior debt</td>
<td>Negotiated point</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of security</td>
<td>On an Event of Default</td>
<td>On an Acceleration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Facilities (and similar) sharing in security</td>
<td>Yes: Cash Management Facilities</td>
<td>Yes: Ancillary Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Structure (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Qualifying Listing” i.e. specified covenant fall away on IPO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-tying limitations apply</td>
<td>Yes but an offshore exemption may apply</td>
<td>UK has a limited one; not Europe; rare in other non-US jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usury Limitation</td>
<td>Varies state by state; New York has an exemption for most corporate loans</td>
<td>Some jurisdictions have e.g. France, Italy but otherwise not in many cases (e.g. not a practical concern in UK); PIK can raise particular issues needing to be dealt with e.g. in Luxembourg, Spain and Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. M&A/Syndication Process

SPA differences

Completion account SPAs are the norm - economic risks/benefits pass from closing, and has a “no MAC” CP

Lockbox SPAs are the norm - economic risks/benefits pass from a lock box date in the past subject to only agreed leakage. Absence of “no MAC” CP

Xerox language required in SPA

Required by financing banks

Not required by financing banks

Finance cooperation required in SPA

Required by financing banks – most guarantees and security required from Target group at closing

Not required by financing banks for loans (banks rely on syndication cooperation language in commitment letter; target group guarantees and security typically follow closing); however typically required by bond/bridge underwriters (short vs. long-form)

“Certain funds” requirement at time of bid/signing of SPA (private M&A)

SunGard limited conditionality applies with same “no target MAC” CP (including its governing law) as the SPA, also solvency rep and often a marketing CP. Fundable documentation not typically required to back bids.

Certain funds with the only conditions ones in the control of the buyer; no “no target MAC” CP, solvency rep or marketing CP. Fundable docs also required to back bid – usually in the form of an Interim Facilities Agreement

“Certain funds” requirement for take privates (public M&A)

As above is the base case (i.e. there is no particular legal requirement)

Varies per jurisdiction but many have requirement for even tighter certain funds and in some cases LCs/avals in favour of the relevant securities regulator
IV. M&A/Syndication Process (cont’d)

**ISSUE**

Certainty of achieving 100% in public M&A if closes

- Normally 100% certainty
- Varies per jurisdiction but minimum acceptance condition often must be lower than that required for minority squeeze out

Margin loan limitations need to be considered/structured around in public M&A

- Yes
- No unless shares or ADRs of the foreign issuer trade on a US exchange, but additional offshore exemptions often then can also apply

Lender reliance on buy-side diligence reports

- None; lender counsel also typically conducts limited due diligence on the target
- Historically yes other than for the commercial due diligence report; now it is as negotiated (common outcome is reliance on a tax structure memo and can be a reasonable efforts undertaking to seek reliance for the balance, but not as a CP). Typically no lender law firm diligence

Timing of debt syndication

- Typically timed to price shortly before closing; bridges typically don’t fund (take out bond issue takes place pre-close)
- Often post-closing but increasing pressure to be before closing. Not unusual for bridges to fund.
## V. Commercial Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability in commitment letter of documentation standards (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“updated for recent top tier sponsor precedent” or (2) providing override that terms will be “no more restrictive than the bonds”</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Yes where there is an upfront issue; a point for negotiation if bonds issued subsequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions wording limited to Restricted Group</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvency rep included as CP</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft call sunset</td>
<td>6-12 mths or no sunset</td>
<td>6-12 mths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freebie basket sizing</td>
<td>Typically 0.50-0.75x</td>
<td>Typically 0.75-1.00x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBITDA cures</td>
<td>Accepted subject to a capped amount</td>
<td>Accepted; uncapped overcures often accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPO/Illegality/Reports/SPA recovery mandatory prepayments</td>
<td>No (and illegality results in a change in the interest measure e.g. LIBOR to base rate)</td>
<td>Yes (through top tier slot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information undertaking time periods</td>
<td>90 days post year end for annuals typical/45 days post quarter end for quarterlies typical</td>
<td>120/150 for annuals; 60/90 for quarterlies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## V. Commercial Terms (con’t)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendments releasing all or substantially all collateral/guarantees</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferees</td>
<td>Black list construct; consent deemed given if no response within 5 Business Days of request; often restriction on transfers to competitors is dealt with by borrower ability to add competitors to blacklist</td>
<td>White list construct; consent deemed given if no response within 5-10 Business Days of request; often a separate restriction on transfers to competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snooze you lose</td>
<td>Uncommon</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set off</td>
<td>Following an Event of Default</td>
<td>Following an acceleration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Benoit Lavigne is a Partner of Morrison & Foerster LLP in the Finance and Projects Group, based in the London office.
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MoFo At A Glance

A GLOBAL FIRM

Globally we have more than 1,000 lawyers across 17 offices, and together with our best-friends network of 125+ relationship firms worldwide, this means that we are a one stop shop on cross-border transactions.

THE FACTS

1,000+ lawyers globally

We emphasize a proactive, client-centered approach

LEADING GLOBAL TECH FIRM

65 PhDs & 100+ advanced degree Patent lawyers

Founded in 1883

17 Offices in 7 countries

200 lawyers in Asia

Global reach of 125+ countries worldwide

Ranked among TOP 10 FIRMS in American Lawyer's Diversity Scorecard
Finance Overview

We offers clients the experience and skills to handle their most strategic needs. Clients take advantage of the knowledge and capabilities of our banking and finance practice, across all areas of business restructuring and insolvency, derivatives and structured products, financial services and financial transactions, project finance, real estate finance, securitization, and tax.

Breadth of Finance Knowledge
Morrison & Foerster’s 95+ finance lawyers, including over 20 London-based lawyers, represent public and privately held companies, major private credit lenders and banking institutions, as well as non-bank lenders, private equity, and corporations, developers and sponsors, on a full range of financial and capital markets transactions globally. Our team includes lawyers with expertise in the areas of banking, securities, structured finance, project finance, private placements and derivatives.

Extensive Experience
We have an experienced, full-service team that represents banks, asset managers, hedge funds, and other market participants in every type of finance transaction. MoFo’s market-leading financial transactions practice is global in scope, with offices in key financial centers and lawyers closing deals worldwide, including Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

Highly Ranked
We collaborate with our highly ranked corporate, M&A, and venture capital practices that have been recognized for their work in industries such as financial institutions, life sciences, IT, energy, telecom, and technology, and for their experience with cross-border transactions.

Recognized Debt Finance Capabilities
Our lawyers are among the most experienced and creative lawyers for leveraged, asset backed and structured debt products in the London market, with specific experience in all kinds of senior, ABL/borrowing base, mezzanine and second lien (both European and US), high yield, PIK, preference share and other junior debt financings, as well as financings based on portfolio equity values such as “margin loans” on unlisted shares and financings of minority stakes. Members of our London finance team are regularly ranked among the best lawyers in their field, including commendation from the Financial Times in the 2016 European Innovative Lawyers report, and have been personally involved in many of the market-moving developments of the past periods including developing the first European super senior revolver alongside a senior secured bond issue, the first pari passu bank/bond deal and arguably the first European unitranche terms.
A Note on Diversity

Diversity has long been a core value of Morrison & Foerster.

We made history in 2001, by becoming one of the first global law firms to elect an openly-gay person to serve as Chair of the firm. More than 20 years ago, we formally implemented our diversity mission statement, which continues to define the firm’s cultural values today. We understand that fostering an environment of inclusion enables us to offer a wide range of perspectives to provide exemplary services to our clients. In short, we aim to make our firm a model of diversity that others will follow.

- When we announced our partner class of 2020, almost half of our 18 newly promoted partners are women.
- This is not just a 2020 phenomenon. In the last five years, we have promoted 32 women to partner, which represents 46% of our total partner promotions. Fourteen of those people promoted were working on a reduced-hours schedule the year prior to promotion (20% of our total partner promotions).
- 40% of the members on our board of directors are women.
- Women chair or co-chair approximately 20 of our practice groups.

We take pride in our diverse workplace. We believe that lawyers with different backgrounds, interests and experiences working together arrive at better answers and offer fresher perspectives.