

**Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group
Maintenance Agenda Submission Form
Form A**

Issue: Bond Definition – Debt Securities Issued by Funds

Check (applicable entity):

	P/C	Life	Health
Modification of Existing SSAP	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New Issue or SSAP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interpretation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Description of Issue: This agenda item has been developed to clarify guidance in the principles-based bond definition on the treatment on debt securities issued by funds, particularly to eliminate inconsistent application between similar funds and to better align with the recently adopted definition of residual tranches. In the adopted bond definition, bonds issued by business development corporations (BDCs), closed-end funds (CEFs), or similar operating entities are provided as examples of issuer credit obligations (ICOs) when they are registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 (1940 Act). It has been noted that this guidance is inconsistent with the stated intent of having the bond definition be principles-based as the registration of the fund appears to be the basis of classification as an ICO vs ABS, rather than based on principles. It has been noted that with the current guidance, two funds with issued debt that are virtually identical can have separate SSAP classification of the debt securities (resulting with different accounting/reporting) simply based on whether the fund is registered. Additionally, it would lead to debt securities being classified inconsistently with their equity counterparts. In concept, there should be consistency between the classification of a debt security as an asset-backed security, and the equity of that structure being classified as a residual interest. Using SEC-registration as currently adopted would result in misalignment of these concepts.

The changes captured within this agenda item propose to revise the principles-based bond definition guidance to clarify that debt securities issued by funds representing operating entities qualify as ICOs. This would allow consistent treatment of similar funds regardless of SEC registration status. Guidance is also proposed to assist with distinguishing whether a fund represents an operating entity or a securitization vehicle.

The original guidance, and the reference to the SEC registration, was an easy approach to determine whether a debt security from a fund qualified as an ICO. This is because SEC registered funds have leverage limits on how much debt can be issued. Although debt securities issued from SEC registered CEFs and BDCs are still permitted as ICOs, the proposed edits permit debt securities from non-registered funds to qualify as ICO if the funds are functioning as operating entities and are not issuing securities for the primary purpose of raising debt capital.

Existing Authoritative Literature:

- **SSAP No. 26R—Bonds (Effective Jan. 1, 2025)**

7. An issuer credit obligation is a bond, for which the general creditworthiness of an operating entity or entities through direct or indirect recourse, is the primary source of repayment. Operating entity or entities includes holding companies with operating entity subsidiaries where the holding company has the ability to access the operating subsidiaries' cash flows through its ownership rights. An operating entity may be any sort of business entity, not-for-profit organization, governmental unit, or other provider of goods or services, but not a natural person or "ABS Issuer" (as defined in paragraph 8). Examples of issuer credit obligations include, but are not limited to:

- a. U.S. Treasury securities, including U.S. Treasury Inflation-Indexed Securities; (INT 01-25).
- b. U.S. government agency securities.

- c. Municipal securities issued by the municipality or supported by cash flows generated by a municipally-owned asset or entity that provides goods or services (e.g., airport, toll roads, etc.).
- d. Corporate bonds issued by operating entities, including Yankee bonds and zero-coupon bonds.
- e. Corporate bonds issued by holding companies that own operating entities.
- f. Project finance bonds issued by operating entities.
- g. Investments in the form of securities for which repayment is fully supported by an underlying contractual obligation of a single operating entity (e.g., Credit Tenant Loans (CTLs), Equipment trust certificates (ETCs), other lease backed securities, Funding Agreement Backed Notes (FABNs), etc.). For purposes of applying this principal concept, repayment is fully-supported by the underlying operating entity obligation if it provides cash flows for the repayment of all interest and at least 95% of the principal of the security.
- h. Bonds issued by real estate investment trusts (REITs) or similar property trusts.
- i. **Bonds issued by business development corporations, closed-end funds, or similar operating entities, in each case registered under the 1940 Act.**
- j. Convertible bonds issued by operating entities, including mandatory convertible bonds as defined in paragraph 20.b.

Issue Paper – Exposure Draft As of 2023 Summer National Meeting

32. Whether an issuer of debt represents an operating entity or ABS Issuer is expected to be clear in most instances, but certain instances may be less clear. Ultimately, for an issuer credit obligation, it comes down to whether support for repayment consists of direct or indirect recourse to an operating entity or entities. In addition to “traditional bond” structures previously included in SSAP No. 26R, examples of issuer credit obligations include:

- a. Investments in the form of securities for which repayment is fully supported by an underlying contractual obligation of a single operating entity. (e.g., CTLs, ETCs, other lease backed securities, Funding Agreement Backed Notes (FABNs), etc.). For purposes of applying this principle concept, repayment is fully-supported by the underlying operating entity obligation if it provides cash flows for the repayment of all interest and at least 95% of the principal of the security.
- b. Bonds issued by real estate investment trusts (REITS) or similar property trusts.
- c. **Bonds issued by business development corporations, closed-end funds or similar operating entities, in each case registered under the 1940 Act. With this inclusion, it is important to highlight that the intent is specific to bonds issued from SEC-registered entities. The reference to “similar entities” is not intended to capture items issued from collateralized fund obligations (CFOs) or other such structures. Although some may consider CFOs to be similar to closed-end funds, that assessment is not supported for classification as an issuer credit obligation. Instruments considered to reflect CFOs (and other like structures) are required to be assessed as asset-backed securities for inclusion on Schedule D-1.**
- d. Project finance debt issued by operating entities. These investments reflect financing of a single asset or “operation” (such as a toll road or power generation facility) that collateralizes a debt issuance and the cash flows produced by the asset/operation service the debt, where the issuer may also represent an operating entity. These designs have characteristics of both issuer credit operations, as the operation constitutes a stand-alone business, as well as characteristics of ABS, as they are formed for the purpose of raising debt capital backed by the cash flows from collateral held by a bankruptcy-remote entity. When viewed holistically, these issuing entities are typically used to facilitate the financing of an operating component of a project sponsor or municipality.

Although the use of a bankruptcy-remote entity (e.g., SPV) facilitates the efficient raising of debt as a source of financing, the primary purpose is to finance an operating project. Therefore, when the issuing entity represents a stand-alone business producing its own operating revenues and expenses, where the primary purpose is to finance an operating project, the issuing entity shall be considered an operating entity despite certain characteristics that resemble ABS issuances.

- i. It is important to highlight that the guidance for project finance is strictly for instruments issued by operating entities, similar to other instruments that qualify as issuer credit obligations under the principles-based bond definition. Consistent with other concepts, the naming convention (e.g., referring to an instrument as project finance) or the presence or absence of an SPV/trust structure are not definitive components in determining whether an investment qualifies for reporting on Schedule D-1, or is classified as an issuer credit obligation or ABS. Instruments (even if identified as “project finance”) that do not qualify as issuer credit obligations as they not issued by operating entities, shall be assessed for qualification for reporting on Schedule D-1 as ABS. If the instruments do not qualify for reporting as ABS, they shall not be reported on Schedule D-1.
- e. U.S. Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPs): The inclusion of U.S. TIPs specifically as an issuer credit obligation intends to highlight a specific exception to the determination as a creditor relationship as the variation is due to plain-vanilla inflation adjustment mechanisms. Although U.S. TIPs are specific as issuer credit obligations, Under the bond definition encompassing both issuer credit obligations and asset-backed securities, in order for a debt instrument to represent a creditor relationship, it must have pre-determined principal and interest payments (whether fixed interest or variable interest) with contractual amounts that do not vary based on the appreciation or depreciation (e.g., performance) of any underlying collateral value or other non-debt variable . For example, an issued security that has varying principal and interest payments based on the appreciation of referenced equity, real estate or other non-debt variables are precluded from bond treatment as they do not reflect creditor relationships. Although US TIPS are indexed to the consumer price index and grows with inflation, these securities shall be captured as issuer credit obligations on Schedule D-1.

Activity to Date (issues previously addressed by the Working Group, Emerging Accounting Issues (E) Working Group, SEC, FASB, other State Departments of Insurance or other NAIC groups):

- *SSAP No. 26R—Bonds* and *SSAP No. 43R—Asset-Backed Securities*, reflecting new guidance to incorporate a principles-based bond definition were adopted during the 2023 Summer National Meeting. This guidance is effective Jan. 1, 2025. The corresponding Issue Paper has been updated as discussions occurred and has not yet been finalized as discussions involving SSAP No. 21R for the debt securities that do not qualify as bonds is not yet adopted.

Information or issues (included in *Description of Issue*) not previously contemplated by the Working Group:
None

Convergence with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS): N/A

Recommendation:

NAIC staff recommend that the Working Group include this agenda item on their maintenance agenda as a SAP clarification and expose revisions to *SSAP No. 26R—Bonds* incorporating the principles-based bond definition to clarify that debt securities issued by funds that represent operating entities are permitted as issuer credit obligations. These revisions would be in effect pursuant to the effective date of the revised SSAP No. 26R guidance, which is Jan. 1, 2025. The edits revise paragraph 7.i and incorporate a new paragraph 12 to the SSAP No. 26R guidance.

This agenda item also proposes revisions to the draft Issue Paper (paragraph 32c) to update the guidance previously included addressing 1940 Act registered BDCs and CEFs as issuer credit obligations.

Proposed Revisions to SSAP No. 26R—Bonds (Effective Jan. 1, 2025)

7. An issuer credit obligation is a bond, for which the general creditworthiness of an operating entity or entities through direct or indirect recourse, is the primary source of repayment. Operating entity or entities includes holding companies with operating entity subsidiaries where the holding company has the ability to access the operating subsidiaries' cash flows through its ownership rights. An operating entity may be any sort of business entity, not-for-profit organization, governmental unit, or other provider of goods or services, but not a natural person or "ABS Issuer" (as defined in paragraph 8). Examples of issuer credit obligations include, but are not limited to:
- a. U.S. Treasury securities, including U.S. Treasury Inflation-Indexed Securities;(INT 01-25).
 - b. U.S. government agency securities.
 - c. Municipal securities issued by the municipality or supported by cash flows generated by a municipally-owned asset or entity that provides goods or services (e.g., airport, toll roads, etc.).
 - d. Corporate bonds issued by operating entities, including Yankee bonds and zero-coupon bonds.
 - e. Corporate bonds, issued by holding companies that own operating entities.
 - f. Project finance bonds issued by operating entities.
 - g. Investments in the form of securities for which repayment is fully supported by an underlying contractual obligation of a single operating entity (e.g., Credit Tenant Loans (CTLs), Equipment trust certificates (ETCs), other lease backed securities, Funding Agreement Backed Notes (FABNs), etc.). For purposes of applying this principal concept, repayment is fully-supported by the underlying operating entity obligation if it provides cash flows for the repayment of all interest and at least 95% of the principal of the security.
 - h. Bonds issued by real estate investment trusts (REITs) or similar property trusts.
 - i. [Bonds issued by funds representing operating entities as described in paragraph 12.](#) ~~Bonds issued by business development corporations, closed-end funds, or similar operating entities, in each case registered under the 1940 Act.~~
 - j. Convertible bonds issued by operating entities, including mandatory convertible bonds as defined in paragraph 20.b.
8. An asset¹-backed security is a bond issued by an entity (an "ABS Issuer") created for the primary purpose of raising debt capital backed by financial assets² or cash generating non-financial assets owned by the

¹ The underlying collateral supporting an asset-backed security shall meet the definition of an asset by the ABS Issuer. Certain forms of collateral, such as rights to future cash flows, may not be recognized as assets by the selling entity but may be recognized as assets when sold to an ABS Issuer. These assets are permitted as the collateral supporting an asset-backed security, although they may not represent an asset that can be liquidated to provide payment toward the issued debt obligations (i.e., if the future cash flows do not materialize). The limited ability to liquidate the underlying collateral supporting an asset-backed security does not impact the structural determination of whether an issued security meets the definition of an asset-backed security but may impact the recoverability of the investment, as well as the consideration of whether there is sufficient credit enhancement.

² SSAP No. 103R—*Transfers and Servicing of Financial Assets and Extinguishments of Liabilities* defines a financial asset as cash, evidence of an ownership interest in an entity, or a contract that conveys to one entity a right (a) to receive cash or another financial instrument from a second entity or (b) to exchange other financial instruments on potentially favorable terms with the second entity. As a point of clarity, for the purposes of this standard, financial assets do not include assets for which the realization of the benefits conveyed by the above rights

ABS Issuer, for which the primary source of repayment is derived from the cash flows associated with the underlying defined collateral rather than the cash flows of an operating entity³. In most instances, the ABS Issuer is not expected to continue functioning beyond the final maturity of the debt initially raised by the ABS Issuer. Also, many ABS Issuers are in the form of a trust or special purpose vehicle (“SPV”), although the presence or lack of a trust or SPV is not a definitive criterion for determining that a security meets the definition of an asset-backed security. The provisions in paragraphs 9-10 detail the two defining characteristics that must be present for a security to meet the definition of an asset-backed security.

9. The assets owned by the ABS Issuer are either financial assets or cash-generating non-financial assets. Cash-generating non-financial assets are defined as assets that are expected to generate a meaningful level of cash flows toward repayment of the bond through use, licensing, leasing, servicing or management fees, or other similar cash flow generation. For the avoidance of doubt, there must be a meaningful level of cash flows to service the debt, other than through the sale or refinancing of the underlying assets held by the ABS Issuer. Reliance on cash flows from the sale or refinancing of cash generating non-financial assets does not preclude a security from being classified as an asset-backed security so long as the conditions in this paragraph are met.
 - a. *Meaningful Level of Cash Flows:* Determining what constitutes a “meaningful” level of cash flows generated to service the debt from sources other than the sale or refinancing of the underlying collateral pursuant to paragraph 9 is specific to each transaction, determined at origination, and shall consider the following factors:
 - i. The price volatility in the principal market for the underlying collateral;
 - ii. The liquidity in the principal market for the underlying collateral;
 - iii. The diversification characteristics of the underlying collateral (i.e., types of collateral, geographic location(s), source(s) of cash flows within the structure, etc.);
 - iv. The overcollateralization of the underlying collateral relative to the debt obligation; and
 - v. The variability of cash flows, from sources other than sale or refinancing, expected to be generated from the underlying collateral.

The factors for price variability and the variability of cash flows are directly related to the “meaningful” requirement. That is, as price volatility or variability of cash flows increase, the required percentage of cash flows generated to service the debt from sources other than the sale or refinancing of the underlying collateral must also increase. The factors for liquidity, diversification and overcollateralization are inversely related to the “meaningful” concept. That is, as liquidity, diversification or overcollateralization increase, the required percentage of cash flows generated to service the debt from sources other than the sale or refinancing of the underlying collateral may decrease.

- b. As a practical expedient to determining whether a cash generating non-financial asset is expected to produce meaningful cash flows, a reporting entity may consider an asset for which less than 50% of the original principal relies on sale or refinancing to meet the meaningful criteria. In applying this practical expedient, only contractual cash flows of the non-financial

depends on the completion of a performance obligation (e.g., leases, mortgage servicing rights, royalty rights, etc.). These assets represent non-financial assets, or a means through which non-financial assets produce cash flows, until the performance obligation has been satisfied.

³ Dedicated cash flows from an operating entity can form the underlying defined collateral in an asset-backed security. This dynamic, perhaps noted in a whole-business securitization, still reflects an asset-backed security and is not an issuer credit obligation.

assets may be considered. This practical expedient should not be construed to mean that assets cannot meet the meaningful criteria if they rely on sale or refinancing to service greater than 50% of the original principal or if they rely on cash flows that are not contracted at origination. Rather, such instances would require a complete analysis of the considerations described within the meaningful level of cash flows definition in [paragraph 9](#).

10. The holder of a debt instrument issued by an ABS Issuer is in a different economic position than if the holder owned the ABS Issuer's assets directly. The holder of the debt instrument is in a different economic position if such debt instrument benefits from substantive credit enhancement through guarantees (or other similar forms of recourse), subordination and/or overcollateralization.
 - a. *Substantive Credit Enhancement:* The intent of the criteria requiring the holder to be in a different economic position is to distinguish qualifying bonds from instruments with equity-like characteristics or where the substance of the transaction is more closely aligned with that of the underlying collateral. To qualify as an ABS under this standard, there is a requirement that there are substantive credit enhancements within the structure that absorb losses before the debt instrument being evaluated would be expected to absorb losses. This is inherent in the context of an issuer credit obligation in scope of SSAP No. 26R as the owners of the equity in the operating entity are the first to absorb any variability in performance of the operating entity. The same concept applies to asset-backed securities. If substantive credit enhancement did not exist, the substance of the debt instrument being evaluated would be more closely aligned with that of the underlying collateral than that of a bond. Credit enhancement that is merely nominal or lacks economic substance does not put a holder in a different economic position. The substantive credit enhancement required to be in a different economic position is specific to each transaction; determined at origination; and refers to the level of credit enhancement a market participant (i.e., knowledgeable investor transacting at arm's length) would conclude is substantive.
 - b. The first loss position may be issued as part of a securitization in the form of a debt or equity interest, or it may be retained by the sponsor and not issued as part of the securitization. If the first loss position (or a more senior position(s), if the first loss position(s) lacks contractual payments along with a substantive credit enhancement) is issued as part of the securitization, and does not have contractual principal and interest payments along with substantive credit enhancement and is held by a reporting entity, the [investment\(s\)](#) does not qualify for reporting as a bond and shall be reported on Schedule BA: Other Long-Term Invested Assets at the lower of amortized cost or fair value consistent with the treatment for residuals. (These items are further addressed in *SSAP No. 21R—Other Admitted Assets*.)
11. Whether an issuer of debt represents an operating entity or ABS Issuer is unambiguous in most instances, but certain instances may be less clear. For example, an entity may operate a single asset such as a toll road or power generation facility (e.g., project finance) which serves to collateralize a debt issuance, and the cash flows produced by the operation of the assets are pledged to service the debt. In many such instances, the entity is structured as a bankruptcy-remote entity that is separate from the municipality or project sponsor. Such entities have characteristics of operating entities as the operation of the asset constitutes a stand-alone business. They also have many common characteristics of ABS Issuers as they are formed for the purpose of raising debt capital backed by the cash flows from collateral held by a bankruptcy-remote entity. When viewed more holistically, these issuing entities are typically being used to facilitate the financing of an operating component of a project sponsor or municipality. The use of a bankruptcy-remote entity facilitates the efficient raising of debt to finance the operating project, but the primary purpose is to finance an operating project. Therefore, structures in which the issuing entity represents a stand-alone business producing its own operating revenues and expenses, where the primary purpose is to finance an operating project, shall be considered operating entities despite certain characteristics they may share with ABS Issuers.

12. Likewise, distinguishing between a fund that represents an operating entity and a securitization vehicle that represents an ABS Issuer can involve similar ambiguity. Both types of entities may hold only passive investments and issue debt securities for which ultimate recourse upon default is to those investments. However, a clear distinction can generally be made by evaluating the substance of the entity and its primary purpose:
- a. A fund representing an operating entity has a primary purpose of raising equity capital and generating returns to its equity investors. Marginal amounts of debt may be issued to fund operations or produce levered returns to equity holders. However, this is in service to meeting the fund's primary equity-investor objective. For 1940-Act registered closed-end funds (CEFs) and business development corporations (BDCs), debt securities issued from the fund in accordance with permitted leverage ratios represent debt issued by operating entities and qualify as issuer credit obligations.
 - b. In contrast, an ABS Issuer has a primary purpose of raising debt capital and its structural terms and features serve to support this purpose. Perhaps most distinctively, in addition to the characteristics detailed in Paragraph 8, the contractual terms of the structure generally define how each cash flow generated by the collateral is to be applied. There is generally little discretion afforded to the manager/servicer of the vehicle and any discretion that is allowed is narrowly defined in the contractual agreements. This hardwiring of debtholder protections allows for the issuance of higher amounts of leverage than would be possible for a fund representing an operating entity, further supporting the entity's primary purpose of raising debt capital.
- ~~12~~13. The definition of a creditor relationship, per paragraph 6, does not include equity/fund investments (such as mutual funds or exchanged-traded funds), or securities that possess equity-like characteristics or that represent an ownership interests in the issuer. However, as identified in paragraph 2, exchange traded funds (ETFs), which qualify for bond treatment, as identified in Part Three of the *Purposes and Procedures Manual of the NAIC Investment Analysis Office* and included in the 'SVO-Identified Bond ETF List' published on the SVO's webpage are provided special statutory accounting treatment and are included within the scope of this statement. These investments shall follow the guidance within this statement, as if they were issuer credit obligations, unless different treatment is specifically identified in paragraphs 32-38.
- ~~13~~14. Investments within the scope of this statement issued by a related party, or acquired through a related party transaction, are also subject to the provisions, admittance assessments and disclosure requirements of *SSAP No. 25—Affiliates and Other Related Parties*.
- ~~14~~15. Investments within the scope of this statement meet the definition of assets as defined in *SSAP No. 4—Assets and Nonadmitted Assets* and are admitted assets to the extent they conform to the requirements of this statement and *SSAP No. 25*.

Proposed Revisions to Draft Issue Paper:

32. Whether an issuer of debt represents an operating entity or ABS Issuer is expected to be clear in most instances, but certain instances may be less clear. Ultimately, for an issuer credit obligation, it comes down to whether support for repayment consists of direct or indirect recourse to an operating entity or entities. In addition to "traditional bond" structures previously included in *SSAP No. 26R*, examples of issuer credit obligations include:
- a. Investments in the form of securities for which repayment is fully supported by an underlying contractual obligation of a single operating entity. (e.g., CTLs, ETCs, other lease backed securities, Funding Agreement Backed Notes (FABNs), etc.). For purposes of applying this principle concept,

- repayment is fully-supported by the underlying operating entity obligation if it provides cash flows for the repayment of all interest and at least 95% of the principal of the security.
- b. Bonds issued by real estate investment trusts (REITS) or similar property trusts.
 - c. Bonds issued by funds representing operating entities. Determining whether a fund represents an operating entity can generally be made by evaluating the substance of the entity and its primary purpose. A fund representing an operating entity has the primary purpose of raising equity capital and generating returns to its equity investors. Marginal amounts of debt may be issued to fund operations or produce levered returns to equity holders. These debt issuances occur in accordance with the fund’s primary equity-investor objective. Debt securities issued by closed-end funds and business development corps registered under the 1940 Act are permitted automatic qualification as issuer credit obligations as those funds are subject to strict limits or reporting components on the leverage (debt issuance) within the fund. ~~Bonds issued by business development corporations, closed-end funds or similar operating entities, in each case registered under the 1940 Act. With this inclusion, it is important to highlight that the intent is specific to bonds issued from SEC-registered entities. The reference to “similar entities” is not intended to capture items issued from collateralized fund obligations (CFOs) or other such structures. In contrast, an ABS Issuer has a primary purpose of raising debt capital and its structural terms and features serve to support this purpose. More distinctively, the contractual terms of the structure generally define how each cash flow generated by the collateral is to be applied. For these structures, there is little or no discretion afforded to the manager/servicer of the vehicle and any discretion that is allowed is narrowly defined in the contractual agreements. The hardwiring of debtholder protections allows for the issuance of higher amounts of debt securities to be issued than what would be possible for a fund representing an operating entity. These features support the entity’s primary purpose of raising debt capital.~~ Although some may consider CFOs to be similar to closed-end funds, that assessment is not supported for classification as an issuer credit obligation. Instruments considered to reflect CFOs (and other like structures) are required to be assessed as asset-backed securities for inclusion on Schedule D-1.
 - d. Project finance debt issued by operating entities. These investments reflect financing of a single asset or “operation” (such as a toll road or power generation facility) that collateralizes a debt issuance and the cash flows produced by the asset/operation service the debt, where the issuer may also represent an operating entity. These designs have characteristics of both issuer credit operations, as the operation constitutes a stand-alone business, as well as characteristics of ABS, as they are formed for the purpose of raising debt capital backed by the cash flows from collateral held by a bankruptcy-remote entity. When viewed holistically, these issuing entities are typically used to facilitate the financing of an operating component of a project sponsor or municipality. Although the use of a bankruptcy-remote entity (e.g., SPV) facilitates the efficient raising of debt as a source of financing, the primary purpose is to finance an operating project. Therefore, when the issuing entity represents a stand-alone business producing its own operating revenues and expenses, where the primary purpose is to finance an operating project, the issuing entity shall be considered an operating entity despite certain characteristics that resemble ABS issuances.
 - i. It is important to highlight that the guidance for project finance is strictly for instruments issued by operating entities, similar to other instruments that qualify as issuer credit obligations under the principles-based bond definition. Consistent with other concepts, the naming convention (e.g., referring to an instrument as project finance) or the presence or absence of an SPV/trust structure are not definitive components in determining whether an investment qualifies for reporting on Schedule D-1, or is classified as an issuer credit obligation or ABS. Instruments (even if identified as “project finance”) that do not qualify as issuer credit obligations as they not issued by operating entities, shall be assessed for

qualification for reporting on Schedule D-1 as ABS. If the instruments do not qualify for reporting as ABS, they shall not be reported on Schedule D-1.

- e. U.S. Treasury Inflation-Protected Securities (TIPs): The inclusion of U.S. TIPs specifically as an issuer credit obligation intends to highlight a specific exception to the determination as a creditor relationship as the variation is due to plain-vanilla inflation adjustment mechanisms. Although U.S. TIPs are specific as issuer credit obligations, Under the bond definition encompassing both issuer credit obligations and asset-backed securities, in order for a debt instrument to represent a creditor relationship, it must have pre-determined principal and interest payments (whether fixed interest or variable interest) with contractual amounts that do not vary based on the appreciation or depreciation (e.g., performance) of any underlying collateral value or other non-debt variable. For example, an issued security that has varying principal and interest payments based on the appreciation of referenced equity, real estate or other non-debt variables are precluded from bond treatment as they do not reflect creditor relationships. Although US TIPS are indexed to the consumer price index and grows with inflation, these securities shall be captured as issuer credit obligations on Schedule D-1.

Status:

On January 10, 2024, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group moved this agenda item to the active listing, categorized as a SAP clarification, and exposed this agenda item with the proposed revisions, as illustrated above, to clarify the guidance for debt securities issued by funds. These revisions permit debt securities issued by funds to be classified as issuer credit obligations if the fund represents an operating entity regardless of SEC-registration status. This item was exposed with a comment deadline of February 9, 2024.

On March 16, 2024, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group re-exposed this item with a request for regulators and industry to provide comment on the proposed language that assists with clarifying the scope of guidance and to the types of debt securities issued by funds that should be considered as operating entities, and the proposed language to better define the extent of debt that may be issued to fund operations. This re-exposure and request for clarification intends to address interpretations from the original exposure that the revised guidance would permit feeder funds (and other structures that raise debt capital) to be classified as issuer credit obligations.

On August 13, 2024, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group exposed revised language to SSAP No. 26 and the adopted issue paper for a shortened comment period ending September 6, 2024, as shown below. These revisions permit debt securities issued by funds that reflect operating entities to qualify as issuer credit obligations. These revisions clarify that SEC registration is a practical safe harbor intended only for SEC registered funds and should not be utilized as a proxy for other debt securities issued by funds. Other debt securities issued by funds should be assessed as to the issuer's primary purpose. Debt securities issued to raise debt capital must be assessed as an asset-backed security regardless of the amount of debt being issued. If no comments are received, or if only supportive comments are received, the Working Group may consider adoption via an evote.

Proposed Revisions to SSAP No. 26—Bonds

(Note: Non-revised subparagraphs have not been included for brevity.)

7. An issuer credit obligation is a bond, for which the general creditworthiness of an operating entity or entities through direct or indirect recourse, is the primary source of repayment. Operating entity or entities includes holding companies with operating entity subsidiaries where the holding company has the ability to access the operating subsidiaries' cash flows through its ownership rights. An operating entity may be any sort of business entity, not-for-profit organization, governmental unit, or other provider of goods or services, but not a natural person or "ABS Issuer" (as defined in paragraph 8). Examples of issuer credit obligations include, but are not limited to:

- i. ~~Bonds issued by funds representing operating entities as described in paragraph 12. Bonds issued by business development corporations, closed-end funds, or similar operating entities, in each case registered under the 1940 Act.~~

12. Likewise, distinguishing between a fund that represents an operating entity and a securitization vehicle that represents an ABS Issuer can involve similar ambiguity. Both types of entities may hold only passive investments and issue debt securities for which ultimate recourse upon default is to those investments. However, a clear distinction can generally be made by evaluating the substance of the entity and its primary purpose:

- a. A fund representing an operating entity has a primary purpose of raising equity capital and generating returns to its equity investors. ~~Marginal amounts of~~ Ancillary debt may be issued to fund operations or produce levered returns to equity holders. However, this is in service to meeting the fund's primary equity-investor objective. As a practical safe harbor, ~~For~~ 1940-Act registered closed-end funds (CEFs) and business development corporations (BDCs), debt securities issued from the fund in accordance with permitted leverage ratios represent debt issued by operating entities and qualify as issuer credit obligations. This safe harbor for SEC-registered funds should not be viewed to extend to funds that are not SEC-registered by analogy, through comparison of leverage levels for example. All other funds should be classified in accordance with the determination of the issuer's primary purpose.
- b. In contrast, an ABS Issuer has a primary purpose of raising debt capital and its structural terms and features serve to support this purpose. Perhaps most distinctively, in addition to the characteristics detailed in paragraph 8, the contractual terms of the structure generally define how each cash flow generated by the collateral is to be applied. There is generally little discretion afforded to the manager/servicer of the vehicle and any discretion that is allowed is narrowly defined in the contractual agreements. This hardwiring of debtholder protections allows for the issuance of higher amounts of leverage than would be possible for a fund representing an operating entity, further supporting the entity's primary purpose of raising debt capital.

Proposed Revisions to Issue Paper No. 169:

32. Whether an issuer of debt represents an operating entity or ABS Issuer is expected to be clear in most instances, but certain instances may be less clear. Ultimately, for an issuer credit obligation, it comes down to whether support for repayment consists of direct or indirect recourse to an operating entity or entities. In addition to “traditional bond” structures previously included in SSAP No. 26R, examples of issuer credit obligations include:

- c. Bonds issued by funds representing operating entities. Determining whether a fund represents an operating entity can generally be made by evaluating the substance of the entity and its primary purpose. A fund representing an operating entity has the primary purpose of raising equity capital and generating returns to its equity investors. ~~Marginal amounts of~~ Ancillary debt may be issued to fund operations or produce levered returns to equity holders. These debt issuances occur in accordance with the fund's primary equity-investor objective. Debt securities issued by closed-end funds and business development corps registered under the 1940 Act are permitted automatic qualification as issuer credit obligations as those funds are subject to strict limits or reporting components on the leverage (debt issuance) within the fund. This safe harbor for SEC-registered funds should not be viewed to extend to funds that are not SEC-registered by analogy, through comparison of leverage levels for example. All other funds should be classified in accordance with the determination of the issuer's primary purpose. (For example, although some registered funds allow a large percentage of debt, non-registered funds with comparable amounts of issued debt may reflect debt securities from feeder funds or equity-backed ABS, and those debt securities are required to be assessed as ABS. As such the percentage of debt permitted for a registered funds should not be utilized as a proxy in determining whether debt issued from a fund is permitted to be

~~captured within the guidance.) Bonds issued by business development corporations, closed-end funds or similar operating entities, in each case registered under the 1940 Act. With this inclusion, it is important to highlight that the intent is specific to bonds issued from SEC registered entities. The reference to “similar entities” is not intended to capture items issued from collateralized fund obligations (CFOs) or other such structures.~~ In contrast, an ABS Issuer has a primary purpose of raising debt capital and its structural terms and features serve to support this purpose. More distinctively, the contractual terms of the structure generally define how each cash flow generated by the collateral is to be applied. For these structures, there is little or no discretion afforded to the manager/servicer of the vehicle and any discretion that is allowed is narrowly defined in the contractual agreements. The hardwiring of debtholder protections allows for the issuance of higher amounts of debt securities to be issued than what would be possible for a fund representing an operating entity. These features support the entity’s primary purpose of raising debt capital. Although some may consider CFOs or feeder funds to be similar to closed-end funds, that assessment is not supported for classification as an ICO. Instruments considered to reflect CFOs (and other like structures) are required to be assessed as ABS for inclusion as a bond reported on Schedule D-1. Paragraphs 27-28 also detail the assessment expected in classifying feeder funds, and the requirement to determine the source of the underlying cash flows in determining classification and if the structure qualifies for reporting as a bond on Schedule D-1.

On September 12, 2024, the Statutory Accounting Principles (E) Working Group concluded an e-vote to adopt the August 2024 exposed revised language to SSAP No. 26 (effective Jan. 1, 2025) and related bond project issue paper. This e-vote noted a single comment letter received from interested parties indicating support for the exposed revisions. As the edits revise the guidance adopted for the bond definition, which is effective Jan. 1, 2025, the edits will follow the same effective date.

<https://naiconline.sharepoint.com/teams/FRSStatutoryAccounting/NationalMeetings/A.NationalMeetingMaterials/2024/09-12-24-EvoteAdoption/B-24-01-PBBB-SEC Funds.docx>