

The Alternative Reference Rates
Committee

Adam Chodkowski, Esq.
Head Capital Markets, Asset Management
Group Operations
Director, Legal & Compliance
Swiss Re Management (US) Corporation
1301 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019
USA
Phone +1 (212) 407-7348
Fax +1 (212) 317-5474
swissre.com

February 4, 2019

Feedback on ARRC Consultation New Issuances of LIBOR Securitizations

Dear Secretariat

Swiss Re respectfully submits this feedback letter to the Alternative Reference Rates Committee in response to the questions raised in the above referenced consultation. Swiss Re is a 157-year old global reinsurance company that has helped rebuild American lives and communities from every major natural disaster since the 1906 San Francisco earthquake.

***Question 1:** Which securitization asset classes are you referring to in your response to this consultation if limited to only certain asset classes? If there are particular features of these asset classes that shape your responses to the questions in this survey, please describe them to the extent possible.*

We refer generally to all securitization asset classes in this response letter.

***Question 2:** The ISDA triggers contemplate a permanent cessation of LIBOR as of a date certain which may be announced in advance (the "Cessation Date"), at which point the transition from LIBOR to SOFR would occur. As there may be operational challenges for securitizations as both assets and liabilities will have to be transitioned, some have asked for the ability to transition in advance of the Cessation Date in order to address any operational issues that may arise. Specifically, the Designated Transaction Representative (as defined in Appendix I) will have the ability to pick one date within a 30-day period prior to the Cessation Date to facilitate an orderly*

transition. Do you feel the inclusion of this ability to transfer prior to the Cessation Date is needed? If so, please explain the specific, critical and tangible needs that support its inclusion?

Yes, we feel that the ability of a Designated Transaction Representative is needed in order to allow sufficient lead time to allow securitization structures to follow required processes to facilitate operational changes.

Question 3(a): *Should fallback language for Securitizations include any of the pre-cessation triggers (clauses (3), (4), (5) and (6) of the Benchmark Discontinuance Event definition)? If so, which ones? Also, please identify any pre-cessation triggers that you do not believe should be utilized for a particular securitization product and explain why.*

Yes, triggers 3 and 6.

Question 3(b): *Please indicate whether any concerns you have about these pre-cessation triggers relate to the differences between these securitization triggers and those for standard derivatives or whether your concerns relate specifically to the pre-cessation triggers themselves.*

Both. Ideally, we would like to see consistency between the cash and the derivatives markets. We are also concerned about some of the pre-cessation triggers themselves, as triggers 4 & 5 appear to be highly subjective.

Question 3(c): *If you believe that the pre-cessation trigger in clause (6) (Asset Replacement Percentage) should not be retained, please note any specific concerns leading to this conclusion. If you believe that it should be retained, are there any changes you believe should be made to this trigger? Please explain.*

We believe trigger (6) should be retained in order to potentially reduce basis risks, and we believe that attempts should be made to agree an industry standard Asset Replacement Percentage of, say 50%.

Question 3(d): *If you believe the pre-cessation trigger in clause (6) (Asset Replacement Percentage) should be retained, how would you address concerns that it could result in a transfer of value in a transaction where the Designated Transaction Representative has the ability to change the benchmark used on the underlying assets and, as a result, determine the timing of this pre-cessation trigger? Are there other changes that should be made to the Asset Replacement Percentage trigger? Note that this trigger relates to a mismatch between the securities and the Securitization assets that results from changes in the assets. A mismatch may also arise from a change in the securities due to a trigger event under these fallback provisions. Any concerns with the latter scenario can be addressed in responses to Question 16.*

In order to address concerns relating to transfer of value, we would recommend agreement on a standard Asset Replacement Percentage, as noted in 3(c) above. Any transition away from LIBOR to new reference rates has the potential to transfer value depending on the circumstances of a particular securitization transaction. Agreeing a fair and standardized mechanism up-front can

potentially mitigate against the risk of lack of agreement among transaction participants in this context, and thus the lack of concrete action being taken by a securitization transaction to prepare for the transition away from LIBOR in a timely manner.

Question 3(e): *If pre-cessation triggers are not included, are there options available to market participants to manage the potential risks involved in continuing to reference a Benchmark in the circumstances contemplated by each of these pre-cessation triggers?*

Any such options are not readily transparent at this date.

Question 4: *Should the proposed securitization fallback language permit the Designated Transaction Representative to transition the securities after a trigger has occurred but before the Benchmark Replacement Date? Should any limitations be placed on its use? Should there be a limited date range (e.g., 60 days) prior to the Benchmark Replacement Date in which this could be used? Should the Designated Transaction Representative be limited in the circumstances under which it could elect to utilize the additional time? If so, what standard should be utilized to assess whether the additional time is necessary? In each case, please explain why.*

Yes. We believe there should be a limited date range, between 30-90 days. We believe no further standards should be utilized as such standards may be too vague and therefore too difficult to become standardized and broadly accepted.

Question 5(a): *If the ARRC has recommended a forward-looking term rate, should that rate be the primary fallback for the securities referencing LIBOR even though derivatives are expected to reference overnight versions of SOFR? Please explain why.*

Yes, as a forward-looking term rate better aligns to current lending practices.

Question 5(b): *Is there a specific reason that the securitization market should first fall back to forward-looking term SOFR instead of another rate? Please explain why.*

SOFR seems to be the leading contender, in terms of market acceptance, to become the primary alternative reference rate.

Question 5(c): *Is the use of an Interpolated Period appropriate in the securitization markets? Please explain any limitations that should be applied to the use of an Interpolated Period.*

The use of an interpolated period could be appropriate, depending on the development and liquidity of the relevant term periods.

Question 5(d): *In the event a Replacement Benchmark is determined other than under Step 1 of the waterfall, should the waterfall provide that the Replacement Benchmark be changed in the future as soon as a rate can be established under Step 1 of the waterfall?*

Yes.

Question 6(a): *Should Compounded SOFR be the second step in the waterfall? Would this preference be influenced by whether ISDA implements fallbacks referencing Compounded SOFR or overnight SOFR?*

Yes. This preference would not be influenced by the choice ISDA implements.

Question 6(b): *If you believe that Compounded SOFR should be included, which compounding period is preferable (“in arrears” or “in advance”)? Please explain why. Would this preference be influenced by whether ISDA implements fallbacks referencing Compounded SOFR “in arrears” or “in advance?” Please explain whether your preference is based on operational concerns in implementing a particular approach or on economic concerns.*

In arrears, as this better aligns to current lending practices. This preference would not be influenced by the choice ISDA implements. This preference is based on both operational and economic concerns.

Question 6(c): *If it was necessary to calculate Compounded SOFR and a third party was not available to perform those calculations, are there parties to the Securitization transactions with sufficient resources to perform those calculations accurately and efficiently? Are there other considerations relating to the calculation of Compound SOFR that would make it an undesirable Replacement Benchmark without the availability of a third party provider?*

Yes, we believe there are. No other considerations at this time.

Question 7: *As noted, this consultation does not include Spot SOFR as a third step in the waterfall. Do you believe that Spot SOFR is an appropriate fallback reference rate for Securitization contracts or should the second step in the replacement rate waterfall be Compounded SOFR, after which the replacement rate would be, first, recommended by the Relevant Governmental Body, second, default to then-current ISDA Definitions, and third, proposed by the Designated Transaction Representative?*

We believe that Spot SOFR is not an appropriate fallback reference rate for securitization contracts.

Question 8: *In the future circumstance where there is no SOFR-based fallback rate, is the replacement rate determined by the Relevant Governmental Body the best alternative at this level of the waterfall? Please explain why.*

Yes, this appears to be the next best step in the circumstances.

Question 9: *In the future circumstance where there is no SOFR-based fallback rate and the Relevant Governmental Body has not recommended a replacement rate for Securitizations, is the fallback for SOFR-linked derivatives set forth in the ISDA definitions at the time of cessation the best alternative at this level of the waterfall? Is this fallback appropriate if ISDA Definitions only include overnight fallback rates? Please explain why.*

Yes. Yes, we believe this to be the best alternative at this level of the waterfall, even if ISDA Definitions only include overnight fallback rates.

Question 10(a): *Since it is unlikely that there will be no ISDA fallback (clause (a) above), this provision is more likely to occur (if at all) when the ISDA fallback is deemed not appropriate for securitization securities (clause (b) above). In that scenario, is this provision appropriate as the final step in the Replacement Benchmark waterfall? Please explain why.*

Yes, we believe this is appropriate for lack of alternatives.

Question 10(b): *Should the provision allow for “re-testing” the waterfall to determine whether another Replacement Benchmark has become available in the scenario where investors have rejected the Proposed Replacement Benchmark? Should the waterfall be re-tested in any other circumstances (e.g., any time the Replacement Benchmark has been determined under a “less-desirable” clause)? How often? Please explain why.*

Yes. Re-testing should occur every calculation period per relevant asset class.

Question 11: *Are there any concerns if a spread adjustment was utilized with cash products that was calculated by a spot rate comparison of the difference between LIBOR and the Replacement Base Rate at the time of conversion? Should this option be included in the spread waterfall? If so, where?*

Yes, we have concerns with calculating by a spot rate, as this could be too variable. We believe this option should not be included in the waterfall.

Question 12: *Do you believe that the ARRC should consider recommending a spread adjustment that could apply to cash products, including Securitizations?*

Yes.

Question 13(a): *Is a spread adjustment applicable to fallbacks for derivatives under the ISDA definitions appropriate as the second priority in the spread waterfall? Please explain why.*

Yes.

Question 13(b): *If the ARRC has recommended a forward-looking term SOFR but has not recommended a corresponding spread adjustment under Step 1 above, do you believe that the ISDA spread adjustment described in Step 2 (which may be intended to apply to a different Replacement Base Rate) should apply to Securitizations? Please explain why.*

Yes.

Question 13(c): *Given that ISDA has not yet decided upon the spread calculation methodology, should Step 2 be excluded from the waterfall? Please explain why.*

We believe Step 2 should not be excluded, as we expect ISDA to decide on a defined methodology similar to that announced in the press releases by ISDA.

Question 14(a): What type of institution can and should take on the responsibility to (i) determine whether the proposed triggers have occurred, (ii) select screens where reference rates or spreads are to be found, (iii) make calculations of a rate or spread in the absence of published screen rates, (iv) interpolate term SOFR if there is a missing middle maturity and/or (v) elect to cause an early transition under the proviso to the definition of Benchmark Replacement Date?

Trustee.

Question 14(b): Whether as issuer, sponsor, servicer or calculation agent, would your institution be willing to (i) determine whether the proposed triggers have occurred, (ii) select screens where reference rates or spreads are to be found, (iii) make calculations of a rate or spread in the absence of published screen rates, (iv) interpolate term SOFR if there is a missing middle maturity and/or (v) elect to cause an early transition under the proviso to the definition of Benchmark Replacement Date?

No.

Question 15: Is there any provision in the proposal that would significantly impede Securitization issuances? If so, please provide a specific and detailed explanation.

No.

Question 16: Given the fallback language for the Securitization and the underlying assets may operate independently, please identify any sources of misalignment between those components that are not addressed in the consultation.

No additional considerations at this time.

Question 17: Are there specific operational challenges that implementing the proposed fallback language might create for securitizations? If so, what are those challenges and under what circumstances might they occur? How might they be mitigated?

No.

Question 18: Please provide any additional feedback on any aspect of the proposal.

No additional considerations at this time.

Yours sincerely,



Swiss Re Management (US) Corporation