Commodity Futures Trading Commission
Office of Public Affairs
Three Lafayette Centre
1155 21st Street, NW
Washington, DC 20581
www.cftc.gov

February 27, 2015

CFTC Division of Swap Dealer and Intermediary Oversight Responds to Frequently Asked Question Regarding Certain Requirements under Section 13 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships with, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds

Section 619 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act added a new section 13 to the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 ("BHC Act"), commonly referred to as the Volcker rule, that generally prohibits insured depository institutions and any company affiliated with an insured depository institution from engaging in proprietary trading and from acquiring or retaining ownership interests in, sponsoring, or having certain relationships with a hedge fund or private equity fund. These prohibitions are subject to a number of statutory exemptions, restrictions, and definitions.

The Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") is working closely with the other agencies charged with implementing the requirements of section 13, including the Federal Reserve Board, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Securities and Exchange Commission (each an "Agency" and collectively with the CFTC "the Agencies"). While this frequently asked question ("FAQ") applies to banking entities for which the CFTC has jurisdiction under section 13 of the BHC Act, it has been developed by staffs of the Agencies and substantively identical versions will appear on the public websites of each Agency.

SOTUS Covered Fund Exemption: Marketing Restriction

1. Section 13(d)(1)(I) of the Bank Holding Company Act ("BHC Act") and section 75.13(b) of the final rule provide an exemption for certain covered fund activities conducted by foreign banking entities (the "SOTUS covered fund exemption") provided that, among other conditions, "no ownership interest in such hedge fund or private equity fund is offered for sale or sold to a resident of the United States" (the "marketing restriction"). Does the marketing restriction apply only to the activities of a foreign banking entity that is seeking to rely on the SOTUS covered fund exemption or does it apply more generally to the activities of any person offering for sale or selling ownership interests in the covered fund? Sponsors of covered funds and foreign banking entities have asked how this condition would apply to a foreign banking entity that has made, or intends to make, an investment in a covered fund where the foreign banking entity (including its affiliates) does not sponsor, or serve, directly or indirectly, as the investment manager, investment adviser, commodity pool operator or commodity trading advisor to, the covered fund (a "third-party covered fund").

The staffs of the Agencies believe that the marketing restriction applies to the activities of the foreign banking entity that is seeking to rely on the SOTUS covered fund exemption (including its affiliates). This is also

reflected in the preamble discussion of the marketing restriction and the structure of the final rule as discussed below.

Consistent with Section 13(d)(1)(I) of the BHC Act, the marketing restriction in the final rule provides that "no ownership interest in the covered fund is offered for sale or sold to a resident of the United States." Section 75.13(b)(3) of the final rule provides that an ownership interest in a covered fund is not offered for sale or sold to a resident of the United States for purposes of the marketing restriction if it is sold or has been sold pursuant to an offering that does not target residents of the United States. In describing the marketing restriction in the preamble, the Agencies stated that the marketing restriction serves to limit the SOTUS covered fund exemption so that it "does not advantage foreign banking entities relative to U.S. banking entities with respect to providing their covered fund services in the United States by prohibiting the offer or sale of ownership interests in related covered funds to residents of the United States."[1]

The marketing restriction, as implemented in the final rule, constrains the foreign banking entity in connection with its own activities with respect to covered funds rather than the activities of unaffiliated third parties, thereby ensuring that the foreign banking entity seeking to rely on the SOTUS covered fund exemption does not engage in an offering of ownership interests that targets residents of the United States.

This view is consistent with limiting the extraterritorial application of section 13 to foreign banking entities while seeking to ensure that the risks of covered fund investments by foreign banking entities occur and remain solely outside of the United States.[2] If the marketing restriction were applied to the activities of third parties, such as the sponsor of a third-party covered fund (rather than the foreign banking entity investing in a third-party covered fund), the SOTUS covered fund exemption may not be available in certain circumstances where the risks and activities of a foreign banking entity with respect to its investment in the covered fund are solely outside the United States.[3]

A foreign banking entity (including its affiliates) that seeks to rely on the SOTUS covered fund exemption must comply with all of the conditions to that exemption, including the marketing restriction. A foreign banking entity that participates in an offer or sale of covered fund interests to a resident of the United States thus cannot rely on the SOTUS covered fund exemption with respect to that covered fund. Further, where a banking entity sponsors or serves, directly or indirectly, as the investment manager, investment adviser, commodity pool operator or commodity trading advisor to a covered fund, that banking entity will be viewed by the staffs as participating in any offer or sale by the covered fund of ownership interests in the covered fund, and therefore such foreign banking entity would not qualify for the SOTUS covered fund exemption for that covered fund if that covered fund offers or sells covered fund ownership interests to a resident of the United States.

[1] See Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds, 79 Fed. Reg. 5536, 5742 (Jan. 31, 2014) (emphasis added).

[2] See id. at 5740.

[3] The staffs also note that foreign funds that sell securities to residents of the United States in an offering that targets residents of the United States will be covered funds under section 75.10(b)(i) of the final rule if such funds are unable to rely on an exclusion or exemption under the Investment Company Act other than section 3(c)(1) or 3(c)(7) of that Act. If the marketing restriction were to apply more generally to the activities of any person (including the covered fund itself), the applicability of the SOTUS covered fund exemption would be significantly limited because a third-party foreign fund's offering that targets residents of the United States would make the SOTUS covered fund exemption unavailable for all foreign banking entity investors in the fund. The Agencies' discussion of the SOTUS covered fund exemption in the preamble does not suggest that the Agencies understood the SOTUS covered fund exemption to have such a limited application.