

Other Financing Alternatives

Private Placements and Hybrid Securities Offerings 2019

May 2019

Publics more private

- Hybrid offering alternatives remain significant
 - Generally, the structuring goal was to formulate a securities offering methodology that was a private or an “exempt” offering, but to try by various means to improve the liquidity of the security
 - This was important in order to avoid the liquidity discount demanded by investors in private offerings that preferred not to hold “restricted securities” and wanted securities that could be freely transferred
 - PIPE transactions were developed, in part, to address these considerations
 - One could say that the Rule 144A market also developed, in part, as a means of addressing these considerations
- Soon, other features became important as well, such as, for example, attempting to structure a “public offering” that would be marketed on a targeted or limited basis in much the same way that PIPE transactions or private offerings were marketed
 - Registered direct offerings evolved from this approach


Publics more private *(cont'd)*

- Following the promulgation of Regulation FD and as a result of changes in the market, many public issuers, with shelf registration statements, sought greater certainty regarding deal execution prior to making any public announcement regarding a potential financing
 - This has led to underwritten public offerings completed on an accelerated basis, as well as to confidentially marketed public offerings, or CMPOs
 - These use the marketing approaches historically employed for private offerings
 - In effect, making “publics” more “private”


Equity follow-ons

- Approximately 30% of follow-on offerings in 2018 were confidentially marketed/overnight deals, a slight decline from 2017. Bought deals and follow-ons marketed on accelerated basis comprised the significant percentages of follow-on volume.

Annual Follow-On Activity (\$ in billions)



Follow-Ons Priced by Marketing Type



SEC testing the waters proposal

- The SEC has proposed a new safe harbor, proposed Rule 163B, that would allow:
 - All issuers, whether or not EGCs, and including funds to test the waters
- The proposed SEC rule is subject to a comment period, and is not yet effective. But, if adopted, Rule 163B would permit an issuer or a person acting on the issuer's behalf (an underwriter) to engage in oral or written communications with entities reasonably believed to be QIBs and IAs either prior to or following confidential submission and public filing of a registration statement in order to gauge interest in a possible offering

Proposed rule

- TTW communications would not:
 - Need to be filed with the SEC
 - Need to include any specified legends
 - Be considered free writing prospectuses (FWP)
- TTW communications cannot conflict with information in the registration statement for the related offering once such registration statement is available
- Just as the SEC Staff now may ask to review TTW written materials (if any) in the case of EGC offerings, if the rule were to be adopted, going forward, the SEC Staff might ask to do so with non-EGC offerings



Who does this help?

- Most IPO issuers are EGCs that already may engage in TTW communications; however, to the extent that an IPO issuer is not an EGC, it would benefit from this TTW safe harbor for its IPO
- For follow-on offerings, there are already a number of communication safe harbors, so this TTW safe harbor may not be necessary. The proposed rule would provide a non-exclusive safe harbor
- For many follow-on offerings, market participants already rely on “wall-crossing” potential investors in order to gauge interest in a possible offering

Who does this help? *(cont'd)*

- Other than in the case of a WKSJ, an issuer must have an effective registration statement prior to having an underwriter wall-cross investors and discuss a possible offering by the issuer. This new TTW expansion would address this:
 - All issuers can submit registration statements for confidential review in connection with their initial public offerings and/or their initial Exchange Act listing, as well as with the first follow-on offerings made within the 12 months following such initial registrations
 - When combined with the ability to submit registration statements for confidential review, the expansion of the TTW provision is very helpful because it allows for TTW meetings to take place and inform the path forward
- It would also address a circumstance in which an issuer's registration statement does not cover the type of security that the underwriters propose to offer
- The enhanced ability to conduct TTW meetings more broadly will accentuate the trend toward non-announced offerings

[Americas](#) | [Asia](#) | [Europe](#) | [Middle East](#)

mayerbrown.com

Mayer Brown is a global services provider comprising associated legal practices that are separate entities, including Mayer Brown LLP (Illinois, USA), Mayer Brown International LLP (England), Mayer Brown (a Hong Kong partnership) and Tauil & Chequer Advogados (a Brazilian law partnership) (collectively the "Mayer Brown Practices") and non-legal service providers, which provide consultancy services (the "Mayer Brown Consultancies"). The Mayer Brown Practices and Mayer Brown Consultancies are established in various jurisdictions and may be a legal person or a partnership. Details of the individual Mayer Brown Practices and Mayer Brown Consultancies can be found in the Legal Notices section of our website. "Mayer Brown" and the Mayer Brown logo are the trademarks of Mayer Brown. © Mayer Brown. All rights reserved.