G2G ADVISORY

Restructuring & Special Situations Reference

Industry Special - Sector-Specific Reference

Prepared exclusively for G2G Advisory candidates | March 2026

Supplement to the G2G Complete Reference. No duplication - sector-only knowledge.

I. INSOLVENCY & ZONE OF INSOLVENCY

Zone of insolvency is triggered by balance sheet test (liabilities exceed assets on fair-value basis) or cash flow test (unable to pay debts as they fall due). Cash flow test is typically more relevant. Once company enters zone of insolvency, director fiduciary duties shift from shareholders to creditors. In UK, wrongful trading (Insolvency Act 1986 s214) creates personal liability for directors who continue operating when insolvent liquidation was inevitable. In US, deepening insolvency doctrine is contested. The zone creates immediate pressure to engage restructuring advisors, lenders, and counsel. Many restructurings begin with solvency analysis by accountants or independent experts.

Insolvency triggers and early warning signals: covenant breaches (leverage, interest cover, minimum liquidity failures), lender notices of default, supplier payment delays (requiring prepayment or cash on delivery), customer payment delays (working capital deterioration), credit rating downgrades, widening credit spreads, EBITDA misses, unexpected capex requirements, regulatory penalties, or litigation penalties. The weeks-of-working-capital metric is a leading indicator: working capital divided by weekly cash outflows. Below 8 weeks signals tight liquidity. Below 4 weeks is distress. A company with 20-30 weeks can navigate most crises. Company survival depends on (i) operating cash flow generation, (ii) availability of financing (revolving credit facility, asset-based lending, DIP loans), and (iii) ability to reduce costs and preserve liquidity.

Absolute Priority Rule (APR) is the foundational principle of restructuring law. Claims are paid in strict priority: super-priority administrative claims (DIP financing, professional fees, bankruptcy court fees) arrow first lien secured creditors arrow second lien secured creditors arrow senior unsecured creditors arrow subordinated creditors arrow mezzanine investors arrow preferred equity arrow common equity. Each class must receive 100 cents on the dollar before next class receives anything. In practice, APR is negotiated around - junior creditors receive value (equity, warrants, contingent payments, cash) in exchange for voting for restructuring plan and releasing legal claims. This negotiated deviation from strict APR is called a gift, uplift, or tip to junior classes. The economic rationale: certain (albeit smaller) recovery today is preferable to uncertain litigation and longer timelines.

II. RECOVERY ANALYSIS & ENTERPRISE VALUE WATERFALL

Recovery rate analysis by seniority: historical empirical averages show first lien secured creditors recover 60-85 percent (lower in full liquidations, higher in going-concern restructurings); second lien secured creditors 30-60 percent; senior unsecured creditors 40-65 percent; subordinated creditors 15-40 percent; preferred equity 2-15 percent; common equity 0-5 percent (typically nothing). Recovery rates vary enormously by: (i) industry structure (asset-heavy businesses like real estate, manufacturing recover more; intangible-asset businesses like software recover less), (ii) cycle timing (recoveries significantly lower in systemic credit crises - 2008 saw recoveries 20-30 percent below trend), (iii) jurisdiction (US Chapter 11 produces higher recoveries than UK administration), (iv) going-concern vs liquidation (going-concern restructurings yield 20-40 percent higher recovery rates), (v) market conditions for asset sales (seller market yields higher recovery; buyer market depresses recovery), and (vi) leverage at entry (higher entry leverage compresses recovery for all tranches).

Liquidation value vs going-concern value: the spread determines whether restructuring occurs or asset sale is optimal. Liquidation value (orderly liquidation) equals forced sale of assets in bankruptcy process, typically recovering 20-60 percent of book value depending on asset type (real estate and inventory recover 40-60 percent of book; machinery and equipment recover 30-50 percent; intangible assets and IP recover near-zero). Going-concern value equals enterprise valued as continuing business, incorporating intangible value: customer relationships, contractual revenue streams, workforce and productivity, proprietary IP, competitive position. The gap can be enormous - a 10 million dollar book equity business with strong customer base might liquidate for 4 million (60 percent loss) but be worth 12 million going-concern (20 percent premium). If liquidation value exceeds going-concern value, secured creditors push for liquidation rather than restructuring. This is rare for service businesses but common for asset-heavy businesses in structural decline. The 13-week cash flow model is the essential diligence tool: weekly granularity for 13 weeks forward, detailing cash receipts, operating disbursements, debt service, capex, estimated professional fees. This model determines liquidity runway and whether DIP financing is needed.

Enterprise value allocation waterfall worked example: Company has 100 million dollars estimated enterprise value (going-concern DCF). Capital structure: 45 million dollars first lien secured term loan, 30 million dollars second lien bond, 20 million dollars senior unsecured bonds, 10 million dollars subordinated debt, 15 million dollars common equity (total 120 million dollars face value - company is underwater). Waterfall: First lien receives 45 million (100 percent recovery). Remaining: 55 million. Second lien receives 30 million (100 percent recovery). Remaining: 25 million. Senior unsecured receives 20 million (100 percent recovery). Remaining: 5 million. Subordinated receives 5 million (50 percent recovery = 50 cents). Equity receives zero. Note the second lien is the fulcrum security - where value breaks. In practice, all three secured layers might receive slightly less if enterprise value estimate is too high or distressed sale discounts apply. The fulcrum security holder has maximum leverage and typically receives substantial equity in reorganised company, potentially 30-50 percent of post-restructuring equity.

III. FULCRUM SECURITY & CAPITAL STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

Fulcrum security identification: the layer of capital structure where enterprise value runs out. Everything senior to fulcrum is paid in full (or near-full) in going-concern restructuring. Everything junior to fulcrum gets nothing (or token recovery). Identifying fulcrum is the most critical analytical exercise in restructuring - it determines who will own reorganised company. Method: (1) estimate going-concern enterprise value (typically 5-15x distressed EBITDA, depending on asset base, market, and covenant trajectory); (2) subtract all claims in strict priority order until value is exhausted; (3) the layer where value breaks is fulcrum. Fulcrum holder has maximum leverage - they effectively become equity owner. Example: company generates 8 million dollars EBITDA. Distressed trading comps value at 6.0x equals 48 million dollars enterprise value. Capital structure: 30 million dollars first lien (110 percent secured), 35 million dollars second lien (130 percent secured), 15 million dollars senior unsecured. First lien receives 30 million. Remaining: 18 million. Second lien is fulcrum - they receive remaining 18 million (51 percent recovery). Senior unsecured gets zero. Second lien holders become new equity sponsors, potentially with warrants or call options. In pre-packaged bankruptcy filing, fulcrum holders pre-negotiate equity ownership percentage (typically 70-85 percent, with 15-30 percent reserved for new money, management, or junior creditor tips).

Trading the capital structure: investors buy fulcrum security at discount to par, betting on recovery. Distressed debt trades in bands: par (90-100 cents), high-yield distressed (60-90 cents), distressed (20-60 cents), and defaulted (5-30 cents). A fulcrum security might trade at 35 cents on dollar, implying market-priced recovery of 35 percent. If fundamental analysis suggests recovery of 60-80 percent, the trade is attractive. Market prices often under-estimate recovery when: (i) restructuring will be orderly and professional; (ii) sufficient enterprise value exists to pay senior secured creditors in full; (iii) management team is credible and can stabilise operations. Conversely, prices over-estimate recovery when: (i) business is structurally impaired (secular decline); (ii) litigation or regulatory penalties are looming; (iii) key customer contracts are at risk.

Negotiating leverage and control: fulcrum holder leverage comes from ability to delay and litigate. If debtor proposes plan that wipes out fulcrum holders entirely, they can (i) vote against plan, (ii) file objections in court, (iii) litigate enterprise value estimate, (iv) demand forensic investigations. Courts are reluctant to impose plans without strong justification. More commonly, debtors negotiate with fulcrum holders to grant equity stakes, warrant coverage, or board seats. The negotiating process involves: (1) announcement of formal process, (2) deadline for stakeholder submissions, (3) mediation or negotiation meetings, (4) disclosure statement circulation, (5) creditor vote, (6) court approval. Entire process typically takes 6-12 months, though pre-packs can be done in 60-90 days.

IV. CHAPTER 11 & US RESTRUCTURING MECHANICS

Chapter 11 structure and eligibility: available to any entity owing more than 2625 dollars (inflation-adjusted annually). Can be filed by debtor (voluntary) or by creditors holding 16750 dollars plus of claims (involuntary, rare). Filing triggers automatic stay - all lawsuits, enforcement actions, repossessions, and foreclosures stop immediately. Company continues operating under court supervision. Debtor-in-possession (DIP) status means existing management stays in control (unlike Chapter 7 liquidation where trustee takes over). DIP status is powerful - allows company to continue operations, avoids disruption of external trustee takeover, and potentially performs better. However, if judge loses confidence in DIP management, court can appoint Chapter 11 trustee or examiner. US Trustee (DOJ representative) supervises case, monitors professional fees, participates in key decisions. Exclusivity: for first 120 days (extendable), only debtor can file reorganisation plan. After exclusivity expires, any party can propose competing plans. This creates pressure on debtors to file plan quickly or negotiate consensually.

DIP financing and liquidity management: Chapter 11 debtors typically need new financing to continue operations. DIP financing is senior to all pre-petition claims - DIP lender receives priming liens on all collateral, sitting in super-priority ahead of existing secured creditors. DIP lenders require court approval and must show (i) adequate protection for primed creditors, and (ii) reasonable likelihood of successful reorganisation. Typical DIP terms: (1) interest rate 8-15 percent (base rate plus spread of 4-8 percent depending on

credit quality); (2) commitment 5 million to 200 million dollars plus depending on burn rate; (3) conditions precedent - budget approval, covenant maintenance, monthly certifications; (4) milestones - plan filed by date X, plan confirmed by date Y, initial payment by date Z (failure triggers acceleration); (5) carve-outs for professional fees (capped, typically 300 thousand to 1 million monthly depending on case size) and US Trustee fees. DIP term sheet is often most contentious negotiation - aggressive terms can dictate outcome.

Section 363 asset sales and stalking horse process: Section 363 of Bankruptcy Code permits expedited asset sales in ordinary course of business or otherwise. A 363 sale can occur within 30-60 days of filing, well before formal plan confirmation. Process: (1) debtor identifies stalking horse buyer (typically strategic acquirer or distressed buyer), negotiates terms, gets court approval of sale process; (2) debtor issues bid procedures order setting deadline for competing bids; (3) stalking horse bid is initial baseline offer; (4) competing bids must meet minimum premium (typically 5-10 percent) and include certified funds; (5) bid deadline (e.g., 30 days post-filing) focuses competing bidders; (6) sale hearing (Section 363 hearing) before bankruptcy judge who approves winning bid; (7) free and clear closing - assets transfer without buyer assuming liabilities (clean slate for buyer). Advantages: speed, certainty of proceeds, ability to cherry-pick assets or business lines. Disadvantages: forced sale discount (typically 10-25 percent below fair market value).

Plan of reorganisation and confirmation: a written proposal detailing (i) treatment of each claim and equity interest, (ii) distribution to each class, (iii) any new governance, (iv) source of consideration (cash, new debt, new equity). Plan must be feasible (reorganised company can pay distributions and operate long-term), in best interests of creditors (each class receives at least what they would receive in liquidation), and satisfy cramdown criteria. Filing requires disclosure statement - detailed explanation of debtor business, reasons for restructuring, proposed treatment, risks, and fairness opinion (valuation support). Both disclosure statement and plan are voted on by creditors in each class. Each class votes separately - at least 50 percent by count and 66.67 percent by amount must accept. If class votes to reject, debtor seeks cramdown - court-imposed confirmation over class objection - if: (i) plan is fair and equitable (respects absolute priority rule), (ii) does not discriminate unfairly against objecting class, and (iii) at least one impaired class (below objecting class in priority) votes in favour. Cramdown is controversial and incentivises negotiation.

V. SCHEME OF ARRANGEMENT & UK RESTRUCTURING

Scheme of Arrangement (UK Companies Act Part 26): court-supervised compromise or arrangement between company and its members or creditors. Process: (1) company files scheme proposal with court; (2) court approves convening hearing (preliminary judicial determination that scheme is not obviously wrong); (3) creditors vote in classes (typically segregated by currency, seniority, nature of claim); (4) requires 75 percent by value and 50 percent by headcount in each class; (5) court holds sanction hearing (final judicial approval); (6) scheme becomes binding on all creditors (holdouts included). Schemes historically required near-unanimous creditor consent out-of-court before court approval (in practice, about 95 percent buy-in). Introduction of Part 26A Restructuring Plans (2020 reforms) changed this dramatically by allowing cross-class cram-down.

Part 26A Restructuring Plan: allows cross-class cram-down for first time in UK law. A company can propose restructuring plan imposing treatment on dissenting classes if: (i) at least one class votes in favour with 75 percent by value; (ii) treatment is fair and equitable (respects absolute priority rule); (iii) court is not satisfied that no member of dissenting class would be better off in hypothetical insolvency than under plan. Part 26A removes the cram-able class requirement - only dissenting class and court approval matter. This substantially increased debtor negotiating leverage. Restructuring Plans can be used for debt-for-equity exchanges, liability management exercises, refinancing, acquisition-linked restructurings. Multiple restructuring plans have been successfully implemented (Looks Like Goodbar, Virgin Hotels, Pinpoint, Nexi). Process typically takes 4-6 months from plan proposal to sanction hearing. Recognition under Chapter 15 (US Bankruptcy Code) allows UK restructuring plans to be recognised in US courts, binding US creditors - important for multinational corporations.

UK administration vs scheme: administration is restructuring equivalent of Chapter 11 - an insolvency process with administrator (equivalent to DIP debtor) managing company. Automatic stay occurs. Administrators have hierarchy of objectives: (i) rescue company as going concern (preferred), (ii) achieve better result for creditors than immediate liquidation, (iii) realise property for distribution to secured creditors only. Administrations are often short-term (12-36 months) with quick exit to pre-negotiated restructuring plan or asset sale. Scheme process is increasingly preferred for complex restructurings - allows pre-negotiation, faster execution, avoids formality and cost of administration. CVA (Company Voluntary Arrangement): a lighter-weight arrangement available to companies not in formal insolvency. Requires 75 percent creditor approval by value. CVAs avoid stigma and formality of administration but lack automatic stay and debtor-in-possession status.

VI. EUROPEAN RESTRUCTURING REGIMES

Comparative frameworks: EU Directive on Preventive Restructuring (2019), implemented 2021, harmonised restructuring frameworks across Europe while preserving national flexibility. Key features: (i) preventive frame - restructuring can occur outside formal insolvency (debtors need not be balance-sheet insolvent); (ii) automatic stay on creditor enforcement for period (typically 4 weeks, extendable); (iii) new financing super-priority; (iv) cross-class cram-down (subject to absolute priority rule and fairness); (v) time-limited process (decisions within 4 months typically). Most EU countries implemented these principles but retained traditional legal frameworks. Notable examples: Netherlands WHOA (wet homologatie onderhands akkoord), Germany StaRUG (Stabilisierungs- und Restrukturierungsgesetz), Spain homologacion, Italy concordato preventivo, France procedure de sauvegarde, Belgium reorganisation judiciaire.

StaRUG (Germany, 2021): Stabilisation and Restructuring Framework permits preventive restructuring without formal insolvency if: (i) company faces insolvency or over-indebtedness risk, (ii) plan is negotiated in protected mediation, (iii) at least 50 percent (by value) of creditors agree. Cross-class cram-down available if (i) at least one affected class votes in favour by 75 percent, (ii) treatment satisfies absolute priority rule. Debtor retains management control (DIP equivalent). Typically takes 3-4 months. StaRUG has been used for significant restructurings - Condor Airlines (380 million euro debt reduction, 2021), Thyssenkrupp (12 billion euro capex-linked restructuring, 2021). Advantages: speed, confidentiality (can be negotiated pre-announcement), preserves ongoing relationships. Disadvantages: no formal stay (creditors must agree to standstill), weaker creditor protections than formal insolvency.

Netherlands WHOA: permits out-of-court compromise on debts, homologated (approved) by court. Requires 75 percent creditor acceptance by value. Court approval is largely pro-forma (administrative confirmation) rather than deep judicial scrutiny. Process is fast (8-10 weeks typical). WHOA has become preferred restructuring vehicle for European corporates given speed and flexibility. France procedure de sauvegarde: also preventive framework, though historically less flexible on cross-class cram-down than StaRUG or WHOA. Recent reforms (Loi Macron, 2017) introduced more flexibility. Italy concordato preventivo: preventive arrangement similar to other EU frameworks. Spain homologacion: judicial approval of negotiated creditor composition. The trend across Europe is toward US-style flexibility - allowing cross-class cram-down, super-priority financing, and faster timelines - while preserving civil-law protections and judicial oversight.

VII. LIABILITY MANAGEMENT EXERCISES & DEBT EXCHANGES

Liability Management Exercise (LME) terminology: a negotiated, out-of-court debt restructuring (sometimes called workout or exchange offer). Typically used by companies wishing to avoid formal insolvency or seeking to restructure without publicity and cost of formal proceedings. Key mechanics: (1) offer announcement - debtor announces formal exchange offer (e.g., swap 1 dollar principal of existing bonds for 0.85 dollar principal of new bonds with extended maturity); (2) consent solicitation - ask creditors to vote in favour; (3) tender process - creditors submit tenders at offer price during defined period (typically 20-40 days); (4) settlement - successful tenders exchanged at agreed terms. Offer requires minimum acceptance thresholds (typically 50-75 percent by value of each bond series or loan facility) - failure to meet threshold means offer is cancelled and no exchanges occur. Consent payment (or consent fee): debtor pays creditors one-time fee (10-50 dollars per 1000 dollars par, typically) for agreeing to amend their debt. Consent fee incentivises participation and compensates for amendment process.

Worked LME example: company with (i) 200 million dollar first lien loans due 2027, (ii) 150 million dollar second lien bonds due 2025 (trading at 65 cents, implying distress), (iii) 100 million dollar senior unsecured bonds due 2024. Liquidity runway is tight (18 months). Company proposes: (1) unsecured bonds: exchange 100 million dollar par for 60 million dollar par of new senior secured bonds due 2030, plus 2 percent consent fee (creditors receive 102 million dollar cash value for 100 million tendered, plus new bonds). (2) Second lien: exchange 150 million dollar par for 90 million dollar par of new senior secured bonds due 2031, plus 2 percent consent fee. (3) First lien: amend agreement to extend maturity to 2029 and reduce interest rate by 100 basis points; 1 percent consent fee. Assuming 80 percent acceptance of each tranche: new capital structure post-LME is 200 million dollar first lien (extended), 90 million by 80 percent equals 72 million new senior bonds (ex-unsecured), 60 million by 80 percent equals 48 million new senior bonds (ex-second lien), approximately 180 million total debt (down from 450 million pre-LME). This deleverages company and extends maturity wall risk.

Uptier transactions: a junior creditor (e.g., second lien holder) pays cash to acquire first lien debt, reducing it and improving their priority position. Example: 200 million dollar first lien debt, 150 million dollar second lien debt, 100 million dollar unsecured debt. Second lien holders collectively raise 50 million and use it to buy 50 million dollar par of first lien debt (typically at discount, 95-98 cents). Post-transaction: 150 million dollar first lien remains, 150 million dollar second lien now senior to 100 million dollar unsecured and some (50 million) first lien debt is retired. Senior-secured ratio improves, potentially unlocking better terms on remaining secured debt. Uptiers are sophisticated and require careful tax and accounting analysis. Dropdown transactions: reverse of uptier - senior creditor acquires junior debt (strengthens their position, reduces junior leverage). Less common because senior creditors have less incentive. Equitisation: creditors convert debt to equity, reducing leverage but diluting existing shareholders. Typically occurs in pre-packaged restructurings. Worked example: 500 million dollar enterprise value, 300 million dollar first lien (secured), 200 million dollar second lien. Assume all value goes to first lien. Second lien holders negotiate: convert 150 million dollar par to equity (25 percent of new company), retain 50 million dollar par as new secured debt. Second lien holders become controlling shareholders of reorganised company.

VIII. INTER-CREDITOR AGREEMENTS & CREDITOR RIGHTS

Inter-creditor agreement (ICA) fundamentals: a contract between two secured lenders governing their relative rights and remedies. Essential in leveraged capital structures. Key provisions: (1) priority of liens - clearly states who has first lien and who has second lien; (2) standstill period - during this period (typically 90-180 days), junior creditors cannot enforce against collateral; senior creditor has exclusive enforcement rights. This delays judgment and forces negotiation; (3) turnover obligation - if junior creditor receives any proceeds, they must turn over full amount to senior until senior is paid in full; (4) enforcement cooperation - senior creditor controls timing and method of enforcement; junior has limited input. This prevents junior from forcing destructive fire sale; (5) release and amendments - senior can release collateral, reduce collateral value, or extend maturity without junior consent (though increasingly, ICAs require adequate protection - maintaining minimum collateral ratio).

Worked ICA scenario: 100 million dollar enterprise value, 60 million dollar first lien (senior), 50 million dollar second lien (junior). Both secured by identical collateral. Borrower defaults on first lien in Month 6. Without ICA, first lien could immediately enforce and sell collateral (potentially obtaining 60 million if market conditions right, or 40 million if forced fire sale). Second lien has no control and recovers nothing in fire sale. ICA standstill: first lien agrees not to enforce for 120 days. During standstill, second lien can join negotiations for restructuring or work-out. If restructuring succeeds, both creditors preserve more value than forced fire sale. If no restructuring occurs, first lien can enforce after 120 days, knowing second lien had opportunity to participate. Standstill periods create incentive for junior creditors to be active in restructuring discussions.

Subordination mechanics: Payment subordination - junior creditor cannot receive any payment (principal or interest) until senior is paid in full. Accrues interest (PIK - paid-in-kind, added to principal) or is forgiven depending on ICA. Lien subordination - junior creditor has lien on same collateral but ranks junior in enforcement. If collateral is sold, senior lien paid first, junior receives remainder. Structural subordination - holdco (parent company) debt is structurally senior to opco (operating subsidiary) debt because opco collateral and cash flow sit below holdco. Opco creditors have no claim on holdco assets unless guaranteed. Contractual subordination - explicit agreement that junior creditor claims are subordinated. Most ICAs contain complex layering: payment subordination during normal operations, lien subordination in enforcement, and provisions allowing junior to be freed up in certain scenarios (e.g., if senior has received 100 percent recovery and willing to release subordination). ICAs are heavily negotiated - senior wants maximum protection; junior wants maximum flexibility and transparency.

IX. DISTRESSED DEBT TRADING & RECOVERY ANALYSIS

Distressed debt market structure and trading levels: debt trades in recognisable bands: par (90-100 cents on dollar, investment grade or near-par credit), high-yield distressed (60-90 cents, companies with elevated refinancing risk but still generating positive cash flow), distressed (20-60 cents, companies in covenant breach or near-term default), distressed-plus (10-35 cents, in or near bankruptcy), defaulted (5-30 cents, already in bankruptcy or default). Credit spread (difference between coupon and risk-free rate) widens as price falls: a 5 percent coupon bond trades at 70 cents when spreads are 600 basis points, implying market-priced total return of 7.1 percent - but credit loss is embedded (market assumes 30 percent recovery loss). Bid-ask spreads widen dramatically in distress: par debt has 5-10 basis points bid-ask spread; distressed has 5-10 points (500-1000 basis points); defaulted debt can have 10-50 point spreads. Liquidity evaporates.

Market participants and flows: (1) Distressed specialists (Apollo, Oaktree, Cerberus, Baupost, Elliott, Avenue Capital, Davidson Kempner, Blackstone Tactical Opportunities) - these buy distressed debt with a thesis (recovery, LTO strategy, creditor activism). Often take 5-20 percent positions in distressed issuer and control negotiation. (2) CLO managers - historically forced sellers (loan downgrades trigger CLO de-leveraging), now sometimes buyers if downgraded loans offer attractive risk-adjusted returns. (3) Bank portfolio sales - banks offload distressed loans for regulatory capital relief; often forced to sell at fire-sale prices. (4) Mutual funds and insurance companies - typically sellers of distressed debt (risk management mandates). (5) Hedge funds - opportunistic buyers and traders. (6) Vulture funds - small, specialised funds focused on bankruptcy litigation and out-of-court restructurings.

Distressed debt valuation and recovery mechanics: Recovery rate modelling - model enterprise value (typically 4-8x distressed EBITDA, depending on asset base and margin-expansion potential), subtract senior claims in priority, estimate junior recovery as (remaining EV minus claims senior to junior) divided by junior claim amount. Example: 80 million dollar enterprise value, 45 million dollar first lien, 40 million dollar second lien, 30 million dollar unsecured. Second lien recovery equals (80 minus 45) divided by 40 equals 87.5 percent capacity, but practical recovery capped at 100 percent due to dilution and refinancing risk. Assume recovery 85 percent equals 680 million recovered. Unsecured recovery equals (80 minus 45 minus 68) divided by 600 equals 17.7 percent recovery equals 106 million paid. Illiquidity discount: distressed debt trades at discount to fundamental recovery value because it is illiquid (cannot be sold easily) and risky (recovery uncertain). A distressed bond with 60 percent expected recovery might trade at 45 cents if (i) limited market liquidity (10-point bid-ask spread), (ii) bankruptcy process likely 18-24 months (time value), (iii) litigation risk (unsecured creditors may sue management), (iv) downside scenario risk (if operational deterioration, recovery could be 30 percent instead of 60 percent). The 15-point discount compensates for illiquidity and risk factors.

X. LOAN-TO-OWN STRATEGIES & DISTRESSED MANDA

Loan-to-own (LTO) strategy: buy distressed debt (typically fulcrum security) at discount arrow exert control over restructuring arrow convert debt to equity arrow become owner of reorganised company. Economic thesis: buy fulcrum security at, say, 40 cents on dollar, negotiate equity conversion at par (100 cents), effectively converting 1 dollar of debt for 1 dollar of equity at 40 cent cost. If post-restructuring equity value is 2 dollars, investor has realised 5x return. Strategy works when: (i) fundamental value is higher than market price - market is pessimistic or distressed selling forces fire-sale prices; (ii) operational value-add is feasible - investor has management expertise, cost-cutting skills, or strategic business combinations to improve EBITDA; (iii) legal certainty in restructuring - US Chapter 11 offers clarity; European restructuring regimes increasingly predictable. LTO requires: (i) deep fundamental analysis - accurate enterprise valuation (mistake of 20-30 percent can wipe out returns); (ii) legal expertise - understanding absolute priority rule, cramdown mechanics, creditor rights; (iii) operational capability - ability to improve business post-restructuring; (iv) capital flexibility - ability to inject new money if needed.

Worked LTO case study: Hertz (2020): pre-bankruptcy, Hertz had 19.5 billion dollar total debt (8.8 billion secured plus 10.7 billion unsecured). Enterprise value estimated at 2-4 billion dollars (depending on used-car sales proceeds). Secured creditors (Apollo, Carlyle) got paid in full. Unsecured creditors recovered approximately 0 percent (offered warrants on reorganised company, essentially worthless). Common equity fully wiped. The lesson: in rapid deterioration (Hertz faced demand collapse due to COVID-19), even unsecured creditors face total loss, and LTO becomes difficult. Contrast: stable business with modest over-leverage (e.g., telecom company with temporary EBITDA pressure) offers better LTO opportunity. Investor buys second lien or unsecured debt at 30-50 cents, business stabilises, debt is refinanced at par, investor equity stake appreciates 3-5x. Timing matters enormously in LTO - entry during panic selling (prices bottomed) vs entry when market is recovering (more expensive entry, but more certainty of recovery).

Creditor-on-creditor violence and creditor activism: distressed funds often accumulate 10-30 percent positions in distressed issuer and use leverage to influence restructuring outcomes. Tactics: (1) blocking votes - accumulate enough debt to block plan vote (need 66.67 percent approval); (2) strategic amendments - propose amendments to capital structure or plan that benefit their position; (3) litigation threats - threaten to litigate fulcrum recoveries, fraudulent transfers, or management compensation; (4) side-car negotiations - negotiate separately with debtor for enhanced recoveries (equity stakes, management control, special fees). Predatory behaviour: some distressed funds engage in aggressive tactics - demanding board seats, threatening to force liquidation if demands not met, pushing for 363 asset sales that benefit their position at expense of other creditors. Courts and restructuring professionals increasingly scrutinise predatory behaviour. Elliott Management and others have faced criticism for aggressive LTO tactics that prioritise their returns over broader stakeholder interests.

XI. CREDIT RATING MECHANISMS & CDS ANALYSIS

Credit rating scales and cross-default triggers: ratings agencies (Moodys, S&P;, Fitch) assign ratings from AAA (highest safety) to C or D (default or distressed). Levels: AAA-AA (high grade, low risk), A-BBB (upper medium grade or investment grade), BB-B (non-investment grade or high-yield), CCC-C (highly speculative, significant distress), D (default). Most corporate debt covenants include ratings triggers - if company is downgraded below certain threshold (e.g., below BB), additional collateral may be required, interest rates spike, or acceleration rights trigger. Downgrade from investment grade (BBB) to non-investment grade (BB) is called fallen angel transition and often triggers forced selling by mutual funds and insurance companies with investment-grade mandates. Downgrade can cascade - company downgraded to BB loses access to investment-grade capital markets, forced into high-yield refinancing at higher rates, or faces covenants that may not be achievable. Watch list status (positive or negative) often precedes formal rating changes by weeks or months, providing leading indicators.

Credit Default Swap (CDS) market: a financial derivative where protection buyer pays protection seller periodic premium in exchange for payment if reference entity defaults. For company with 1 billion dollar debt and 5-year CDS spread of 500 basis points, protection buyer pays 5 percent of notional (e.g., 50 million per year) for 1 billion of protection. If company defaults, protection seller pays out difference between par and recovery value. If recovery is 40 percent, payout is 600 million. CDS spreads reflect market-priced default probability: 500 basis points spread roughly implies 10-15 percent cumulative default probability over 5 years (depends on recovery assumptions). Distressed companies can have CDS spreads of 1000-3000 basis points (10-30 percent implied default probability). CDS used for: (i) hedging (bondholder buys CDS to protect against loss), (ii) speculation (bet on default or recovery), (iii) capital structure arbitrage (trade between CDS and bonds to exploit pricing inefficiencies). Basis (difference between bond price and CDS pricing) can be significant in distressed situations.

Recovery value in CDS: historically, standardised recovery assumed (40 percent for senior unsecured, 25 percent for subordinated). But in distressed situations, market participants debate recovery - if recovery likely 60 percent instead of 40 percent, CDS payout is lower, and CDS seller profits. This creates conflicting incentives: CDS sellers benefit from high recovery; bondholders benefit from low recovery (if they also own bond, high recovery limits their losses; if only own CDS, low recovery triggers large payout). In some restructurings, this led to perverse incentives - CDS sellers lobbying for asset sales that depress recovery, or bondholders lobbying for going-concern restructuring that supports higher recovery. 2009 Lehman Brothers bankruptcy saw significant CDS disputes due to recovery value disagreements. Regulatory reforms (ISDA 2009) introduced standardised auction processes to determine recovery value post-default.

XII. ALTMAN Z-SCORE & FINANCIAL DISTRESS PREDICTION

Altman Z-Score methodology: developed by Edward Altman (1968), Z-Score is quantitative model predicting bankruptcy risk. Formula for manufacturing companies: Z equals 1.2A plus 1.4B plus 3.3C plus 0.6D plus 1.0E, where A equals working capital divided by total assets, B equals retained earnings divided by total assets, C equals EBIT divided by total assets, D equals market value of equity divided by book value of liabilities, E equals sales divided by total assets. Interpretation: Z greater than 2.99 (safe zone, low bankruptcy risk), 1.81-2.99 (grey zone, moderate risk), less than 1.81 (distress zone, high bankruptcy risk). Model was approximately 80-90 percent accurate predicting bankruptcy within 2 years. Notable successes: Altmans model correctly flagged Enron, WorldCom, and Lehman Brothers as distressed in years preceding collapse. Limitations: (i) based on historical data (manufacturing-focused 1960s dataset, less applicable to intangible-asset businesses like software or media), (ii) assumes linear relationships (may break in tail events), (iii) equity value is forward-looking market estimate (volatile and subject to speculative bubbles).

Revised Z-Score for private companies (Altman 1983): adjusts D (market value) to 0.9 times book value of equity divided by book value of liabilities (since private company equity value not observable). This variant widely used by credit analysts for non-traded companies. Z-Score for service sector (Altman 1995) adjusts weights given service firms have less asset tangibility: Z equals 6.56A plus 3.26B plus 6.72C plus 1.05D. Predictive power: Z-Score is screening tool - Z less than 1.81 flags risk but does not necessarily predict bankruptcy (many companies with low Z-Scores survive through restructuring or improve operational performance). Conversely, high Z-Score does not guarantee safety (Enron had Z greater than 2 months before collapse, due to aggressive accounting). Used alongside other metrics: leverage ratios (net debt divided by EBITDA), liquidity metrics (current ratio, quick ratio, cash divided by monthly burn), and operational metrics (EBITDA margin trend, revenue growth). Combination of high leverage, deteriorating margins, and tight liquidity is classic distress signal.

Worked Z-Score example: Manufacturing company, annual financials: Total assets 500 million, Working capital 80 million, Retained earnings 120 million, EBIT 50 million, Sales 800 million, Market value of equity 100 million, Book value of liabilities 400 million. Calculations: A equals 80 divided by 500 equals 0.16; B equals 120 divided by 500 equals 0.24; C equals 50 divided by 500 equals 0.10; D equals 100 divided by 400 equals 0.25; E equals 800 divided by 500 equals 1.60. Z equals 1.2(0.16) plus 1.4(0.24) plus 3.3(0.10) plus 0.6(0.25) plus 1.0(1.60) equals 0.192 plus 0.336 plus 0.33 plus 0.15 plus 1.60 equals 2.608 (grey zone - moderate risk). Company not obviously distressed but warrants monitoring. If retained earnings decline or sales fall, Z-Score could drop below 1.81, signalling material distress risk.

XIII. RESTRUCTURING WATERFALL & WORKED EXAMPLES

Comprehensive waterfall example Telecom restructuring (going-concern). Company: 2 billion dollar annual revenue, 400 million dollar EBITDA (20 percent margin), highly leveraged due to spectrum auctions. Enterprise value estimate: 5.5x EBITDA (distressed comps average) equals 2.2 billion. Capital structure: 1.2 billion first lien term loan, 800 million second lien bonds (trading at 60 cents equals 480 million market value, implying approximately 40 percent expected recovery), 600 million unsecured bonds, 300 million preferred equity, 1 billion common equity (total face approximately 3.9 billion, enterprise value approximately 2.2 billion - company is underwater). Going-concern restructuring waterfall: (1) DIP financing 200 million (ranks super-priority). (2) First lien term loan 1.2 billion - recovers 100 percent. (3) Second lien bonds 800 million - recovers (2.2B minus 1.2B) divided by 800M equals 125 percent capacity, but practical recovery capped at 100 percent due to dilution and refinancing risk. Assume recovery 85 percent equals 680 million. (4) Unsecured bonds 600 million - recovers (2.2B minus 1.2B minus 680M) divided by 600M equals 17.7 percent recovery equals 106 million paid. (5) Preferred equity - recovers 0 dollars. (6) Common equity - recovers 0 dollars. Second lien holders (fulcrum) receive equity in reorganised company (typically 60-70 percent), unsecured holders receive warrants or small equity stakes (5-10 percent) and retention of some bonds with amended terms.

Comparative waterfall: Liquidation scenario. Same company, but operational deterioration occurs (customer defections, competitive pressure, technology obsolescence). Enterprise value estimate drops to 1.0 billion (forced sale valuation, 50 percent haircut). Waterfall: (1) DIP financing 200 million (paid back from proceeds). (2) First lien term loan 1.2 billion - recovers 1.0B divided by 1.2B equals 83 percent equals 996 million. (3) Second lien bonds 800 million - recovers 0 dollars (no remaining value after first lien). (4) Unsecured bonds 600 million - recovers 0 dollars. (5) All junior classes wiped. Jump from 85 percent second lien recovery (going-concern) to 0 percent (liquidation) illustrates why fulcrum holders have leverage to shape restructuring process. They prefer negotiated restructuring that preserves going-concern value over forced liquidation. Incentive to negotiate - and ability to block liquidation - comes from their leverage in controlling or blocking plan vote.

Inter-creditor dynamics in restructuring: First lien lenders prefer liquidation scenario (get paid 83 cents instead of 100 cents, but avoids further operational deterioration risk and shortens timeline). Second lien bondholders prefer going-concern scenario (recover 85 cents plus equity upside rather than 0 dollars). This conflict is typical: senior creditors prefer speed and certainty (even if fire sale); junior creditors prefer extended timeline and going-concern restructuring. In practice, debtor and investment advisor (banker) hired by board navigate this conflict. Banker typically runs formal process: (i) announces sale process (invites strategic buyers), (ii) simultaneously negotiates going-concern restructuring with creditors, (iii) compares going-concern value to sale proceeds, (iv) selects optimal path. If sale proceeds exceed going-concern value estimate, 363 sale occurs. If going-concern value higher, restructuring plan negotiated. Formal process takes 4-8 months and results in either asset sale, plan vote, or settlement agreement.

XIV. DISTRESSED MANDA & STRATEGIC BUYER STRATEGIES

Strategic buyer distressed targeting: distressed situations create acquisition opportunities for strategic buyers. Seller motivations: (i) asset acquisition (buy specific business lines, customer bases, or IP at distressed valuations), (ii) competitive elimination (acquire weakened competitor, roll it up), (iii) technology or IP acquisition (acquire patent portfolios or proprietary technology at fraction of their R&D; cost), (iv) geographic expansion (acquire market presence in underserved regions). Buyer motivations: bankruptcy-remote acquisition - structured to isolate distressed seller liabilities (buyer acquires only specific assets, not all liabilities) arrow buyer avoids assuming pension deficits, litigation claims, environmental obligations. Typically done via Section 363 asset sale where buyer acquires assets and avoids bulk of liabilities. Buyer valuations typically 20-40 percent below normal market value (acquisition discount for integration risk, distress discount for speed and certainty). Example: strategic buyer acquires distressed telecom for 1.5 billion (distressed valuation) vs estimated 2.0 billion going-concern value, saving 500 million. Buyer assumes only specific liabilities (assumed contracts), avoids 200 million pension deficit, 100 million environmental liability, and 300 million litigation exposure.

Section 363 sale process and stalking horse mechanics: debtor and investment banker identify stalking horse buyer (lead bidder) and negotiate purchase agreement. Stalking horse bid announced as baseline - sets floor price and demonstrates market interest. Bidding procedures order issued, setting deadline for competing bids (typically 30 days post-filing). Competing bids must: (i) exceed stalking horse bid by 5-10 percent (overbid requirement), (ii) include earnest money or deposit (evidence of seriousness), (iii) meet other terms (assumption of certain liabilities, employment level commitments). Auction hearing occurs at approximately day 40 - judge and creditors evaluate competing bids. Highest or best bid approved by court. Closing occurs 7-30 days later. Advantages: rapid process (60-90 days), certainty of proceeds, debtor avoids operating for 2 plus years while plan negotiated. Disadvantages: forced sale discount, potential buyer leverage to reduce offer price if competing bids weak, loss of business relationships (customers defect).

Leveraged acquisition and LBO post-restructuring: after restructuring plan confirmation, reorganised company may be acquired by private equity fund (LBO). PE fund finances acquisition with leverage: equity (20-30 percent), senior debt (50-60 percent), mezzanine or preferred debt (10-20 percent). Reorganised company (with lower leverage, improved operations) financed with 3.0-4.5x leverage (vs 5-6x pre-restructuring), enabling PE fund realise 20-30 percent IRR over 5-7 year hold. Toys R Us (2005 LBO) classic case: KKR, Vornado Realty, and PE Capital acquired Toys R Us for 6.6 billion (financed with 65 percent leverage). Company struggled with operating competition (Amazon, Walmart), debt burden, and capital intensity. By 2017, Toys R Us filed Chapter 11 with approximately 5 billion remaining debt and unable to refinance. 2005 LBO destroyed value due to (i) strategic misjudgment (underestimated Amazon threat), (ii) over-leverage (too much debt relative to cash generation), (iii) PIK toggle debt (deferred interest, pyramiding debt). Contrast: in 2023, Tapestry acquired Capri Holdings for approximately 10 billion to acquire Coach, Gucci, and other luxury brands - strategic acquisition at attractive valuation due to Capris distress. Post-acquisition integration added 2-3 billion value through cost synergies and brand synergies.

XV. ADVISORY FIRMS & PROFESSIONAL ECOSYSTEM

Restructuring advisory leaders: Houlihan Lokey (market leader by deal count, approximately 150 plus restructuring assignments per year, known for debtor-side expertise and transaction execution), PJT Partners (Park Hill plus Evercore restructuring, strong in creditor advisory and private credit placement), Lazard (cross-border strength, particularly Europe and emerging markets), Rothschild (traditional European player, strong in Scheme of Arrangement work), Moelis (growing restructuring practice, distressed equity research), Evercore (full-service investment bank with restructuring practice), Perella Weinberg (boutique specialist, high-value assignments). Big Three audit firms also have restructuring arms: Deloitte (largest turnaround practice globally, approximately 500 plus dedicated professionals), EY (Financial Advisory, restructuring and insolvency), PwC (restructuring and insolvency, UK administration market leader). Typical engagement size: 500 thousand to 5 million pounds plus depending on company size and complexity. Fee structures: hourly billing (200-400 pounds per hour for experienced professionals), fixed fees (for bankruptcy exams), contingency (percentage of recovery for debt advisory), or hybrid. Conflicts of interest are common - bankruptcy estate may hire multiple advisors (debtor estate counsel, creditor committee counsel, debtor operational restructuring advisor, creditor financial advisory), and advisors can have conflicting interests.

Distressed debt funds and investors: Apollo Global Management (approximately 470 billion dollars AUM, large distressed portfolio), Oaktree Capital (approximately 160 billion dollars AUM, founded by Howard Marks, specialised in distressed investing), Cerberus Capital Management (approximately 50 billion dollars AUM, known for auto industry restructurings - GMAC, Chrysler), Baupost Group (approximately 35 billion dollars AUM, value or distressed, concentrated portfolio), Elliott Management (approximately 65 billion dollars AUM, activist or distressed, known for aggressive LTO tactics), Davidson Kempner (approximately 65 billion dollars AUM, distressed and event-driven), Centerbridge Partners (approximately 35 billion dollars AUM, multi-strategy including distressed). These funds often co-invest or form consortiums to acquire large distressed positions. Largest restructurings (GM, Lehman Brothers, Washington Mutual) involve 10-30 distressed or activist funds negotiating as consortium. Bank loan platforms (Golub Capital, Ares, KKR Credit, Blackstone Tactical Opportunities) increasingly active in distressed debt, treating it as distinct asset class within broader credit businesses.

Legal counsel specialisation: Weil Gotshal and Manges (US bankruptcy leader, approximately 100 plus restructuring lawyers, known for complex Chapter 11 work and cross-border cases), Kirkland and Ellis (corporate or restructuring specialist, significant bankruptcy practice), Latham and Watkins (US-focused, strong in large restructurings and 363 sales), Sullivan and Cromwell (financial restructuring), Milbank (leveraged finance restructuring), Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer (UK or European restructuring, strong in schemes of arrangement), Allen and Overy (UK or European, global reach), Clifford Chance (multinational, cross-border restructuring). Restructuring is one of most legally intensive areas of finance - bankruptcy code and cross-border frameworks are complex, court decisions set precedent, litigation over claim priority or recoveries is common. Quality of legal counsel can materially affect outcomes (well-drafted plan language survives appellate challenges; poorly drafted language creates appellate exposure). Fees for counsel in large restructurings: 5 million to 50 million dollars plus. Big Three law firms derive 10-20 percent of their revenue from restructuring and insolvency work.

XVI. CASE STUDIES & LESSONS LEARNED

General Motors and Chrysler (2008 - 2009): triggered by financial crisis and auto industry collapse. GM filed Chapter 11 with 60 billion dollars debt (largest US bankruptcy at time). Government provided DIP financing (61 billion dollars for GM, 15 billion dollars for Chrysler). Key mechanics: (i) pre-packaged 363 sale - GM assets sold to New GM (government-backed entity) for 49 billion; Old GMs debt remained unsecured, recovered 10-25 percent (Lehman-era pricing); (ii) union concessions - UAW agreed to 4 - 5 billion dollars wage concessions, retiree health care restructuring; (iii) creditor losses - unsecured bondholders received 2-10 percent recovery (highly controversial because government supported deal), shareholders wiped, pension claims protected under PBGC guarantees. Lessons: (i) government support can materially alter recovery waterfall (political considerations override market-based restructuring), (ii) strategic buyers (in this case, US government) have leverage to set terms, (iii) union and employee agreements are critical creditor claims in industrial restructurings.

Toys R Us (2017): 5 billion dollar debt from 2005 LBO, rapid deterioration due to Amazon competitive pressure. Chapter 11 filed with approximately 11 billion dollars liabilities (enterprise value estimated 0.5 - 1.5 billion). Key mechanics: (i) going-concern store-by-store sale - sold approximately 200 stores to various buyers over 6 months; remaining stores liquidated for pennies; (ii) 3 percent recovery for unsecured creditors (historic low, due to asset dispositions generating minimal proceeds and leverage overhang); (iii) vendor claims - suppliers owed 1 billion dollars plus (many small vendors received pennies); (iv) employee claims - severance and unpaid wages were priority claims. Lessons: (i) pure financial LBOs destroying operational flexibility - heavy debt burden prevented management from making strategic capex investments; (ii) secular decline (brick-and-mortar retail) interacting with high leverage produces catastrophic outcomes; (iii) creditor losses are asymmetric - first lien recovers 100 percent, unsecured recovers 3 percent; (iv) bankruptcy process takes 18 plus months, further eroding asset value.

Steinhoff (2017 - ongoing): South African furniture retailer, multi-billion-dollar accounting fraud (similar scale to Wirecard). Enterprise value collapsed from 3 billion dollars plus to near-zero. Scheme of Arrangement filed in UK and South Africa (2021), but process still ongoing (as of 2024) due to complexity and cross-border coordination (South Africa, UK, Netherlands, Poland, etc.). Lessons: (i) fraud restructurings are extremely costly - litigation claims, asset recoveries from insiders, clawbacks of dividends; (ii) cross-border coordination is slow - different jurisdictions have different priorities and processes; (iii) secured creditors recover modestly, unsecured creditors face near-total loss; (iv) management credibility destroyed (difficult to fundraise, retain customers, hire talent). Steinhoff also highlights risk of relying on auditors to catch fraud - PwC, as both auditor and consultant, failed to detect scheme.

XVII. SPECIAL SITUATIONS INVESTING & NON-PERFORMING LOANS

Distressed-for-control investing: specialist strategy where investor accumulates 15-40 percent of companys debt and uses leverage to influence outcome. Tactics: (1) blocking positions - accumulate enough to block plan vote (need 33.3 percent to block), force debtor back to negotiation table; (2) creditor committee participation - join official creditor committee (allows access to confidential information, bidding processes); (3) acceleration threats - threaten to accelerate debt, force default, if demands not met; (4) litigation threats - file objections to plan, challenge valuation, pursue avoidance actions; (5) replacement demands - demand CEO replacement, board seats, management changes. Goal is extract value by influencing restructuring outcome - perhaps forcing liquidation (benefits senior creditors), negotiating equity conversion at higher recovery (benefits junior creditors), or acquiring assets post-bankruptcy at discount. Elliott Management is archetypal distressed-for-control investor - accumulated 16 percent of GameStop prior to 2021 meme stock surge, demanded board changes, benefited from stock rally. However, most distressed-for-control strategies more modest - target 20-25 percent of distressed debt, engage in 2 - 3 year holding period, achieve 15-30 percent IRR.

Non-performing loan (NPL) markets: banks offload distressed loans to specialist NPL funds. NPL characteristics: loan is greater than 90 days past due, borrower faces payment difficulty, likelihood of full recovery low (typically 20-60 percent expected recovery for residential mortgage NPLs, 10-40 percent for commercial real estate NPLs). NPL market participants: specialist NPL funds (Apollo, Oaktree, Cerberus, Baupost, KKR), distressed real estate funds, bank servicers (manage assets for purchaser). Valuation mechanics: NPL sold as portfolio (e.g., 500 million dollars par of NPLs for 150 million dollars cash equals 30 cents on dollar valuation). Buyer then works out assets: (i) loan modification (extend maturity, reduce interest rate, reduce principal), (ii) forbearance (temporary payment holiday, resume after borrower stabilises), (iii) foreclosure (seize collateral and liquidate), (iv) sale of note (sell to another servicer). Recovery depends on: (i) collateral value (for mortgages, home appreciation or depreciation), (ii) borrower financial condition (employment, income), (iii) legal process (foreclosure takes 6-24 months depending on jurisdiction, costs 5 - 10 percent of collateral value). European NPL crisis (2014 - 2018): Southern European banks (Italian, Spanish, Greek banks) accumulated 1 plus trillion euros in NPLs due to real estate bubble collapse.

Distressed real estate and workout strategies: commercial real estate (office, retail) defaulted loans surge during downturns (2008 - 2012 crisis, COVID-19 related 2021 - 2023). Loan modification strategies: (i) extend and amend (E and A) - extend maturity 2 - 5 years, reduce interest rate 100 - 300 basis points, potentially reduce principal by 5 - 15 percent; (ii) rate reduction - lower coupon to help borrower stabilise cash flows; (iii) principal reduction - reduce principal balance to bring loan into better LTV (loan-to-value) position, incentivises borrower to stay current; (iv) payment holidays - temporary suspension of payments for 6 - 12 months while borrower executes operational improvements or refinances. Forbearance and restructuring: lender provides temporary relief (6 - 12 month payment deferral) while borrower improves property (leases additional space, reduces capex to stabilise NOI). If successful, borrower refinances out of distressed position. If unsuccessful, lender forecloses, seizes property, and liquidates. Foreclosure timeline: 90 days (notice period) plus 120 days (judicial process in some states) plus 60 - 90 days (sale process) equals 8 - 12 months minimum. Costs: 5 - 8 percent of property value in legal, real estate commissions, and carrying costs. Valuation of defaulted real estate: 60 - 80 cents on dollar (property-specific basis).

XVIII. REGULATORY & POLICY FRAMEWORKS

Bankruptcy Code evolution: Chapter 11 introduced in 1978 Bankruptcy Reform Act as debtor-friendly restructuring framework (allowing debtor-in-possession management and exclusive plan filing periods). Subsequent reforms: (i) BAPCPA (2005) - Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act - introduced means testing for Chapter 7 discharge eligibility, making it harder for individuals to eliminate unsecured debt; increased disclosures and credit counselling requirements; shortened exclusivity periods in some cases; (ii) Cramdown restrictions - courts increasingly willing to impose plans over dissenting classes, though litigation common. Absolute Priority Rule debated heavily - should junior equity holders retain value despite senior creditor losses? US Supreme Court (Norwest Bank v. AWCO) confirmed APR not absolute - creditors can negotiate deviations (gifts to junior classes). DIP financing protections: BAPCPA introduced disclosure requirements for DIP financing to prevent excessive priming and aggressive terms. Liquidation alternative: courts increasingly compare Chapter 11 plan value to hypothetical Chapter 7 liquidation value - if Chapter 11 plan delivers less value, plan rejected.

EU Restructuring Directive implementation: harmonised framework across EU member states (effective June 2021). Key provisions: (i) preventive restructuring available to debtors in financial difficulty (not yet in formal insolvency); (ii) automatic stay on creditor enforcement (4 weeks, extendable); (iii) super-priority for restructuring financing (equivalent to DIP); (iv) cross-class cram-down available (if at least one impaired class votes for plan and absolute priority respected); (v) time-limited process (4 months typical for plan approval); (vi) workers or employees prioritised (wage claims, pension liabilities given priority). Implementation uneven - Netherlands moved quickly (WHOA mechanisms adopted), Germany implemented StaRUG (2021), UK introduced Part 26A (2020), but Southern European countries (Greece, Italy, Spain) slower to implement. Underlying goal: reduce stigma of insolvency, encourage early restructuring intervention, harmonise outcomes across EU members.

Insolvency regimes across jurisdictions: US Chapter 11 remains gold standard - DIP debtor management, 120-day exclusivity, cramdown flexibility, established case law. UK administration - trustee appointed (administrator), automatic stay, faster (12-36 months typical) than US due to simpler creditor structure. Germany StaRUG - preventive, fast (3-4 months), but requires mediation phase and majority creditor support. France procedure de sauvegarde - preventive, judicial supervision lighter than formal insolvency. Spain homologacion - judicial approval of negotiated composition. Italy concordato preventivo - preventive arrangement, gaining popularity post-EU directive. Australia - voluntary administration (similar to UK administration), plus Restructuring Plan (Part 5.3B, Companies Act) post-2019 reforms. Singapore - Restructuring and Insolvency Division (RID) introduced 2017, following US or UK models. Trend across jurisdictions toward US-style flexibility - faster timelines, debtor-in-possession management, and cross-class cram-down - while preserving civil-law protections and stakeholder consultation.