

SEC Guidance on Well-Known Seasoned Issuer Waivers

On March 12, 2014, the Division of Corporation Finance (the “Division”) of the US Securities and Exchange Commission (the “SEC”) issued its “Revised Statement on Well-Known Seasoned Issuer Waivers.”¹ This guidance updates and refines the Division’s 2011 policy for granting waivers of “ineligible issuer” status in order to allow an issuer to qualify as a “well-known seasoned issuer” (a “WKSI”).

When an issuer qualifies as a WKSI, it can register its securities under the Securities Act of 1933 (the “Securities Act”) on a shelf registration that becomes effective automatically upon filing. This streamlined process provides flexibility for a WKSI to time securities sales to meet market conditions, without waiting for the Division to review and comment upon a registration statement and declare it effective.

Unless a waiver is granted, an issuer may not qualify as a WKSI if it is an ineligible issuer. Pursuant to Rule 405 under the Securities Act, an issuer will be an ineligible issuer if it (or its subsidiary) has been convicted of specified felonies or misdemeanors under Section 15 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, or has violated the anti-fraud provisions of the federal securities laws. Rule 405 authorizes the SEC to grant waivers of ineligible issuer status “upon a showing of good cause, that it is not necessary under the circumstances that the issuer be considered an ineligible issuer.”

In the guidance, the Division indicated that when making a determination that a waiver would be consistent with the public interest and

the protection of investors, it will consider whether the conduct involved a criminal conviction or scienter-based violation. It will also assess whether the violation involved disclosure for which the issuer was responsible or calls into question the issuer’s ability to produce reliable disclosure. While no single factor is determinative, the Division will consider:

- Who was responsible for the misconduct?
- What was the duration of the misconduct?
- What remedial steps were taken by the issuer?
- What impact would denial of the waiver request have?

The issuer carries the burden of justifying the appropriateness of any waiver request, based on the framework set forth in the Division’s guidance.

In a key change from its previous guidance on WKSI waivers, the Division’s new guidance no longer designates anti-fraud violations stemming from the issuer’s own disclosures about itself and the scienter-based nature of an anti-fraud violation as threshold considerations. Also, while the Division continues to take into account whether a violation was scienter-based, its revised guidance does not limit application of factors being considered to non-scienter-based violations.

Practical Considerations

Any issuer seeking a waiver of ineligible issuer status should review the updated guidance

carefully and frame a waiver request letter to respond to the specific points that the Division has stated are important to its consideration. An express purpose of the Division's guidance is to provide transparency for its decision-making process. An issuer should provide specific, factual details demonstrating how factors that the guidance highlights as potential justifications are applicable to its situation.

The guidance specifically emphasizes "tone at the top." It is important that senior management does not condone or ignore violative behavior or "red flags" hinting at violative conduct. WKSI eligibility, and the related process for waiver of ineligible issuer status, provides another compliance incentive for promptly addressing and correcting securities law problems.

Remediation efforts designed to prevent future violations can be important to the justification for a waiver of ineligible issuer status. For example, the Division's guidance mentions improved training and improved internal controls as efforts it will take into consideration. The Division also reviews whether key changes have been made in the personnel involved in the violative or criminal conduct. Because the Division is focused on an issuer's ability to produce reliable disclosure, demonstrating improvements to disclosure controls and procedures may be helpful to a waiver request.

*If you have any questions about the Division's WKSI waiver guidance, please contact the author of this Legal Update, **Laura D. Richman**, at +1 312 701 7304, or any of the lawyers listed below, or any other member of our Corporate & Securities practice.*

David S. Bakst

+1 212 506 2551
dbakst@mayerbrown.com

Harry Beaudry

+1 713 238 2635
hbeaudry@mayerbrown.com

John P. Berkery

+1 212 506 2552
jberkery@mayerbrown.com

Edward S. Best

+1 312 701 7100
ebest@mayerbrown.com

Bernd Bohr

+44 20 3130 3640
bbohr@mayerbrown.com

Robert E. Curley

+1 312 701 7306
rcurley@mayerbrown.com

Paul De Bernier

+1 213 229 9542
pdebernier@mayerbrown.com

Robert M. Flanigan

+44 20 3130 3488
rflanigan@mayerbrown.com

Marc H. Folladori

+1 713 238 2696
mfolladori@mayerbrown.com

Robert F. Gray

+1 713 238 2600
rgray@mayerbrown.com

Lawrence R. Hamilton

+1 312 701 7055
lhhamilton@mayerbrown.com

Michael L. Hermsen

+1 312 701 7960
mhermsen@mayerbrown.com

Philip J. Niehoff

+1 312 701 7843
pniehoff@mayerbrown.com

Dallas Parker

+1 713 238 2700
dparker@mayerbrown.com

Elizabeth A. Raymond

+1 312 701 7322
eraymond@mayerbrown.com

Laura D. Richman

+1 312 701 7304

lrichman@mayerbrown.com

David A. Schuette

+1 312 701 7363

dschuette@mayerbrown.com

Jodi A. Simala

+1 312 701 7920

jsimala@mayerbrown.com

Frederick B. Thomas

+1 312 701 7035

ftthomas@mayerbrown.com

J. Kirk Tucker

+1 713 238 2500

ktucker@mayerbrown.com

comprehensive treatment of the subject matter covered and is not intended to provide legal advice. Readers should seek specific legal advice before taking any action with respect to the matters discussed herein.

© 2014 The Mayer Brown Practices. All rights reserved.

Endnotes

¹ Available at

<http://www.sec.gov/divisions/corpfin/guidance/wksi-waivers-interp-031214.htm>.

Mayer Brown is a global legal services organization advising many of the world’s largest companies, including a significant portion of the Fortune 100, FTSE 100, DAX and Hang Seng Index companies and more than half of the world’s largest banks. Our legal services include banking and finance; corporate and securities; litigation and dispute resolution; antitrust and competition; US Supreme Court and appellate matters; employment and benefits; environmental; financial services regulatory & enforcement; government and global trade; intellectual property; real estate; tax; restructuring, bankruptcy and insolvency; and wealth management.

Please visit our web site for comprehensive contact information for all Mayer Brown offices. www.mayerbrown.com

IRS CIRCULAR 230 NOTICE. Any advice expressed herein as to tax matters was neither written nor intended by Mayer Brown LLP to be used and cannot be used by any taxpayer for the purpose of avoiding tax penalties that may be imposed under US tax law. If any person uses or refers to any such tax advice in promoting, marketing or recommending a partnership or other entity, investment plan or arrangement to any taxpayer, then (i) the advice was written to support the promotion or marketing (by a person other than Mayer Brown LLP) of that transaction or matter, and (ii) such taxpayer should seek advice based on the taxpayer’s particular circumstances from an independent tax advisor.

Mayer Brown is a global legal services provider comprising legal practices that are separate entities (the “Mayer Brown Practices”). The Mayer Brown Practices are: Mayer Brown LLP and Mayer Brown Europe – Brussels LLP, both limited liability partnerships established in Illinois USA; Mayer Brown International LLP, a limited liability partnership incorporated in England and Wales (authorized and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority and registered in England and Wales number OC 303359); Mayer Brown, a SELAS established in France; Mayer Brown JSM, a Hong Kong partnership and its associated entities in Asia; and Tauil & Chequer Advogados, a Brazilian law partnership with which Mayer Brown is associated. “Mayer Brown” and the Mayer Brown logo are the trademarks of the Mayer Brown Practices in their respective jurisdictions.

This Mayer Brown publication provides information and comments on legal issues and developments of interest to our clients and friends. The foregoing is not a