Money Market Funds
Measures to improve stability and liquidity

SUMMARY
Money Market Funds (MMFs) are a type of collective fund that invest in short-term debt and provide financing for financial institutions, corporations and governments. During the financial crisis their liquidity and stability were challenged which prompted discussion on how to make them more shock-resistant.

In 2013 the Commission proposed a regulation on MMFs aiming to improve their ability to weather stressed market conditions, mainly through establishing a capital buffer, introducing conditions on portfolio structure, addressing over-reliance on external credit rating agencies and improving their internal risk management, transparency and reporting. In April 2015 the European Parliament adopted amendments in which it proposed the creation of new kinds of MMFs and chose not to retain the capital buffer. The Council has yet to reach a general approach.

The reaction of stakeholders was mixed: many welcomed the intention to establish a harmonised and transparent MMF framework at EU level but there have also been considerable concerns raised regarding the impacts, including of the capital buffer.
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**Introduction**

On 4 September 2013, the European Commission proposed a regulation aimed at enhancing the liquidity and stability of MMFs in Europe.

In order to be able to meet daily redemptions by their investors MMFs require a high degree of asset liquidity. The Commission proposed setting minimum levels of daily and weekly liquid assets that MMFs are obliged to hold. This would be done by boosting the quality of the assets (i.e. refraining from illiquid investments) and by requiring funds' managers to conduct active monitoring of the redemption profile of its investors. In order to improve the stability of MMFs, the Commission proposes: (i) a mandatory capital buffer (reserves) sufficient to absorb the potential losses of MMFs that offer redemptions at a stable share price, and (ii) to clarify the rules concerning valuation of the assets in which a MMF invests, by limiting over-reliance (and mechanistic reliance) on ratings issued by external rating agencies. To achieve this, MMFs would have to set up an internal rating system based on a harmonised rating scale and an internal assessment procedure.

**Context**

An MMF is a type of mutual fund (it gathers capital from a number of investors to create a pool of money that is then re-invested into assets). MMFs purchase short-term assets such as money-market instruments issued by banks, governments or corporations (such as treasury bills, commercial paper and certificates of deposit). These instruments qualify as MMF instruments only if their residual maturity does not surpass 397 days (short-term MMF) or two years (standard MMF).

A constant net asset value (CNAV) MMF is a fund that, unlike other mutual funds, aims to preserve a stable value of €1 per share at which investors either redeem or purchase shares. The net value of the assets held by an MMF can be subject to fluctuation, resulting in a situation in which the market value of a share may not always equal €1. To address this fluctuating share value issue, a CNAV MMF employs amortised costs to value its assets.

There are also MMFs which do not offer redemptions or purchases at a constant price. Just like other regulated mutual funds, variable net asset value (VNAV) MMFs promise redemptions and subscriptions at a price equal to the fund's NAV per share. This value is calculated by subtracting the liabilities of the fund from the market value of its assets, and is stated on a per share basis.

The main difference between the two is that CNAV funds consider that a share purchased or redeemed always equals €1, while VNAV MMFs redeem and allow investors to buy shares using the fund’s NAV per share.
MMFs are a considerable source of short-term financing for financial institutions, corporations and governments. For holders of significant amounts of money (mostly institutional investors) they offer diversification of their investment portfolio (large cash holdings are at high risk in case of a bank default). Importantly, the MMFs in issue in the EU have systemic relevance as they manage assets worth approximately €1 trillion, and constitute around 15% of the EU's funds industry. The crisis highlighted possible problems with instantaneous redemption and value preservation when the prices of assets in which MMFs are invested start to decline. Particularly in a situation of market stress, MMFs cannot always honour the promise to redeem immediately and to preserve the principal value of a unit or share issued by the MMF to investors. This may trigger abrupt redemption requests on a massive scale, so-called 'runs', as investors withdraw from MMFs, potentially leading to broader macroeconomic impacts. This situation, according to the Financial Stability Board (FSB) and the International Organisation of Securities Commissions (IOSCO) can be particularly critical for CNAV MMFs which are a central source of potential risk. FSB, IOSCO and the European Systemic Risk Board therefore recommended conversion of CNAV MMFs to VNAV MMFs where workable.

Existing situation

MMF market
EU-domiciled MMFs are based mostly in France, Ireland and Luxembourg, which together represent more than 95% of the market. There has been a steady decrease overall in the value of assets managed by MMFs since 2008, with a total fall of more than 30%. This has been primarily caused by a 48% (€448 billion) drop in the value of assets managed by the VNAVs. The value of assets under management in CNAV MMFs grew 7% (€29 billion) over the same period. Investors tend to prefer CNAV MMFs to VNAV MMFs mainly because of their stable net value, exemption from capital gains tax obligations and more rapid settlement. CNAV MMFs, which are the main subject of the regulatory proposals, hold around €540 billion (with a similar volume invested in VNAV MMFs).

Legal framework
The Commission estimates that around 80% of MMF assets and 60% of the funds (as entities) are covered by the rules of Directive 2009/65/EC on Undertakings for Collective Investment in Transferable Securities (UCITS). The remaining MMFs operate under the rules of Directive 2011/61/EU, covering 'Alternative Investment Fund Managers' (AIFM).

The UCITS framework regulates the following areas: (i) key investor information (in the form of a standardised and harmonised disclosure document), (ii) rules for the conduct of UCITS management companies (aligning organisational requirements and rules of conduct for investment firms with the Markets in Financial Instruments Directive – MIFID) (iii), UCITS mergers and master-feeder structures, and (iv) details of the notification procedure – used by a UCITS to gain access to the market in another Member State – together with common procedures for strengthening supervisory cooperation of Member States in their oversight of fund managers' cross-border activity.

The AIFM Directive provides a framework for monitoring risks posed by AIFMs, and lays out conditions under which they can operate across the internal market. Specifically, the rules concern: (i) the conditions and procedure for the determination and authorisation of AIFMs, notably the capital requirements; (ii) conditions concerning
their operation such as rules on remuneration, conflicts of interest, risk management, liquidity management, investment in securitisation positions, organisational requirements, rules on valuation; (iii) conditions for the delegation of AIFM functions to third parties; (iv) rules on depositaries such as their tasks and liability; reporting obligations and leverage calculation; and (v) rules for supervisory cooperation.

The changes the proposal would bring

On 4 September 2013, the European Commission adopted a proposal for new rules on MMFs. The proposed regulation aims to improve the ability of MMFs to weather possible redemption pressure by boosting their liquidity profile as well as stability, to be achieved through five initiatives:

- introducing mandatory conditions on portfolio structure – MFFs would need to hold at least 10% of assets that mature (have to be repaid by the issuer) within a day, and a further 20% that mature within a week;
- establishing a capital buffer (3% of the assets) for 'constant net asset value' (CNAV) MMFs, which seek to maintain a stable share/unit price (unlike variable NAV MMFs) – this buffer would be used to help ensure stable redemption prices;
- clear labelling of MMFs, differentiating between short-term and standard kinds; short-term MMFs, which may be either VNAV or CNAV, have residual maturity of less than 397 days; standard MMFs are allowed to invest in longer-term instruments than short-term MMFs. Their residual maturity may not exceed two years. Standard MMFs cannot be CNAV;
- customer profiling policies to help predict substantial redemptions;
- internal credit risk assessment by MMF managers, to prevent excessive dependence on external ratings.

The regulation would apply to all MMFs established, managed and/or marketed in the EU and intends to be exhaustive (leaving no room for additional gold-plating at Member State level). MMFs are defined as either UCITS or AIFs that invest in short-term financial instruments and have specific objectives (such as offering returns and preserving the value of investments).

Consequently, the proposed regulation is intended to supplement present rules. The existing authorisation procedures for UCITS as specified in the UCITS Directive are still valid. The MMF regulation would introduce a harmonised authorisation procedure for AIF MMFs, currently left to the discretion of national authorities (mirroring the authorisation procedure for UCITS). Managers and funds falling under the scope of the new regulation will have to comply with this supplementary layer of MMF-specific requirements as well as either the UCITS or AIFM Directive.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Asset Value (NAV) buffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNAV MMFs must meet specific additional requirements, most importantly the establishment and maintenance of an NAV buffer to at least 3% of the total value of their assets. It would be applied to cover differences between the MMF’s CNAV and market value NAV, in other words to absorb the market fluctuations inherent in capital markets. The buffer would be composed exclusively of cash and held in a protected reserve account separate from the MMF. If this falls below 3% the competent authorities and European Securities and Markets Authority are to be notified. If the MMF fails to replenish the buffer within one month it ceases to be a CNAV MMF. Short-term money market funds that choose not to establish a capital buffer would be required to convert to VNAV pricing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparation of the proposal

In the context of improving the international financial framework and in view of the shortcomings in it demonstrated during the crisis, the Financial Stability Board and other institutions, such as the International Organisation of Securities Commissions and the European Systemic Risk Board (ESRB) have analysed the financial sector and concluded that certain systemically important activities and entities (including MMFs) had not been sufficiently regulated.

In March 2012 the Commission published its Green Paper on Shadow Banking, responses to which helped to prepare a more specific consultation on the investment funds framework, including a part devoted to MMFs (launched in July 2012). It received 56 responses on the MMF section, mostly from public authorities and the industry and its various stakeholders.

The Commission has also carried out an impact assessment analysing 16 policy options against the general objectives (improving financial stability and increasing the protection of MMF investors), and more specific policy objectives (preventing the risk of contagion to the real economy and the sponsor, and lessening the disadvantages for late redeemers, particularly in stressed market conditions). The assessment concluded that a more robust framework for MMFs requires the boosting of liquidity levels and the introduction of a more stable structure. The Commission expects that the impact of the regulation will be beneficial to MMFs by enhancing their resilience to stressed market conditions. This would lead to more stability on the money market in general that will benefit investors, issuers of short-term debt and banks sponsoring MMFs.

Parliament's starting position

The European Parliament adopted a resolution on shadow banking in November 2012, in which it invited the Commission to 'submit a review of the UCITS framework, with particular focus on the MMF issue, in the first half of 2013, by requiring MMFs either to adopt a variable asset value with a daily evaluation or, if retaining a constant value, to be obliged to apply for a limited-purpose banking licence and be subject to capital and other prudential requirements'.

Stakeholders' views

The European Banking Federation (EBF) supported the establishment of a transparent, harmonised framework for MMFs, but considered that some of the proposed measures (such as a capital buffer) are excessive and may even threaten the viability of both CNAV and VNAV MMFs. The EBF argues that the regulation as proposed by the Commission would have a negative impact on portfolio returns and therefore lower the attractiveness of MMFs. This could direct investments away from regulated markets, triggering new types of risks.

Business Europe expressed concern that the MMF proposal does not sufficiently take into account the impact it would have on European companies. The association welcomed the ECON Committee's inclusion of asset-backed commercial paper and securities in the investments permissible for MMFs and the removal of the mandatory capital buffer. It has however stressed that the implications of some novel proposals such as the establishment of LVNAV MMFs remains unknown, and as such has asked the Commission to subject the MMF proposal to a thorough, new impact assessment.
Finance Watch strongly supported the Commission’s MMF proposal, considering it one of the rare legislative initiatives addressing the risks to financial stability of shadow banking. It advocated more stringent limits on eligible assets, mandatory buffers for CNAV MMFs and their conversion to VNAV MMFs, restrictions on external support given to MMFs in case of difficulties and banning external ratings by agencies.

The European Fund and Asset Management Association (EFAMA) welcomed the EP amendment to remove the capital buffer, but warned that if implemented, legal provisions outlined in the ECON Committee report would make it more difficult for companies in Europe to manage their liquidity as the short-term funding of MMFs would be seriously impacted. EFAMA recommended seeking a permanent alternative to the CNAV MMF model rather than launching LVNAV MMFs with a sunset clause. It also considered that requirements placed on VNAF MMFs such as tightened diversification and liquidity rules will have an adverse impact on their portfolio returns.

Institutional Money Market Funds Association (IMMFA) welcomed the Commission's intention to create a more coherent MMF framework in the EU. However, IMMFA criticised some provisions (e.g. capital buffers) as superficial and warned that if fully implemented the new regulation will make access to capital more expensive for businesses, institutions and individuals, while money markets will continue to be vulnerable to systemic risks.

The European Association of Corporate Treasurers (EACT) welcomed the position of ECON on the proposed regulation on MMFs, in particular allowing MMFs to obtain external credit ratings, and introducing new kinds of CNAV MMFs and LVNAV MMFs. However, it expressed concerns about the uncertain future of the latter since they would be authorised only for five years.

The European Parliamentary Financial Services Forum (EPFSF) gave a somewhat mixed opinion on the MMF proposal. EPFSF supported the introduction of minimum liquidity buffers but recommended the use of liquidity fees and gates rather than capital buffers. It welcomed the general orientation of permissible investment practices (e.g. asset diversification) but also noted that some of the tabled rules differ from the UCITS rules and will have negative consequences for the financing of the economy. The EPFSF also underlined the importance of external credit ratings to the industry.

The French Autorité des Marchés Financiers (AMF) favoured requiring CNAV funds to ultimately become MMFs with fluctuating NAV, and argued that this is the only way to fully address the financial stability concern stemming from the CNAV model. The AMF also stressed that the proposed Public Debt CNAV MMFs pose new problems such as determining the credit quality criteria for the eligible public debt, and finding ways to avoid turning to taxpayers' money in case of difficulties.

The Irish Funds Industry Association argued that the new types of funds proposed in the Parliament's amendments do not deliver an alternative which will satisfactorily meet the needs of existing CNAV investors. It also stressed that there is a substantial risk of the proposal having a negative impact on the creation of a Capital Markets Union in Europe.

The European Association of Credit Rating Agencies (EACRA) agreed that mechanistic reliance on external ratings needs to be addressed. EACRA recommended the use of several ratings interchangeably when valuing MMFs, since this will provide differing and additional information to investors. It also warned that prohibiting agencies' ratings
altogether will cause external risk assessments to move into an unregulated, unsupervised market, increasing uncertainty for ratings users and supervisors.

**Deutsche Bank** agreed that the new rules on MMFs would strengthen the resilience of MMF portfolios. Nevertheless, in the case of a loss of investor confidence, mitigating the risk to an investor is likely to remain challenging. The bank argues that capital requirements will make it more difficult to generate returns and may lead to a process of concentration in the industry.

### European Central Bank

The European Central Bank (ECB) gave its [opinion](#) on the proposed MMF regulation in May 2014. It advocated the need for further clarification regarding the interaction between national provisions transposing the UCITS and AIFM Directives and the directly applicable provisions of the proposed regulation. The ECB considered the introduction of the capital buffer as a step to mitigate the risks stemming from CNAV MMFs and underlined the need to reassess its adequacy three years after the entry into force of the regulation. However, the ECB noted that one common 3% buffer for the entire industry does not take into account MMFs' varying risk profiles and as such may incentivise low-risk profile CNAV MMFs to undertake more profitable and more risky investments in order to be able to build up or replenish the buffer. Furthermore, the Bank suggested considering more flexible means for maintaining the buffer, particularly extending the time period in which it must be undertaken. The ECB also noted that increased limitations on MMF funding may create incentives for banks to raise funding from corporates directly rather than from MMFs, and recommended further assessment of the impact of new provisions on short money markets. Finally, the ECB sees the possibility that the increased cost of implementing the reform may lead a number of funds to exit the market, which in turn may lead to further concentration make the remaining MMFs more systemically important, which warrants further assessment.

### Advisory committees

The European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) adopted its [opinion](#) in December 2013. The Committee welcomed the proposal and endorsed the choice of legal instrument by the Commission (a regulation rather than a directive), underlining that the global character of MMFs' activities requires uniform and immediately applicable rules. Furthermore, the EESC supported applying the rules for MMFs jointly with the US authorities, given the high degree of market integration. It also strongly recommended that constant net asset value (CNAV) funds are converted into variable net asset value (VNAV) funds, and warned that the 3% capital buffer is likely to be insufficient to cope with liquidity demands at a time of stressed market conditions when many investors may seek redemptions simultaneously (taking into account that in the past there have been cases requiring over 6% of CNAV assets). To counter the possibility of external agencies triggering panic among investors the Committee recommended introducing robust internal rating measures, reinforcing risk management procedures and safeguards and more stringent oversight. Furthermore, to safeguard the stability of the financial system, the EESC argued that the MMF industry should be subject to rules and controls similar to those covering the banking system.

### Council

**Italian Presidency**

The proposal was first examined by the Working Party on Financial Services in 2012. Based on these discussions and the positions of delegations the Italian Presidency presented a progress [report](#) in December 2014. It underlined that in general Member
States agree with the aim of the proposal, but certain provisions, particularly on CNAV MMFs, raised strong reservations. The Presidency proposed to extend the scope of MMF's eligible assets (e.g. by repurchase agreements) and to define the characteristics of MFF-eligible securitisations (in a delegated act by the Commission). It also supported the principle of diversification of MMFs' assets. The progress report also notes that, while the vast majority of Member States agree that over-reliance on external ratings should be avoided, many delegations consider that the internal rating system is burdensome and call for its simplification. Outright banning of external ratings was opposed by many Member States who consider them an important source of investor information. The Presidency was not able to reach a compromise on the treatment of CNAV MMFs. Numerous options put forward either by the Presidency or Member States included notably the transformation of CNAV funds into a new class of MMFs called Low Volatility NAV (LVNAV) MMFs which would be more resilient to runs by investors. Nevertheless the delegations remained divided over whether to consider the LVNAV as a permanent regime.

**Further stalemate**

While the subsequent Latvian Presidency strived to advance the dossier, no further progress was reported. The ensuing Luxembourg Presidency reportedly contemplated advancing the process but finally did not include the MMF regulation in its formal priorities. According to some observers Luxembourg, which has a vital stake in the MMF industry, did work on reaching a compromise but no breakthrough occurred. It reportedly sought to remove a five-year limit after which the continued existence of LVNAV MMFs would be reassessed, which would likely be hard for all Member States to accept.

**National parliaments**

Parliaments in 17 Member States have examined the proposal, with none delivering a reasoned opinion on subsidiarity grounds. The Italian Senate supported a transition from CNAV to VNAV money market funds, buffer build-up and stricter rules on liquidity risk management. It invited the Commission to examine whether it is feasible to: (i) reduce the scope and subject matter of the proposed regulation to funds investing only in short-term assets, (ii) allow an MMF to borrow money to a limit of up to 10% of its assets if necessary. It also recommended that funds should be equipped with an internal procedure to determine the quality of securities and that MMFs should be allowed to invest in other funds of the same type particularly to diversify the modes of their short-term indebtedness. The German Bundesrat called for more protection of retail/small investors (of up to €100 000) for whom MMFs pose particularly high risks, suggesting an instrument such as a guarantee fund.

**Parliamentary analysis**

An initial appraisal of the Commission's impact assessment, published by EPRS in February 2014, underlined that the assessment had analysed the main options proposed by the EP in its 2012 resolution on Shadow banking, referred to above. It also concluded that the majority of the options retained by the Commission seem to be broadly aligned with approach taken by the EP and the IOSCO.

A March 2015 study, commissioned by EPRS at the request of the ECON Committee, assesses the impact of four substantive amendments contained in the rapporteur's draft report (in particular on retail and public debt CNAV MMFs). The study concludes
that the amendments are likely to significantly transform the majority of the CNAV MMF market in Europe. It anticipates only limited take-up of Retail CNAV or Public Debt CNAV Money Market Funds. It suggests that most of the funds currently held would be directed to alternative investments such as bank deposits or VNAV MMFs, which in effect would largely limit the use of CNAV MMFs in the EU. Finally, the study predicts that to some degree those features of CNAV MMFs which are attractive to investors would be duplicated in VNAV MMFs, in effect creating the possibility of replicating the same concerns over systemic risks.

**Legislative process**

The European Parliament voted its amendments on the proposal for the MMF regulation in plenary on 29 April 2015. In its amendments, the European Parliament recognised that MMFs need to be more resilient to crises. MEPs proposed to remove the obligation to hold a 3% capital buffer for CNAV MMFs and to limit CNAV MMFs to:

- Retail CNAV MMFs, available only for selected investors such as charities, public authorities, and foundations and non-profit organisations;
- Public Debt CNAV MMFs (investing 99.5% of their assets in public debt instruments, and, by 2020, at least 80% of their assets in EU public debt instruments) – a new type of Low Volatility Net Asset Value MMFs (LVNAV MMFs may show a constant NAV under strict conditions). This type of fund would be authorised for a maximum period of five years, but the Commission would review the regulation after four years, specifically including examination of the possibility of extending this authorisation indefinitely.

All MMFs should have in place liquidity fees and redemption gates to help prevent sudden outflows. Public Debt CNAV MMFs and Retail CNAV MMFs should cease to be CNAV MMFs if they fail to meet the minimum amount of weekly liquidity requirements within 30 days of having utilised the liquidity fees or redemption gates. In such instances, they should automatically convert to a VNAV MMF or be liquidated. The Parliament also underlined that it is not appropriate to ban MMFs from soliciting or financing an external credit rating and added financial derivative instruments (fulfilling certain conditions) and high-quality asset backed securities (e.g. car loans) to instruments eligible for investment by MMFs. MMFs will also be required to diversify their asset portfolios, respect strict liquidity and concentration standards, have sound stress-testing processes and increase their reporting and transparency towards investors.

Importantly, the assets of an MMF are to be valued every day and this value published daily on its website. MMFs are also to report weekly to their investors the following: the liquidity profile; the credit profile and portfolio composition; weighted average maturity (WAM) of the portfolio; weighted average life (WAL) of the portfolio; and concentration of the top five investors in the MMF.

The plenary did not conclude Parliament’s first reading, instead referring the proposal back to the ECON Committee with a view to starting trilogue negotiations as soon as possible, pending the Council agreeing on its general approach.
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Endnotes

1 For the sake of simplicity the euro is used here. However, MMFs in Europe can also be denominated in US dollars or pounds Sterling.

2 French MMFs are made up almost entirely of VNAV MMFs, while Luxembourg and Ireland host the majority of CNAV MMFs.

3 Despite this concentration in three countries, the market is interconnected to a high degree at EU level through a high proportion of cross-border investments as well as investors, and the cross-border contagion possibility between MMFs and their sponsors.

4 The Directive is complemented by four implementing acts (two Directives and two Regulations). Furthermore, to improve consumer protection in financial services, the EU adopted Directive 2014/91/EU amending Directive 2009/65/EC.

5 The American phrase 'breaking the buck' originates from MMFs. In the USA, MMFs traditionally keep the net asset value at US$1. If the value drops below the $1 NAV level, some of the original investment is depleted and investors will lose money.

6 The Commission defines gold-plating as 'transposition of EU legislation, which goes beyond what is required by that legislation, while staying within legality. Member States have large discretion when implementing EU directives. They may increase reporting obligations, add procedural requirements, or apply more rigorous penalty regimes. If not illegal, "gold-plating" is usually presented as a bad practice because it imposes costs that could have been avoided.'

7 The summary of the Impact Assessment reads: ‘In order to meet the first operational objective (ensure adequate levels of MMF liquidity), the Commission’s services have analysed different policy options covering the following aspects: three different mechanisms of redemption fees or restrictions, one option on liquidity buffer, one option on asset quality and diversification and options on MMF ‘customer profiling’. In order to meet the second operational objective (equip MMF to withstand adverse market conditions), the Commission’s services have analysed policy options related to the following aspects: one option on transparency, two options on valuation requiring a floating NAV, two options imposing NAV buffers, one option on bank status, one option combining floating NAV and NAV buffer, and one option on rating.’

8 The rapporteur’s amendments were modified in the plenary vote on the proposal: (i) a third type of MMF (LVNAV) was added, (ii) natural persons were taken out of the list of entities to which Retail CNAV MMFs would be available for subscription, (iii) that public debt CNAV MMF by definition ‘invests 99.5% of its assets in public debt instruments’ and (iv) that the definition of “EU public debt instruments is clarified: ‘public debt instruments that are cash or government assets of the Member States, or reverse repurchase agreements secured with public debt of the institutions of the Union or its bodies, offices or agencies, including among others the European Central Bank, the European stability mechanism, the European Investment Bank, the European Investment Fund and the European Fund for Strategic Investments’.

9 This provision is called, by many stakeholders, a ‘sunset clause’. It is defined as: ‘A statutory provision providing that a particular agency, benefit, or law will expire on a particular date, unless it is reauthorised by the legislature’.
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