

3a-7 under the Investment Company Act.¹¹⁰ Section 3(c)(5) was intended to exclude from the definition of investment company certain factoring, discounting and mortgage companies. However, Rule 3a-7 contains substantive conditions designed to address, among other things, conflicts of interest concerning ABS and Section 3(c)(5) does not contain the same substantive conditions. Would it be appropriate to require, as an additional transaction requirement for ABS shelf eligibility, that the ABS issuer of the transaction meet the requirements of Rule 3a-7? We note that the practical effect of such a requirement would be that transactions excluded from the definition of investment company under Section 3(c)(5) of the Investment Company Act would not be eligible for shelf registration unless they satisfy Rule 3a-7. Would restricting shelf eligibility to those issuers that meet the requirements of Rule 3a-7 give equal access to shelf for all issuers of ABS across asset classes? Should we require disclosure of the basis for the exclusion from the definition of investment company in the prospectus?

III. Disclosure Requirements

A. Exhibits to be Filed with Rule 424(h) Filing

We are proposing to require ABS issuers to file copies of the underlying transaction agreements, including all attached schedules, and other agreements that are referenced (such

¹¹⁰ Section 3(c)(5) of the Investment Company Act excludes from the definition of investment company any person who is not engaged in the business of issuing redeemable securities, face-amount certificates of the installment type or periodic payment plan certificates, and who is primarily engaged in one or more of the following businesses: (A) purchasing or otherwise acquiring notes, drafts, acceptances, open accounts receivable, and other obligations representing part or all of the sales price of merchandise, insurance and services; (B) making loans to manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers of, and to prospective purchasers of, specified merchandise, insurance, and services and (C) purchasing or otherwise acquiring mortgages and other liens on and interests in real estate. Certain asset-backed issuers, including those that securitize retail automobile installment contracts, credit card receivables, trade receivables, boat loans or equipment leases, have sought to rely on the provisions of Section 3(c)(5)(A) or (B).

as those containing representations and warranties regarding the underlying assets), at the same time as a preliminary prospectus that would be required under proposed Rule 424(h).¹¹¹

In the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we proposed to revise the filing deadlines in shelf offerings to provide investors with additional time to analyze transaction-specific information prior to making an investment decision. Under the proposed ABS shelf procedures, an ABS issuer would be required to file a preliminary prospectus with the Commission for each takedown off of the proposed new shelf registration form for ABS (Form SF-3) at least five business days prior to the first sale in the offering.¹¹² We proposed to require that such information be filed at least five business days before the first sale of securities in the offering in an effort to balance the interest of ABS issuers in quick access to the capital markets and the need of investors to have more time to consider transaction-specific information. Given many ABS investors' stated desire for more time to consider the transaction and for more detailed information regarding the pool assets, the proposed new filing deadlines were designed to promote independent analysis of ABS by investors rather than reliance on credit ratings. While commentators generally either supported¹¹³ or did not object to this proposed approach, some commentators asked that we shorten the five-day period. For example, several commentators generally suggested the period be reduced to two

¹¹¹ See Section II. above and fn. 19. See also the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23335.

¹¹² We proposed new Rule 430D to provide the framework for shelf registration of ABS offerings and related Rule 424(h) filing requirements for a preliminary prospectus. Under proposed Rule 430D, the Rule 424(h) preliminary prospectus must contain substantially all the information for the specific ABS takedown previously omitted from the prospectus filed as part of an effective registration statement, except for pricing information. See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23335.

¹¹³ See letters from AMI; California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS); CREFC; Rylee Houseknecht; Jamie L. Larson; Investment Company Institute (ICI); AFL-CIO; CFA Institute; Metlife; Prudential and Realpoint on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

days.¹¹⁴ We have not reached a conclusion on that aspect of the proposal and it remains outstanding.

Related to the proposal to require the preliminary prospectus be made available in time to facilitate independent analysis by investors, commentators on the 2010 ABS Proposal requested that investors also have access to copies of the underlying agreements on a more timely basis given the importance of the final documents to an investor's understanding of the actual contractual provisions.¹¹⁵ In the staff's experience with the filing of these documents, ABS issuers have delayed filing such material agreements with the Commission until several days or even weeks after the offering of securities off of a shelf registration statement, even though these transaction agreements and other documents provide important information regarding the terms of the transactions, representations and warranties about the assets, servicing terms, and many other rights that would be material to an investor.¹¹⁶ In light of these concerns, we had proposed to amend Item 1100(f) of Regulation AB¹¹⁷ to clarify the existing exhibit filing requirements by making explicit that the exhibits filed with respect to an ABS offering, registered on proposed Form SF-3, must be on file and made part

¹¹⁴ See letters from ABA; AmeriCredit; ASF; BOA; CNH; Vanguard; Vehicle ABS Group; and Wells Fargo on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹¹⁵ See letter from CMBS investors on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release (suggesting that the rules require that key disclosures, including the pooling and servicing agreement, be made available to investors during the marketing period so that investors have adequate time to review prior to making an investment decision). See also letter from Prudential on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release (stating that last minute financial engineering may occur, thereby contributing to poor understanding, and in some instances, misunderstanding of the transaction).

¹¹⁶ In the 2004 ABS Adopting Release we stated that consistent with Item 601 of Regulation S-K, governing documents and material agreements for an ABS offering such as the pooling and servicing agreement, the indenture and related documents must be filed as an exhibit.

¹¹⁷ Item 1100(f) of Regulation AB allows ABS issuers to file agreements or other documents as exhibits on Form 8-K and, in the case of offerings on Form S-3, incorporate the exhibits by reference instead of filing a post-effective amendment.

of the registration statement at the latest by the date the final prospectus is required to be filed pursuant to Rule 424.¹¹⁸

As noted above, commentators urged that we should ensure that the exhibits be available for investor review prior to making an investment decision.¹¹⁹ In light of these concerns, we are re-proposing Item 1100(f) of Regulation AB to also require that the underlying transaction documents, in substantially final form, be filed and made part of the registration statement by the date the Rule 424(h) prospectus is required to be filed. This requirement, if adopted, would allow investors additional time to analyze the actual underlying agreements containing the specific structure, assets, and contractual rights regarding each transaction. If the exhibits filed with the Rule 424(h) prospectus remain unchanged at the time final prospectus under Rule 424(b) is required to be filed, then an issuer would not be required to re-file the same exhibits.¹²⁰

Request for comment:

64. Is our proposed amendment to Item 1100(f) appropriate? Is there any reason that exhibits, in substantially final form, could not be filed by the time the preliminary prospectus is required to be filed under proposed Rule 424(h)?

¹¹⁸ We stated in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release that ABS shelf offerings were designed to mirror non-shelf offerings in terms of filing exhibits and final prospectuses. We also noted that the filing requirements for Form S-3 are consistent with Form S-1 because all exhibits to Form S-1 must be filed by the time of effectiveness. See 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23388.

¹¹⁹ See fn. 116.

¹²⁰ Under this proposal, any change to the agreement could only be minor. As we explained in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, a material change in the information provided in the Rule 424(h) filing, other than offering price, would require a new Rule 424(h) filing. See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23335. Finalized agreements at the time of the offering may be filed as provided by Instruction 1 to Item 601 of Regulation S-K. The filing requirement for an exhibit (other than opinions and consents) may be satisfied by filing the final form of the document to be used; the final form must be complete, except that prices, signatures and similar matters may be omitted. See Elimination of Certain Pricing Amendments and Revision of Prospectus Filing Procedures, Release No. 33-6714 (June 5, 1987) [52 FR 21252]. We also note that filing of final agreements at the time the final prospectus is due will be after the time of sale of the security for purposes of Rule 159 and Securities Act Section 12(a)(2), and that information conveyed to the investor after the time of sale will not be taken into account for purposes of Section 12(a)(2) of the Securities Act. See Rule 159.

65. Is it appropriate to require that exhibits be filed in “substantially final form” at the time of filing the Rule 424(h) prospectus, as proposed? If we require something other than “substantially final form” what information should we require, and what information may be omitted?
66. Should we require the final form of the exhibits to be filed at the same time as the Rule 424(b) prospectus, if the exhibits have not changed since the 424(h) filing?
67. One commentator also suggested that we require issuers provide investors with a copy of the representations, warranties, remedies and exceptions marked to show how it compares with model provisions developed by the Commercial Real Estate Finance Council (CREFC).¹²¹ Should we require that issuers file as an exhibit a copy of the representations, warranties, remedies and exceptions marked to show how it compares to an industry developed model provisions? If so, should we require that the industry developed model provisions be developed by an industry group whose membership includes issuers, investors, and other market participants? Do such model provisions exist for other asset classes? Should we require that the marked copy be filed at the same time as the Rule 424(h) prospectus? Should we require an updated marked copy be filed at the same time as the Rule 424(b) prospectus if they have not changed since the 424(h) filing?

B. Requests for Comment on Asset-Level Information

1. Section 7(c) of the Securities Act

Section 942(b) of the Act added Section 7(c) to the Securities Act requiring the Commission to adopt regulations requiring an issuer of an asset-backed security to disclose,

¹²¹ See letter from CMBS investors on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. CREFC is a trade organization for the commercial real estate finance industry.

for each tranche or class of security, information regarding the assets backing that security.¹²²

It specifies that in adopting regulations, the Commission shall:

- (A) set standards for the format of the data provided by issuers of an asset-backed security, which shall, to the extent feasible, facilitate the comparison of such data across securities in similar types of asset classes; and
- (B) require issuers of asset-backed securities, at a minimum, to disclose asset-level or loan-level data, if such data are necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence including –
 - (i) data having unique identifiers relating to loan brokers and originators;
 - (ii) the nature and extent of the compensation of the broker or originator of the assets backing the security; and
 - (iii) the amount of risk retention by the originator and the securitizer of such assets.¹²³

In the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, to augment our current principles-based pool-level disclosure requirements, we had proposed new requirements to disclose asset-level information in prospectuses and in periodic reports. We believe that our proposal for asset-level data for registered offerings, which remains outstanding, would implement the requirements of Section 7(c) because our proposal would set standards that would facilitate the comparison of data across asset classes, and within the same asset class. Further, our proposals require issuers to disclose asset-level data, which we believe are necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence.

¹²² See Section 7(c) of the Securities Act, as added by Section 942(b) of the Act.

¹²³ See Section 7(c)(2) of the Securities Act, as added by Section 942(b) of the Act.

In the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we explained that investors, market participants, policy makers and others have increasingly noted that asset-level information is essential to evaluating an asset-backed security.¹²⁴ We proposed to require, with some exceptions, that prospectuses for public offerings of asset-backed securities and ongoing Exchange Act reports contain specified asset-level information about each of the assets in the pool.¹²⁵ Because we believe that issuers should provide transparent and comparable data, we proposed to require asset-level information in a standardized format to be included in the prospectus and periodic reports and filed on EDGAR. Our proposal specifies and defines each item that must be disclosed for each asset in the pool and requires that the asset-level information be provided in a tagged data format using Extensible Markup Language (XML) in order to facilitate data analysis, consistent with the requirements of Section 7(c).¹²⁶

Section 7(c) also requires that we require issuers of asset-backed securities, at a minimum, to disclose asset-level or loan-level data, if such data are necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence, including data having unique identifiers relating to loan brokers and originators. The 2010 ABS Proposal would require disclosure of the name of the

¹²⁴ See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23355.

¹²⁵ We proposed that all asset classes, except for stranded cost and credit cards issuers, provide asset-level data. For credit card and charge card ABS, we proposed that issuers be required to provide grouped account data. See 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23355.

¹²⁶ By proposing to require the asset-level data file in XML, a machine-readable language, we anticipate that users of the data will be able to download the disclosure directly into spreadsheets and databases, analyze it using commercial off-the-shelf software, or use it within their own models in other software formats. As we explained in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, XML is an open standard that defines or “tags” data using standard definitions. The term “open standard” is generally applied to technological specifications that are widely available to the public, royalty-free, at minimal or no cost. The tags establish a consistent structure of identity and context. This consistent structure can be recognized and processed by a variety of different software applications. In the case of XML, software applications, such as databases, financial reporting systems, and spreadsheets recognize and process tagged information. Some issuers already file loan schedules on EDGAR as part of the pooling and servicing exhibit or a free writing prospectus. However, the data is currently filed on EDGAR in ASCII or HTML, both of which do not facilitate data analysis. See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23374.

originator of an asset for all asset classes.¹²⁷ If the asset is a residential mortgage, and a MERS number for the originator is available, we proposed to require that the MERS number for the originator be provided.¹²⁸

In addition, for residential mortgages only, we proposed that issuers be required to disclose unique identifiers related to loan originators and company, as required by the Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008, otherwise known as the NMLS numbers.¹²⁹ We note that the NMLS numbers for “originator” and company refer to the individual and company taking the loan application, which would include loan brokers and the company that the broker works for.¹³⁰ Therefore, we believe that our proposal to require NMLS numbers would implement the requirements of Section 7(c) with respect to mortgages by requiring a unique numerical identifier for a loan broker.

We are unaware of any standardized unique identifying system used for the purpose of identifying brokers or originators of other asset classes, across all asset classes or within an asset class.¹³¹ Further, we believe that asset classes, other than RMBS and CMBS, do not

¹²⁷ See proposed Item 1(a)(4) of Schedule L of Regulation AB in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹²⁸ Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS) is affiliated with the Mortgage Industry Standards Maintenance Organization (MISMO), a not-for profit subsidiary of the Mortgage Bankers Association. MERS has developed a unique numbering system and reporting packages to capture and report data at different times during the life of the underlying residential or commercial loan.

¹²⁹ See proposed Items 2(a)(11) and (12) of Schedule L of Regulation AB in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. In 2008, Congress passed The Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (the “SAFE Act”) which required the creation of a Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System and Registry and unique identifiers for loan originators and company (NMLS numbers). The SAFE Act is designed to enhance consumer protection and reduce fraud by encouraging states to establish minimum standards for the licensing and registration of state-licensed mortgage loan originators and for the Conference of State Bank Supervisors (CSBS) and the American Association of Residential Mortgage Regulators (AARMR) to establish and maintain a nationwide mortgage licensing system and registry for the residential mortgage industry. The SAFE Act was enacted as part of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, Public Law 110–289, Division A, Title V, sections 1501–1517, 122 Stat. 2654, 2810–2824 (July 30, 2008), codified at 12 U.S.C. 5101–5116.

¹³⁰ In contrast, note that for purposes of Regulation AB, we have generally interpreted an originator to be the person or entity that extends the credit to the borrower. See the 2004 Adopting Release at 1538.

¹³¹ See also Joint Study on the Feasibility of Mandating Algorithmic Descriptions for Derivatives (April 7, 2011), available at <http://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2011/719b-study.pdf> (also concluding that before

typically use brokers to originate loans; however we request comment on whether brokers are used in other asset classes. We are also requesting comment on whether unique identifiers for loan brokers and originators exist for other asset classes (or a system of unique identifiers could reasonably be established), and if so, whether the data is necessary to independently perform due diligence for other asset classes.

Section 7(c) also requires that we require issuers to disclose asset-level data on the nature and extent of the compensation of the broker or originator of the assets backing the security, if such data are necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence. The 2010 ABS Proposals did not include requirements to provide asset-level data regarding fees to brokers or originators. However, with respect to RMBS, our proposal did include an asset-level disclosure requirement to indicate whether a broker originated a loan.¹³² In addition, disclosure of the origination channel for each loan is also required under the 2010 ABS Proposals (i.e., was the loan originated through a bank's own retail operation, a broker, a correspondent lender, etc.).¹³³ We are not proposing asset-level disclosure requirements for broker's compensation at this time because we believe that the proposed data points may provide the information necessary to perform due diligence on an RMBS pool with respect to broker involvement because investors can analyze the method in which a loan was underwritten based on these data points. We request comment on whether the specific compensation paid to brokers or originators would be useful in performing due diligence for RMBS and for other asset classes and should be required under our final rules. In light of the fact that compensation may be paid in many different forms and calculated in different ways

mandating the use of standardized descriptions for all derivatives a universal entity identifier and product or instrument identifiers, among other things, are needed).

¹³² See proposed Item 2(a)(9) of Schedule L of Regulation AB in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹³³ See proposed Item 2(a)(10) of Schedule L of Regulation AB in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

we are requesting comment about the forms of compensation. We also request comment on how to define these data points so that the information provided is standardized and comparable across asset classes or within an asset class.

In addition, Section 7(c) requires that we require issuers to disclose asset-level data related to the amount of risk retention by the originator and securitizer of such assets, if such data are necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence. The 2010 ABS Proposals include a requirement to disclose any interest the sponsor has retained in the transaction, including the amount and nature of that interest.¹³⁴ Also, as discussed above, the joint regulators proposed risk retention requirements as required by Section 15G of the Exchange Act and that proposal also includes disclosure requirements concerning the risk retention option selected.¹³⁵ The outstanding Risk Retention Proposals do not require originators to retain risk in individual assets of the pool.¹³⁶ In light of the outstanding Risk Retention Proposals and 2010 ABS Proposal for sponsor risk retention disclosure, at this time we are not proposing additional disclosure requirements but we are requesting comment on whether risk retention disclosure on an asset-level basis is necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence.

Requests for Comment:

68. Do the 2010 ABS Proposals implement Section 7(c) effectively? Are there any changes or additions that would better implement Section 7(c)?

¹³⁴ See proposed Item 1104(e) of Regulation AB in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹³⁵ See fn. 12.

¹³⁶ See the Risk Retention Proposing Release at 24114.

69. Is the proposed XML format an adequate standard for the format of data that, to the extent feasible, facilitates the comparison of data across securities in similar types of asset classes? If not, how could it be improved?
70. Are unique identifiers for loan brokers and/or originators necessary to permit investors to independently perform due diligence for asset classes other than RMBS or CMBS? If so, is there a unique system of identifiers for brokers and originators for other asset classes?
71. Do asset classes other than RMBS or CMBS use brokers?
72. Would it be appropriate to require an originator's tax ID number, RSSD ID number, FDIC Certificate Number or Routing Transit Number (RTN) as a unique identifier?¹³⁷ Would any of these identifiers be an appropriate unique identifier across asset classes? Do originators have multiple tax ID numbers, RSSD IDs, FDIC Certificate Numbers, or RTNs? If so, how should we specify which one to use? With respect to tax ID numbers, should we specify that social security numbers should not be provided? Are there any other existing unique identifiers that would be appropriate for these purposes? Should new identification systems be developed? If so, by whom?
73. Is asset-level disclosure related to the nature and extent of the compensation of the broker or originator necessary to independently perform due diligence across all asset classes?

¹³⁷ A tax ID number is a unique number assigned by the Internal Revenue Service. An RSSD ID is a unique identifying number assigned by the Federal Reserve for all financial institutions, main offices, as well as branches. An FDIC Certification Number is a unique number assigned by the FDIC used to identify institutions and to issue insurance certificates. An RTN, or a routing transit number, is a nine-digit unique bank identifier originally designed by the American Bankers Association.

Request for comment:

81. How should we require asset-level data, both initially and on an ongoing basis, to implement Section 7(c) effectively, yet also address commentators' privacy concerns?
82. What particular data elements could be revised or eliminated for each particular asset class in order to address commentator's privacy concerns, yet still enable an investor to independently perform due diligence? For instance, if we do not require information about an obligor's credit score and income, while still requiring the other proposed asset data points, are concerns about obligor privacy alleviated while also implementing the requirements of Section 7(c)?
83. Would it be appropriate to require an obligor's credit score and income be provided on a grouped basis in a format similar to our credit card proposal in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release,¹⁴⁶ in addition to requiring all of the other proposed asset-level data points with the prospectus? What would be appropriate groupings (i.e., should the columns or ranges be different than our credit card proposal)? Would that approach alleviate privacy concerns and also implement the requirements of Section 7(c)?
84. Would any of these approaches be appropriate for RMBS, as well as other asset classes?

¹⁴⁶ The 2010 ABS Proposals proposed that issuers of ABS backed by credit cards provide disclosure more granular than pool-level disclosure by creating "grouped account data." As we explain the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, grouped account data would be created by compressing the underlying asset-level data into combinations of standardized distributional groups using asset-level characteristics and providing specified data about these groups. Like the asset-level data proposals, the grouped account data would be provided in XML to facilitate data analysis. See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23372.

85. Are there other ways to present data that is useful to investors but helps to address privacy concerns? How else can we implement Section 7(c) and also address commentators' privacy concerns related to asset-level reporting?

2. Additional Requests for Comment on Asset-Level Data

As discussed above, in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we proposed to require asset-level disclosures for ABS backed by residential mortgages; commercial mortgages; automobile loans or leases; equipment loans or leases; student loans; floorplan financings; corporate debt; and resecuritizations. For ABS backed by credit and charge card receivables we proposed requiring disclosure of grouped account data in lieu of asset-level data. We received many helpful and detailed suggestions regarding many of the proposed asset data points. We received a mixed response to our proposal, with some commentators supporting asset-level disclosure across asset classes and some commentators suggesting that asset-level data would not be appropriate. For several asset classes we received various recommendations for either grouped account disclosures or grouped account and pool-level disclosures in lieu of asset-level disclosures.¹⁴⁷ Some of the letters included detailed suggestions for group data. We will consider these letters along with all the letters on the original proposal. We have at this time made no determination regarding the final rules for any asset class. However for two discrete asset classes, namely Equipment ABS¹⁴⁸ and Equipment Floorplan ABS,¹⁴⁹ we are requesting more information on possible data points.

¹⁴⁷ See, e.g., letters on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from ASF's auto ABS issuer members and certain investor members (submitting a recommendation for grouped account and pool-level disclosures for ABS backed by auto loans and leases); ASF issuer and investor members (submitting a recommendation for grouped account disclosures for auto floorplan ABS); Sallie Mae (submitting an "aggregated and grouped representative line" proposal for ABS backed by student loans).

¹⁴⁸ For purposes of this discussion, we refer to ABS backed by equipment loans and leases as "Equipment ABS."

¹⁴⁹ For purposes of this discussion, we refer to ABS backed by equipment floorplan financings as "Equipment Floorplan ABS."

For Equipment ABS, our proposal to require asset-level disclosure, like other asset classes, received a mixed response from commentators. Some commentators supported asset-level data for Equipment ABS, while others suggested that asset-level data was not appropriate.¹⁵⁰ The Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group, CNH, ELFA and Navistar each suggested that asset-level data would create privacy issues, risk dissemination of competitively sensitive information and increase costs. The Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group, CNH and ELFA also suggested that asset-level data goes beyond what investors need or require for Equipment ABS. Some commentators individually recommended that Equipment ABS issuers should be permitted to present grouped account disclosure similar to what we proposed for credit and charge card issuers. CNH and Navistar also suggested that some of the proposed asset-level data points are inapplicable to Equipment ABS.

We appreciate that Equipment ABS may share some characteristics with other asset classes for which commentators have suggested grouped account data may be appropriate. For example, commentators for the Auto ABS asset class¹⁵¹ suggested grouped data was more appropriate due to the privacy and competition concerns, and other concerns, raised by asset-level disclosures,¹⁵² and one of these commentators submitted a grouped data and pool-level disclosure format for the Commission to consider as an alternative to asset-level reporting.¹⁵³ Our proposal did not include grouped account data for Equipment ABS, and it

¹⁵⁰ See, e.g., letters on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from MetLife and SIFMA (investors) (each letter suggesting support for asset-level disclosures and revisions to the Commission's asset-level proposal for Equipment ABS); CalPers (expressing general support for asset-level disclosures for Equipment ABS). But see letters on the 2010 ABS Release from CNH, Navistar Financial Corporation (Navistar) and Equipment Leasing and Financing Association (ELFA) and from a group of five captive equipment ABS issuers (Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group) (each suggesting that asset-level data was not appropriate for Equipment ABS).

¹⁵¹ For purposes of this discussion, we refer to ABS backed by auto loans and leases as "Auto ABS."

¹⁵² See letters from Americredit, ASF (auto ABS issuers), Vehicle ABS Group on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹⁵³ See letter on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from ASF's auto ABS issuer members and certain investors members. The auto ABS issuer members and certain investor members submitted a recommendation

is unclear whether the suggestions we received on a possible grouped account approach for this asset class continued to be supported by commentators based on the comments received.¹⁵⁴ A group of issuers through a trade association submitted a suggestion for standardized pool-level disclosures, but we preliminarily believe that more granular disclosure – either asset-level or grouped account data – is appropriate at the time of offering and on an ongoing basis for Equipment ABS than provided by only pool-level disclosures.¹⁵⁵ In order to better analyze comments received and formulate the appropriate disclosure requirements for Equipment ABS, we request additional comment below.

Request for comment:

86. Is it possible to require asset-level data, both initially and on an ongoing basis, and address commentators' privacy and competitive concerns applicable to the Equipment ABS sector? What particular data elements would need to be revised or eliminated?

for grouped account and pool-level disclosures for ABS backed by auto loans and leases. The recommendation suggested that at the time of an Auto ABS offering and monthly thereafter an issuer would provide statistical information about the underlying pool in the form of grouped-asset representative data lines and prescribed stratification tables.

¹⁵⁴ Navistar submitted a grouped account disclosure proposal for Equipment ABS, but Navistar subsequently was a signatory to a standardized pool-level format submitted by the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group. See letters about the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from Navistar and the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group (located in the memorandum to file dated March 8, 2011 covering the staff's meeting with members of the Financial Services Roundtable). It is unclear in light of their participation in the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group letter whether Navistar's grouped account suggestion still stands. Also, the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group submitted in their letter dated December 13, 2010 (located in the memorandum to file dated December 15, 2010 covering the staff's meeting with members of the Roundtable) a grouped data proposal. However, as noted above, in March 2011 the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group later recommended standardized pool-level disclosures.

¹⁵⁵ See letter regarding the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from members the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group contained in the memorandum to file dated March 8, 2011 (suggesting that their recommended pool-level disclosure format was based on feedback they received from investors. However, we did not receive any comment letters from investors that supported this position).

87. Is asset-level data necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence for Equipment ABS?¹⁵⁶ Or would a grouped account disclosure requirement along with pool-level disclosures be sufficient for investors to independently perform due diligence and also address commentators' privacy and competition concerns? If so, would it be appropriate to require for Equipment ABS similar disclosure requirements that were recommended by commentators for Auto ABS?¹⁵⁷
88. Could the grouped account and pool-level disclosures that commentators recommended for initial and ongoing reporting of Auto ABS be used for Equipment ABS? Would commentators' recommended disclosure requirements for Auto ABS need to be altered to fit the Equipment ABS sector? If so, how would it need to change? Is there a more appropriate grouped account format for Equipment ABS? Please be specific in your response.

For Equipment Floorplan ABS, some commentators suggested that asset-level data was not appropriate.¹⁵⁸ We recognize that Equipment Floorplan ABS, as revolving assets, may share some characteristics with other asset classes for which grouped account data may be appropriate; for instance, credit cards are typically structured as revolving asset master trusts and Equipment Floorplan ABS are also typically structured as revolving asset master trusts. Like Equipment ABS, however, we did not receive a recommendation for a grouped

¹⁵⁶ See Section 7(c) of the Securities Act.

¹⁵⁷ See letter on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from ASF's auto ABS issuer members and certain investors members (submitting a recommendation for grouped account and pool-level disclosures for ABS backed by auto loans and leases.)

¹⁵⁸ See letters from Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group, CNH and Navistar on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release (expressing concerns that asset-level reporting for floorplan receivables ABS was not appropriate due to obligor privacy concerns, concerns over the release of proprietary information and increased costs.)

account data approach.¹⁵⁹ A group of issuers through a trade association recommended that we require standardized pool-level disclosures, but we preliminarily believe that more granular disclosure is appropriate at the time of offering and on an ongoing basis than is provided by only pool-level disclosures.¹⁶⁰ In order to better analyze comments and formulate the appropriate disclosure requirements for Equipment Floorplan ABS, we request additional comment below.

Request for comment:

89. Is it possible to require asset-level data, both initially and on an ongoing basis, and address commentators' privacy and competitive concerns applicable to the Equipment Floorplan ABS sector? What particular data elements would need to be revised or eliminated?
90. Is asset-level data necessary for investors to independently perform due diligence for Equipment Floorplan ABS? Or would a grouped account disclosure requirement be sufficient for investors to independently perform due diligence and also address commentator's privacy and competition concerns? If so, would it be appropriate to require for Equipment Floorplan ABS¹⁶¹ similar disclosure

¹⁵⁹ Navistar expressed support in their comment letter for the floorplan grouped data disclosure proposal proposed in a letter from the Vehicle ABS Group. See letters from Navistar and the Vehicle ABS Group about the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. However, the Vehicle ABS Group later withdrew support for their recommendation in favor of the grouped account disclosure recommended by ASF's issuer and investor members for ABS backed by auto floorplans. See letter from the Vehicle ABS Group about the 2010 ABS Release dated November 8, 2010. ASF submitted a grouped account recommendation for vehicle floorplan ABS, but it was not clear that this proposal covered Equipment Floorplan ABS. See the letter on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from ASF issuer and investor members (submitting a recommendation for grouped account disclosures for auto floorplan ABS).

¹⁶⁰ See letter regarding the 2010 ABS Proposing Release from members the Captive Equipment ABS Issuer Group contained in the memorandum to file dated March 8, 2011 (suggesting that their recommended pool-level disclosure format was based on feedback they received from investors. However, we did not receive any comment letters from investors that supported this position).

¹⁶¹ See letter from ASF on the auto sector setting forth the alternative disclosure regime recommended by ASF's auto ABS grouped-asset investor members and issuer members.

requirements that were recommended for Auto Floorplan ABS?¹⁶² Would it resolve commentators' privacy and competitive concerns?

91. Could the grouped account disclosures that commentators recommended for initial and ongoing reporting for Auto Floorplan ABS also be used for Equipment Floorplan ABS? Would commentators' recommended disclosure requirements for Auto Floorplan ABS need to be altered to fit the Equipment Floorplan ABS sector? If so, how would it need to change? Is there a more appropriate grouped account format for Equipment Floorplan ABS? Please be specific in your response.

3. Additional Requests for Comment on When to Require Schedule L

In our 2010 ABS Proposing Release under our proposed requirements for when asset-level data would be required in a prospectus, we proposed to require that issuers provide for each asset in the pool all of the asset-level data points enumerated in proposed Schedule L of Regulation AB as of a recent practicable date, defined as the "measurement date," at the time of a Rule 424(h) prospectus.¹⁶³ We also proposed that an updated Schedule L, as of the cut-off date for the securitization, be provided with the final prospectus under Rule 424(b). Finally, we proposed that if issuers are required to report changes to the pool under Item 6.05 of Form 8-K, then an updated Schedule L would be required.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶² For purposes of this discussion, we refer to ABS backed by auto floorplans as "Auto Floorplan ABS."

¹⁶³ See proposed Item 1111A of Regulation AB and the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23356.

¹⁶⁴ In footnote 235 of the 2010 ABS Proposing Release we stated that if a new asset is added to the pool during the reporting period, an issuer would be required to provide the asset-level information for each additional asset as required by our proposed revisions to both Item 1111 of Regulation AB and Item 6.05 of Form 8-K. See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23356.

Under our proposed revisions to Item 6.05 of Form 8-K, however, we proposed that a new Schedule L be required to be filed if any material pool characteristic of the actual asset pool at the time of issuance of the asset backed securities differs by 1% or more than the description of the asset pool in the prospectus filed for the offering pursuant to Securities Act Rule 424.¹⁶⁵ In our discussion of asset-level ongoing reporting requirements, we stated that if assets are added to the pool during the reporting period, either through prefunding periods, revolving periods or substitution, disclosure would be required under our proposed revisions to Item 6.05 on Form 8-K along with the Schedule L data contained in proposed Item 1111A of Regulation AB.¹⁶⁶

One investor, in response to our 2010 ABS Proposing Release, recommended that if assets are added to the pool through prefunding periods or revolving periods during the month a new Schedule L should be provided.¹⁶⁷ This commentator suggested that such a requirement will allow investors to evaluate the risk layering introduced by any new collateral that is added to securitizations after issuance. This comment seemed to indicate that it was not clear an Item 6.05 Form 8-K was required when prefunding or revolving assets increased or changed the pool by 1% or more, although that was the intention of the language in the proposal. Therefore, we are requesting additional comment to determine whether we should clarify this proposed requirement by specifying in Item 6.05 that the filing of a Schedule L is required when assets are added to the pool after the issuance of the

¹⁶⁵ See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23392. As proposed, if any material pool characteristic of the actual asset pool at the time of issuance of the asset backed securities differs by 1% or more than the description of the asset pool in the prospectus filed for the offering pursuant to Securities Act Rule 424 an issuer would be required to file an Item 6.05 of Form 8-K and provide the disclosures required under Item 1111 and Item 1112 of Regulation AB. Under the proposed Item 1111(h) of Regulation AB issuers would be required to provide a Schedule L. In addition, the item, as proposed to be revised, also requires a description of the changes that were made to the asset pool, including the number of assets substituted or added to the asset pool.

¹⁶⁶ See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23368.

¹⁶⁷ See letter from Prudential (suggesting that for securitizations with prefunding periods or revolving transactions a new Schedule L should be filed monthly when new collateral is added.)

securities, either through prefunding periods, revolving periods or substitution and the triggers in that item are met.

Request for comment:

92. Should we specify in Item 6.05 of Form 8-K that a new Schedule L must be filed when assets are added to the pool after issuance, either through prefunding periods, revolving periods or substitution and the triggers in that item are met?
93. Instead, should we require that filing of a new Schedule L be triggered when assets are added to the pool during a month, distribution period or some other timeframe?
94. Rather than require that Schedule L be filed with [or as an exhibit to] a current report on Form 8-K, under Item 6.05, should it be required to be filed under a new requirement as an exhibit to Form 10-D? Please be specific in your response.
95. Should the Schedule L data include information about all assets in the pool, including the new assets? If so, should we clarify in an instruction this will just be repeating the original schedule or should we require that it be updated? Could any of the information be updated? If so, should we require that? Or should Schedule L data only be required for the assets added during the reporting period?
96. Could investors evaluate risk layering introduced by new assets if a new Schedule L is required only for the new assets added during the relevant period?
97. Current disclosure requirements under Item 1121(b) of Regulation AB require that during a prefunding or revolving period, or if there has been a new issuance of asset-backed securities backed by the same pool under a master trust, during the fiscal year of the issuing entity, updated pool composition information in the Form 10-D report is required to be provided in the last required distribution report of the fiscal year of the issuing entity in accordance with Items 1110, 1111 and 1112 of

Regulation AB.¹⁶⁸ If, as proposed in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, updated asset-level information would be required to be provided with an Item 6.05 Form 8-K when prefunding or revolving assets change the pool by 1% or more, would the information required by Item 1121(b) be necessary? Should Item 1121(b) be revised to specifically require updated asset-level information be provided in the last required distribution report of the fiscal year of the issuing entity?

4. Additional Requests for Comment on Privately-Issued Structured Finance Products

In the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we proposed amendments to our safe harbors for exempt offerings and resales and new related rules regarding the information that must be made available to investors in privately-issued asset-backed securities.¹⁶⁹ We proposed to require that, in order for a reseller of a “structured finance product,” as proposed to be defined,¹⁷⁰ to sell a security in reliance on Securities Act Rule 144A,¹⁷¹ or in order for an issuer of a structured finance product to sell a security in reliance on Rule 506 of Regulation D,¹⁷² certain conditions had to be met.¹⁷³

For sales of structured finance products made in reliance on Rule 144A or Rule 506, first, under our proposal the underlying transaction agreement of the issuer would have to grant any purchaser, any security holder and any prospective purchaser of the securities

¹⁶⁸ Also, updated information is required in the first Form 10-D report for the period in which the prefunding or revolving period ends (if applicable).

¹⁶⁹ See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23393.

¹⁷⁰ The 2010 ABS Proposals would apply to any “structured finance product,” which would be more broadly defined than in the Regulation AB Item 1101(c) definition of “asset-backed security” in order to reflect the wide range of securitization products that are sold in the private markets.

¹⁷¹ 17 CFR 230.144A.

¹⁷² 17 CFR 230.506.

¹⁷³ See proposed revisions to Rule 144A(a)(8), Rule 192, Rule 501 and Rule 502 in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

designated by the holder the right to obtain, upon request of the purchaser or security holder, information that would be required if the offering were registered on Form S-1 or proposed Form SF-1 under the Securities Act and any ongoing information regarding the securities that would be required by Section 15(d) of the Exchange Act, if the issuer were required to file reports under that section. Second, the issuer would have to represent that it would provide such information to the purchaser, security holder, or prospective purchaser upon request of the purchaser or security holder.¹⁷⁴

As discussed above, in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we also proposed an amendment to Regulation AB that would require issuers of registered ABS offerings to disclose in the prospectus asset-level information in a standardized format.¹⁷⁵ Thus, together with the proposed asset-level requirements, the proposed amendments for privately issued structured finance products would require that issuers in offers and sales of structured finance products in reliance on Rule 144A or Rule 506 would need to provide, upon request, asset-level disclosures, along with other disclosures required by Regulation AB.

In the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we requested comment on whether we should provide more specificity in the rules for privately issued structured finance products covering what disclosure would be required to be provided and, if so, what types of disclosure we should specifically require and whether the required disclosures should differ by type of security and, if so, in what way. We also requested comment on whether our proposal with respect to ongoing information regarding the securities was appropriate.

¹⁷⁴ See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23396

¹⁷⁵ See the ABS 2010 ABS Proposing Release at 23355.

In response to our 2010 ABS Proposals, several commentators expressed concern regarding the disclosure standards for privately issued structured finance products.¹⁷⁶ Commentators noted that there are not clear information requirements for certain types of ABS that are not typically offered under Regulation AB, such as CDOs, CLOs, asset-backed commercial paper or synthetic ABS.¹⁷⁷ Commentators expressed concerns regarding the standards for disclosure and noted that any novel asset type or structure would face uncertainty regarding their disclosure obligations.¹⁷⁸ In addition, some commentators asked the Commission to recognize the unique characteristics of different asset classes.¹⁷⁹

In light of these comments, we are requesting comment on whether we should only require asset-level disclosures where the “structured finance product” being sold in reliance

¹⁷⁶ See letters from ABA, ABAASA, Association of Financial Markets in Europe/European Securitisation Forum (AFME/ESF), ASF, Cleary Gottlieb Steen and Hamilton (Cleary), PPM America (PPM), Sallie Mae, SIFMA (dealers and sponsors), Wells Fargo on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹⁷⁷ See letters from ABA, ASF and SIFMA on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. The ASF suggested that the proposed disclosure regime would be untenable because the safe harbor for securities that fall outside of the current Regulation AB definition would be subject to a hybrid of the corporate and Regulation AB disclosure requirements, without the benefit of detail on how those disclosure requirements would apply.

¹⁷⁸ See letters from AFME/ESF, SIFMA (dealers and sponsors), and Wells Fargo on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. SIFMA (dealers and sponsors) suggested that the uncertainty over disclosure requirements could affect the ability of insurance-linked securities, whole business securitizations, future flow securitizations, securitizations of film rights, franchise fees, IP licensing fees, charged-off assets, leases exceeding the limits of the Reg. AB definition of ABS and non-revolving assets exceeding a year to rely upon Rule 144A. Wells Fargo expressed concern regarding the uncertainty in determining the applicable reporting requirements for future flow, film rights, franchise fees, patent royalties, certain lease transactions and novel asset classes and structures.

¹⁷⁹ See letters from ABASA, AFME/ESF and Cleary on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. AFME/ESF suggested that it would be inappropriate to apply Regulation AB to UK mortgage master trust issuers without adjustment. Cleary urged the Commission to “acknowledge that some of the detailed, asset-level disclosure mandated by the Proposed Rules will simply not be possible for some issuers, in some asset classes, to compile without expending levels of time and expense that are simply not warranted.” Cleary recommended revising the proposal to require “issuers to provide (in connection with the initial placements) the information that would be required if the offering were registered on Form S-1 or Form SF-1 under the Securities Act, and to provide (on an ongoing basis) the information that would be required by Section 15(d) of the Exchange Act, in each case if requested, only to the extent that the issuer possesses such information or can acquire it without unreasonable effort or expense.” Cleary also suggested that “such required information in each case may differ as to format, presentation, or specific loan-level data points from the requirements of Regulation AB, and that loan-level information may be omitted for one or more portfolio components not exceeding a specified percentage of the relevant portfolio individually and a specified percentage of the relevant portfolio in the aggregate.”

on Rule 144A, or Rule 506 of Regulation D, is backed by or collateralized by assets of an asset class for which there are prescribed asset-level reporting requirements in Regulation AB. As proposed, this would include: residential mortgage backed securities; commercial mortgage backed securities; automobiles loans or leases; equipment loans or leases; student loans; floorplan financings; corporate debt; and resecuritizations.

Request for comment:

98. Should we only require that the transaction agreements underlying structured finance products sold in reliance on Rule 144A or sold pursuant to Rule 506 be required to provide for asset-level disclosures if the particular asset class of the securities are of an asset class where asset-level disclosures are prescribed in Regulation AB (i.e., residential mortgage backed securities; commercial mortgage backed securities; automobiles loans or leases; equipment loans or leases; student loans; floorplan financings; corporate debt; and resecuritizations)? Should securities where the asset class is not of an asset class where asset-level disclosure is required under Regulation AB be exempted from providing asset-level disclosure?
99. Is there any reason that we should not require structured finance product issuers that utilize the safe harbors to comply with the proposed asset-level disclosure requirements for initial and/or ongoing information if asset-level disclosure for the particular asset class underlying the transaction is required under Regulation AB?
100. For securities that fall outside the Regulation AB definition of “asset-backed securities,” how can the Commission address commentators’ concern that those

securities would be subject to a hybrid of the corporate and Regulation AB disclosure requirements?¹⁸⁰

101. If we do not require asset-level disclosures for certain “structured finance products” or “novel asset types or structures” that fall outside the Regulation ABS definition of “asset-backed securities,” are there other types of disclosure that we should require the issuer to provide to investors or prospective purchasers? How should “novel asset types or structures” be defined? Is there any guidance that the Commission should provide for structured finance products that fall outside of Regulation AB’s definition of ABS?

C. Waterfall Computer Program

In the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we proposed to require that most ABS issuers file a computer program that gives effect to the flow of funds, or “waterfall,” provisions of the transaction. The proposal was designed to make it easier for an investor to analyze the ABS offering at the time of its initial investment decision and to monitor ongoing performance of the ABS. In this way, market participants would be able to better conduct their own evaluations of ABS. Although several commentators supported the proposal because it would promote transparency and enable investors to make better decisions,¹⁸¹ several commentators opposed the proposal for various reasons, such as the lack of clarity of

¹⁸⁰ See letter from ASF on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release (expressing that the array of structured finance products offered and sold in the private placement market may technically fall outside the Regulation AB definition of “asset-backed securities,” which would by default subject them to the corporate disclosure regime, together with some elements of the Regulation AB disclosure regime).

¹⁸¹ See comment letters from AMI; Bank of New York Mellon; CalPERS; Keith G. Cascio; CoStar Group; Council of Institutional Investors; Knowledge Decision Securities; Risk Management Association/Securitization Risk Roundtable; and XBRL US on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

the requirements of our proposal,¹⁸² the cost burden on issuers and/or investors,¹⁸³ and concern about liability under the federal securities laws.¹⁸⁴ We received many helpful and detailed suggestions regarding the proposed waterfall computer program requirement, and plan to re-propose the requirement separately from adopting requirements for ABS shelf eligibility, offering process and disclosures, including asset-level disclosures. We believe these requirements could be adopted and implemented together, separately from any waterfall disclosure component.

IV. Transition Period

As we explained in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release, we believe that compliance dates should not extend past a year after adoption of the new rules. We are considering the appropriate timing for implementation of the 2010 ABS Proposals and today's re-proposals, if adopted.

Request for comment:

102. Should implementation of any proposals be phased-in? If so, explain why and provide a reasonable timeframe for a phase-in (e.g., six months, one or two years)?
103. Should implementation be based on a tiered approach that relates to a characteristic other than the size of the sponsor? Is there any reason to structure implementation around the asset class of the securities?

¹⁸² See comment letters from ABA; BOA; Discover; FSR; Vehicle ABS Group; JP Morgan; and Sallie Mae on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹⁸³ See comment letters from ABASA; ABA; American Financial Services Association (AFSA); BOA; Business Software Alliance; Capital One Financial; Citigroup Global Markets (Citi); CREFC; Discover; FSR; Vehicle ABS Group; Intex Solutions; IPFS Corp; JP Morgan; MathWorks; MBA; Navistar; PPM; PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP; Sallie Mae; SIFMA; Trepp; UBmatrix; Wells Fargo; and Wyndham Worldwide on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

¹⁸⁴ See comment letters from ABASA; ABA; AFSA; AmeriCredit Corp; BOA; (Citi); Discover; Intex Solutions; JP Morgan; MBA; Sallie Mae; SIFMA; Vehicle ABS Group; Wells Fargo on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

V. General Request for Comment

We request comment on the specific issues we discuss in this release, and on any other approaches or issues that we should consider in connection with the proposed amendments. We seek comment from any interested persons, including investors, asset-backed issuers, sponsors, originators, servicers, trustees, disseminators of EDGAR data, industry analysts, EDGAR filing agents, and any other members of the public.

VI. Paperwork Reduction Act

A. Background

Certain provisions of the proposed rule amendments contain “collection of information” requirements within the meaning of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA).¹⁸⁵ The Commission is submitting these proposed amendments and proposed rules to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review in accordance with the PRA.¹⁸⁶ An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to comply with, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid control number. The titles for the collections of information are:¹⁸⁷

- (1) “Form S-3” (OMB Control No. 3235-0073);
- (2) “Form 10-D” (OMB Control No. 3235-0604);
- (3) “Regulation S-K” (OMB Control No. 3235-0071); and
- (4) “Form SF-3 (a proposed new collection of information).

¹⁸⁵ 44 U.S.C. 3501 et seq.

¹⁸⁶ 44 U.S.C. 3507(d) and 5 CFR 1320.11.

¹⁸⁷ The paperwork burden from Regulation S-K is imposed through the forms that are subject to the requirements in those regulations and is reflected in the analysis of those forms. To avoid a Paperwork Reduction Act inventory reflecting duplicative burdens and for administrative convenience, we assign a one-hour burden to Regulation S-K.

The forms listed in Nos. 1 through 3 were adopted under the Securities Act and the Exchange Act and set forth the disclosure requirements for registration statements and periodic reports filed with respect to asset-backed securities and other types of securities to inform investors. The form listed in No. 4 is a newly proposed collection of information under the Securities Act. Form SF-3, if adopted, would represent the registration form for offerings that meet certain shelf eligibility conditions and can be offered on a delayed basis under Rule 415.

Compliance with the proposed amendments would be mandatory, and responses to the information collections would not be kept confidential and there would be no mandatory retention period for proposed collections of information.

B. Revisions to PRA Reporting and Cost Burden Estimates

Our PRA burden estimate for the existing collection of information on Form S-3 is based on an average of the time and cost incurred by all types of public companies, not just ABS issuers, to prepare the collection of information. In contrast, Form 10-D is a form that is only prepared and filed by ABS issuers. In 2004, we codified requirements for ABS issuers in these regulations and forms, recognizing that the information relevant to asset-backed securities differs substantially from that relevant to other securities.

Our PRA burden estimates for the proposed amendments are based on information that we receive on entities assigned to Standard Industrial Classification Code 6189, the code used with respect to asset-backed securities, as well as information from outside data sources.¹⁸⁸ When possible, we base our estimates on an average of the data that we have available for years 2004 through 2010. In some cases, our estimates for the number of asset-

¹⁸⁸ We rely on two outside sources of ABS issuance data. We use the ABS issuance data from Asset-Backed Alert on the initial terms of offerings, and we supplement that data with information from Securities Data Corporation (SDC).

backed issuers that file Form 10-D with the Commission are based on an average of the number of ABS offerings in 2006 through 2010.¹⁸⁹

1. Form S-3 and Form SF-3

Our current PRA burden estimate for Form S-3 is 243,927 annual burden hours. This estimate is based on the assumption that most disclosures required of the issuer are incorporated by reference from separately filed Exchange Act reports. However, because ABS issuers using Form S-3 often present all of the relevant disclosure in the registration statement rather than incorporate relevant disclosure by reference, our current burden estimate for ABS issuers using Form S-3 under existing requirements is similar to our current burden estimate for ABS issuers using Form S-1. During 2004 through 2010, we received an average of 90 Form S-3 filings annually related to asset-backed securities.

We are proposing to move the requirements for asset-backed issuers into new forms that would be solely for the registration by offerings of asset-backed securities. Under the proposal, proposed Form SF-3 would be the ABS shelf equivalent form of existing Form S-3. For purposes of our calculations, we estimate that the proposals relating to shelf eligibility would cause a 5% movement in the number of filers (i.e., a decrease of five registration statements) out of the shelf system due to the new requirements which include the proposed executive officer certification, the proposed transaction requirement for the credit risk manager, the proposed transaction requirement related to investor communications, and the proposed annual evaluations of compliance with timely Exchange Act reporting and timely filing of transaction agreements and certifications.¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, we estimate the

¹⁸⁹ Form 10-D was not implemented until 2006. Before implementation of Form 10-D, asset-backed issuers often filed their distribution reports under cover of Form 8-K.

¹⁹⁰ We calculated the decrease of five Form SF-3s by multiplying the average number of Form S-3s filed (90) by 5 percent.

number of shelf registration statements for ABS issuers would increase by five as a result of the outstanding proposal from the 2010 ABS Proposing Release to eliminate the practice of providing a base prospectus and a prospectus supplement for these issuers.¹⁹¹ Thus, we estimate that the annual number of shelf registration statements concerning ABS offerings would remain the same. Accordingly, since the proposals would shift all shelf eligible ABS filings from Form S-3 to Form SF-3, we estimate that the proposals would cause a decrease of 90 ABS filings on Form S-3 and a corresponding number of 90 ABS filings on Form SF-3s filed annually.¹⁹²

In 2004, we estimated that an ABS issuer, under the 2004 amendments, would take an average of 1,250 hours to prepare a Form S-3 to register ABS.¹⁹³ Additionally, in the January 2011 ABS Issuer Review Release, we estimated that the requirements described in that release would increase the annual incremental burden to ABS issuers by 30 hours per form.¹⁹⁴ Therefore, we currently estimate that it would take an average of 1,280 hours to prepare a Form S-3 to register ABS. For registration statements, we estimate that 25% of the burden of preparation is carried by the company internally and that 75% of the burden is carried by outside professionals retained by the registrant at an average cost of \$400 per hour.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹¹ See Section II.D. of the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. Based on staff reviews, we believe it is very unusual to see ABS registration statements with multiple unrelated collateral types such as auto loans and student loans. There are occasionally multiple related collateral types such as HELOCs, subprime mortgages and Alt-A mortgages in ABS registration statements.

¹⁹² This is based on the number of registration statements for ABS issuers filed on Form S-3 and the four changes due to our rule proposal.

¹⁹³ See 2004 ABS Adopting Release and 2004 ABS Proposing Release.

¹⁹⁴ See January 2011 ABS Issuer Review Release at 4239.

¹⁹⁵ See, e.g., Credit Ratings Disclosure, Release No. 33-9070 (Oct. 7, 2009) [74 FR 53086].

We are proposing new and revised disclosure requirements for ABS issuers that, if adopted, would be a cost to filing on Form SF-3. In particular, we are proposing to add a shelf eligibility condition that the registrant file a certification at the time of each offering off of a shelf registration statement, or takedown, by the chief executive officer of the depositor or executive officer in charge of securitization of the depositor concerning the disclosure contained in the prospectus and the design of the securitization. We are also proposing a shelf eligibility condition that the underlying transaction agreement must provide for the appointment of a credit risk manager to review assets upon the occurrence of certain trigger events and provisions related to repurchase request dispute resolution. Additionally, we are proposing to require that registrants include disclosures concerning the credit risk manager in the prospectus in the registration statement. Lastly, we are proposing a shelf eligibility condition that the underlying transaction agreement include a provision requiring that the party responsible for making periodic filings on Form 10-D include any request received from an investor to communicate with other investors during the reporting period related to investors exercising their rights under the terms of the asset-backed security. We are also proposing changes to Form 10-D relating to disclosure regarding credit risk managers.

If the proposals are adopted, we estimate that the incremental burden for ABS issuers to complete the disclosure requirements in Form SF-3, prepare the information, and file it with the Commission would be 100 burden hours per response on Form SF-3. As a result, we estimate that each Form SF-3 would take approximately 1,380 hours to complete and file.¹⁹⁶ We estimate the total internal burden for Form SF-3 to be 31,050 hours and the total

¹⁹⁶ The total burden hours to file Form SF-3 are calculated by adding the existing burden hours of 1,280 that we estimate for Form S-3 and the incremental burden of 100 hours imposed by our proposals for a total of 1,380 total burden hours.

related professional costs to be \$37,260,000.¹⁹⁷ This would result in a corresponding decrease in Form S-3 burden hours of 28,800 and \$34,560,000 in professional costs.¹⁹⁸

2. Form 10-D

In 2004, we adopted Form 10-D as a new form for only asset-backed issuers. This form is filed within 15 days of each required distribution date on the asset-backed securities, as specified in the governing documents for such securities. The form contains periodic distribution and pool performance information. We estimate that the yearly average number of Form 10-D filings is 10,000¹⁹⁹ and that the proposed new Regulation AB disclosure requirements that would be included in Form 10-D related to investor communications (Item 1121(g)) and credit risk managers (Item 1121(f)) would result in an additional burden of five hours per filing to prepare. Consistent with our estimate in 2004, we estimate that it currently takes 30 hours to complete and file a Form 10-D. Therefore, we estimate that the proposals would increase the number of hours to prepare, review, and file a Form 10-D to 35 burden hours; thus, increasing the total burden hours for all annual Form 10-D responses to an estimate of 350,000 hours.²⁰⁰

We allocate 75% of those hours (262,500 hours) to internal burden and the remaining 25% to external costs totaling \$35,000,000 using a rate of \$400 per hour.

¹⁹⁷ To calculate these values, we first multiply the total burden hours per Form SF-3 (1,380) by the number of Form SF-3s expected under the proposal (90), resulting in 124,200 total burden hours. Then, we allocate 25 percent of these hours to internal burden, resulting in 31,050 hours. We allocate the remaining 75 percent of the total burden hours to related professional costs and use a rate of \$400 per hour to calculate the external professional costs of \$37,260,000.

¹⁹⁸ To calculate these values, we first multiply the total burden hours per Form S-3 (1,280) by the average number of Form S-3s over the period 2004-2010 (90), resulting in 115,200 total burden hours. Then, we allocate 25 percent of these hours to internal burden, resulting in 28,800 hours. We allocate the remaining 75 percent of the total burden hours to related professional costs and use a rate of \$400 per hour to calculate the external professional costs of \$34,560,000.

¹⁹⁹ Our estimate is based on 1,000 respondents per year multiplied by 10 filings per respondent.

²⁰⁰ The burden hours are calculated by multiplying 10,000 Form 10-Ds by the 35 burden hours required to complete the form for a total of 350,000 hours.

3. Regulation S-K

Regulation S-K, which includes the item requirements in Regulation AB, contains the requirements for disclosure that an issuer must provide in filings under both the Securities Act and the Exchange Act. We assign one burden hour to Regulation S-K for administrative convenience to reflect that the changes to the regulation did not impose a direct burden on companies.

4. Summary of Proposed Changes to Annual Burden Compliance in Collection of Information

Table 1 illustrates the changes in annual compliance burden in the collection of information in hours and costs for existing reports and registration statements and for the proposed new registration statement for asset-backed issuers. Bracketed numbers indicate a decrease in the estimate.

Form	Current Annual Responses	Proposed Annual Responses	Current Burden Hours	Decrease or Increase in Burden Hours	Proposed Burden Hours	Current Professional Costs	Decrease or Increase in Professional Costs	Proposed Professional Costs
S-3	2,065	1,075	243,927	[28,800]	215,127	\$292,711,500	[\$34,560,000]	\$258,151,500
SF-3	90	31,050	31,050	\$37,260,000	\$37,260,000
10-D	10,000	10,000	225,000	37,500	262,500	\$30,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$35,000,000

5. Solicitation of Comments

We request comments in order to evaluate: (1) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information would have practical utility; (2) the accuracy of our estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information; (3) whether there are ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (4) whether there are ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond,

including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.²⁰¹ We also specifically request comment regarding:

104. Whether and to what extent the proposed shelf eligibility requirements would cause a movement in filers that are currently eligible for shelf registration on Form S-3 out of shelf registration to proposed Form SF-3.

Any member of the public may direct to us any comments concerning the accuracy of these burden estimates and any suggestions for reducing these burdens. Persons submitting comments on the collection of information requirements should direct the comments to the Office of Management and Budget, Attention: Desk Officer for the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Washington, DC 20503, and should send a copy to Elizabeth M. Murphy, Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, 100 F Street, NE, Washington, DC 20549-1090, with reference to File No. S7-08-10. Requests for materials submitted to OMB by the Commission with regard to these collections of information should be in writing, refer to File No. S7-08-10, and be submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Records Management, Office of Filings and Information Services, 100 F Street, NE, Washington, DC 20549. OMB is required to make a decision concerning the collection of information between 30 and 60 days after publication of this release. Consequently, a comment to OMB is best assured of having its full effect if OMB receives it within 30 days of publication.

VII. Economic Analysis

A. Background

In April 2010, we proposed rules that would revise the disclosure, reporting and offering process for ABS.²⁰² Among other things, in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release we

²⁰¹ We request comment pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(B).

proposed eligibility requirements to replace the current credit rating references in shelf eligibility criteria for asset-backed security issuers (i.e., a certification by the chief executive of the depositor, risk retention, third party opinion relating to representations and warranties, and ongoing Exchange Act reporting). We also proposed to require that, with some exceptions, prospectuses for public offerings of asset-backed securities and ongoing Exchange Act reports contain specified asset-level information about each of the assets in the pool in a standardized tagged data format. Further, we proposed to require asset-backed issuers to provide investors with more time to consider transaction-specific information about the pool assets.

In this release, we are re-proposing certain requirements for ABS shelf eligibility and filing deadlines for exhibits in ABS shelf offerings. We are also proposing new Form 10-D disclosure requirements related to investor communications and credit risk managers. Section 23(a) of the Exchange Act²⁰³ requires the Commission, when making rules and regulations under the Exchange Act, to consider the impact a new rule would have on competition. Section 23(a)(2) prohibits the Commission from adopting any rule that would impose a burden on competition not necessary or appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of the Exchange Act. Section 2(b) of the Securities Act²⁰⁴ and Section 3(f) of the Exchange Act²⁰⁵ require the Commission, when engaging in rulemaking that requires it to consider whether an action is necessary or appropriate in the public interest, to consider, in addition to the protection of investors, whether the action would promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation. We have considered and discussed below the effects of the proposed rules

²⁰² See the 2010 ABS Proposing Release.

²⁰³ 15 U.S.C. 78w(a).

²⁰⁴ 15 U.S.C. 77b(b).

²⁰⁵ 15 U.S.C. 78c(f).

on efficiency, competition, and capital formation, as well as the benefits and costs associated with the Commission's decisions in the proposed rulemaking. Except as noted below, our benefit-cost analysis included in the 2010 ABS Proposing Release remains unchanged and outstanding.

B. ABS Shelf Eligibility Proposals

We are re-proposing the registrant and transaction requirements for ABS shelf registration because two of the proposed transaction requirements in the April 2010 Proposing Release – risk retention and continued Exchange Act reporting – will be required for most registered ABS offerings as a result of changes mandated by provisions of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. Further, our re-proposals for ABS shelf registration eligibility are also made in connection with Section 939A of that Act which generally requires that we modify our regulations to remove any references to or requirement of reliance on credit ratings and to substitute in such regulations such standard of credit-worthiness that we determine as appropriate for such regulations. Therefore, instead of the investment grade ratings requirement, under our re-proposal, taking into account the context and purposes of the affected rules, we are proposing a CEO or executive officer certification, provisions in the transaction agreements requiring the appointment of an independent credit risk manager under certain conditions and certain dispute resolution provisions, and provisions in the transaction agreements related to investor communications for any offering off the Form SF-3 shelf registration statement, which we believe would be indicative of a higher quality security.

We are also proposing to require that, in order to conduct a takedown off an effective shelf registration statement, an ABS issuer would be required to conduct an annual evaluation of compliance with the transaction requirements for shelf offerings conducted

during the past year as well as compliance with timely Exchange Act reporting. Further, as re-proposed, issuers would be allowed to cure any failure to timely file the required certification or transaction agreements with required provisions. Specifically, under the re-proposal, the depositor would be deemed to satisfy the registrant requirements related to timely filing the certifications and transaction agreements 90 days after the date all required filings are filed.

1. Benefits

We believe a benefit of the re-proposed ABS shelf eligibility requirements is that they would replace the current investment grade rating condition while providing improved investor protections that would be indicative of a higher quality security. We believe that our proposal to require a certification by the depositor's chief executive officer or executive officer in charge of securitization may cause these officials to review more carefully the disclosure, and in this case, the transaction, and would encourage better oversight of the securitization process. As a result, certifiers may provide a more accurate review of the registration statement disclosures and the transaction. To the extent that a more careful review improves the securitization quality in the presence of such a certification, the proposed certification would be an appropriate eligibility requirement for shelf registration.

We believe that our proposal requiring provisions in the underlying transaction agreements requiring the appointment of a credit risk manager to review assets upon the occurrence of certain trigger events, requiring that the credit risk manager provide a report to the trustee of the findings and conclusions of the reviews of the assets, and requiring repurchase dispute resolution procedures should help the enforceability of contract terms surrounding representations and warranties regarding the pool assets. We are proposing to require that the transaction agreements require, at a minimum, review by the credit risk

manager (1) when the credit enhancement requirements, as specified in the underlying transaction agreements, are not met; and (2) at the direction of investors pursuant to the process provided in the transaction agreement and disclosed in the prospectus. We believe specifying these two minimum trigger requirements should facilitate the ability of transaction parties to pursue transaction remedies, which we believe would be a feature of a higher quality security, while at the same time providing flexibility to transaction parties to develop more robust trigger requirements as they deem appropriate.

The requirement that the credit risk manager not be affiliated with the sponsor, depositor, or servicer helps assure investors that the review of assets is impartial. By not prescribing specific procedures for the review and repurchase process, we are providing the credit risk manager and ABS investors with the flexibility to determine the most appropriate and efficient procedures for each ABS transaction. We believe that taken together our transaction requirements related to the appointment of a credit risk manager would better strengthen the enforceability of contract terms surrounding the representations and warranties regarding the pool assets for ABS shelf transactions and incentivize obligated parties to better consider the characteristics and quality of the assets underlying the securities, thus making them appropriate criteria for shelf eligibility.

We believe that our proposal requiring a provision in an underlying transaction agreement to require the party responsible for making periodic filings on Form 10-D include in the Form 10-D any request from an ABS investor to communicate with other ABS investors related to investors exercising their rights under the terms of the asset-backed security would benefit ABS investors because facilitating communication among ABS investors enables them to exercise the rights included in the underlying transaction agreements. In this regard, as previously discussed in Part II.B.1(c) of this release, we are

aware that ABS investors have had difficulty enforcing rights contained in transactions agreements, and in particular, those relating to the repurchase of underlying assets for breach of representations and warranties. We also believe the disclosure would benefit investors by helping solve collective action problems related to communication between investors and issuers. By decreasing the costs of communication among investors, this proposed requirement helps investors exercise the rights included in the underlying transaction agreements.

The above three shelf eligibility requirements are designed to improve the quality of the securities being offered by strengthening investor protections, so that the offerings may appropriately be conducted quickly. To the extent that better investor protection increases investors' trust in the fairness and security of the ABS markets, the result could be lower cost of capital and increased investor participation in ABS markets, which should facilitate capital formation.

We believe that requiring an annual evaluation of compliance with the registrant requirements in order to continue using an effective shelf registration statement would benefit investors because it would encourage issuers to file their Exchange Act reports and transaction documents in connection with prior offerings at the required time, and therefore, enhance informed investment decisions. We also believe that a 90-day cure period strikes an appropriate balance between monitoring issuers' compliance with the proposed shelf transaction requirements and commentator's concerns that the one-year penalty was too costly.

2. Costs

We believe that the certification transaction requirement could impose additional review and oversight costs, potential litigation costs, and disclosure costs on ABS issuers.

First, since the intent of the certification is to enhance the accountability and oversight of the ABS transaction, if effective, it will result in additional costs related to further verifying the characteristics of the asset pool, the payment and rights allocations, the distribution priorities and other structural features of the transactions. We note that these costs could be lessened to the extent that the certifier could rely in part on the review that would already be required in order for an issuer to comply with recently adopted Rule 193.²⁰⁶ Ultimately, we believe that for shelf offerings the benefit of improving the accuracy of securitization disclosures and enhancing the accountability and oversight of the ABS transaction justifies these additional review and oversight costs incurred by the ABS issuers.

We have considered that the certification transaction requirement might also result in litigation costs for those signing the certification with the magnitude of the costs dependent on the scope of the certification. We received several comment letters indicating that the certification language included in our 2010 ABS Proposing release could be interpreted as a guarantee of the future performance of the assets underlying the ABS.²⁰⁷ We realize that unexpected losses incurred by security holders may be the result of misrepresentation by the securitization parties but may also be the outcome of a negative realization. Since the distinction is typically difficult to discern, a certification misinterpreted as a guarantee could have increased the likelihood of litigation, and therefore expected litigation costs to the certifier. In an attempt to mitigate these costs, we are proposing revised certification

²⁰⁶ Rule 193 implemented Securities Act Section 7(d), as added by Section 945 of the Act, by requiring that any issuer registering the offer and sale of an ABS perform a review of the assets underlying the ABS.

²⁰⁷ See letters from ASF (issuer members), ABASA, CREFC and Wells Fargo on the 2010 ABS Proposing Release. Several commentators offered, as an alternative, that the CEO of the depositor certify to the adequacy and accuracy of the disclosure in the offering documents. See letters from ABA; ABASA; ASF; AusSF; BOA; CNH; FSR; JP Morgan; MBA; SIFMA (dealers and sponsors); Sallie Mae; and Wells Fargo.

language, which we believe reduces a certifier's exposure to unnecessary litigation and limits litigation costs that the certification may create.

The proposed transaction requirements for shelf eligibility related to the credit risk manager would increase costs of securitization to ABS issuers to the extent a credit risk manager would not have otherwise been appointed in the transaction because they would be required to hire an additional participant in the transaction in order to maintain shelf eligibility. We have attempted to mitigate these costs by requiring that a credit risk manager be involved in the transaction only upon the occurrence of certain triggering events. We also recognize that not prescribing specific procedures for the review and repurchase process may impose a cost to investors if the transaction parties do not select appropriate procedures for such process. This transaction requirement would also result in some additional disclosure costs as information about the credit risk manager will have to be provided in the ABS prospectus.

The proposed disclosure requirements related to investor communications in distribution reports on Form 10-D would increase the disclosure costs of preparing these respective filings for ABS issuers. We also expect this requirement would impose additional costs on ABS issuers because the person responsible for making periodic filings on Form 10-D would need to design systems to receive investor requests to communicate and verify the identity of the investor making the request.

We believe that requiring an annual evaluation of compliance with the registrant requirements would impose additional costs on ABS issuers because of any systems needed to ensure and check compliance with the reporting and filing requirements. However, we believe these costs should be minimal because these issuers should already have in most

instances systems designed to ensure that reports and transaction agreements are being filed timely in accordance with rules under the Exchange Act or Securities Act, respectively.

We recognize that some of the new shelf registration costs may be passed down the chain of securitization and ultimately to borrowers. The ability to pass costs on to borrowers would be constrained by competition from non-securitizing lenders, which would weaken the competitive ability of firms that solely rely on securitization for funding relative to other financial firms that have other sources of funding.

Finally, if ABS sponsors are forced to bear all or some of these new costs and if these new costs exceed the costs of obtaining a credit rating, then ABS sponsors might choose to avoid the shelf registration process by registering their ABS on the proposed Form SF-1. Alternatively, they might choose to bypass SEC registration altogether and issue in private markets instead. This will have the effect of reduced efficiency and impeded capital formation. We seek comments and empirical data to help us assess the macroeconomic impact of the costs associated with the new shelf registration requirements.

C. Disclosure Requirements

In addition to the shelf eligibility proposals, we are also proposing a disclosure requirement that would require disclosure in the prospectus concerning any party selected as a credit risk manager. We are also proposing to require ABS issuers to file copies of the underlying transaction agreements, including all attached schedules, and other agreements that are referenced (such as those containing representations and warranties regarding the underlying assets), at the same time as a preliminary prospectus that would be required under proposed Rule 424(h). We are also proposing to require in distribution reports filed on Form 10-D disclosure related to the review of pool assets by credit risk managers during the relevant distribution period as well as events involving a change in the credit risk manager.

1. Benefits

We believe that providing disclosure concerning credit risk managers will facilitate an informed assessment by investors as to the appropriateness of the selected credit risk manager. We also believe that providing in distribution reports disclosure related to the credit risk manager's review of assets and any change in the credit risk manager would be beneficial to investors because it would provide them material information concerning such matters on a timely basis. Finally, requiring underlying transaction agreements to be filed in substantially final form at the same time as the preliminary prospectus should benefit investors by allowing them necessary time to analyze the actual underlying agreements containing the specific structure, assets, and contractual rights regarding each transaction. To the extent that additional time for investment analysis results in investors making better informed decisions on how to allocate capital, this requirement could improve economic efficiency and facilitate capital formation.

2. Costs

The proposed disclosure requirements related to credit risk managers in prospectuses and distribution reports would increase the disclosure costs of preparing these filings for ABS issuers. The proposed requirement that ABS issuers file copies of the underlying transaction agreements at the same time as a preliminary prospectus that would be required under proposed Rule 424(h) may increase the costs associated with conducting an offering to the extent that such filing requirement exposes issuers to the risk of changing market conditions; however, such uncertainty is similar to that faced by other issuers of underwritten initial public offerings of debt whose final offer prices are not set for weeks or months after filing. To the extent the requirement requires that documents be completed earlier in the offering process, ABS issuers may face additional costs to accelerate drafting of the required

documents. As noted earlier, for purposes of the PRA, we estimate that the incremental burden for ABS issuers to complete the disclosure requirements in Form SF-3, prepare the information, and file it with the Commission would be 100 burden hours per response on Form SF-3.

D. Requests for Comment

We seek comments on all aspects of this Economic Analysis including identification and quantification of any additional costs and benefits. We also request comments on whether our proposals would promote efficiency, competition, and capital formation. Commentators are requested to provide empirical data and other factual support for their views, if possible.

We further ask the following specific questions:

105. Would the proposed credit risk manager and certification transaction requirement for shelf eligibility impose costs in addition to those identified above? How much would a credit risk manager be compensated for these services? Would insurance costs increase for those providing credit risk manager services or providing a certification? If so, by how much? Are there other measurable costs associated with these proposed requirements?
106. Could the costs associated with the proposed shelf registration requirements be passed down the securitization chain? Would these costs affect an ABS issuer's choice between registering securities on proposed Form SF-3 or registering them on proposed Form SF-1? Would these costs affect an ABS issuer's willingness to register the securities altogether rather than issuing in the private markets?
107. Do you believe that the proposed disclosure requirements will impose costs on other market participants?

VIII. Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act

For purposes of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996,²⁰⁸ a rule is “major” if it has resulted, or is likely to result in:

- an annual effect on the U.S. economy of \$100 million or more;
- a major increase in costs or prices for consumers or individual industries; or
- significant adverse effects on competition, investment, or innovation.

We request comment on whether our proposed amendments would be a “major rule” for purposes of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act. We solicit comment and empirical data on:

- the potential effect on the U.S. economy on an annual basis;
- any potential increase in costs or prices for consumers or individual industries;

and

- any potential effect on competition, investment, or innovation.

IX. Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Commission hereby certifies pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 605(b) that the proposals contained in this release, if adopted, would not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The proposals relate to the registration, disclosure and reporting requirements for asset-backed securities under the Securities Act and the Exchange Act. Securities Act Rule 157²⁰⁹ and Exchange Act Rule 0-10(a)²¹⁰ defines an issuer, other than an investment company, to be a “small business” or “small organization” if it had total assets of \$5 million or less on the last day of its most recent fiscal year. As the depositor and

²⁰⁸ Public Law 104-121, Title II, 110 Stat. 857 (1996).

²⁰⁹ 17 CFR 230.157.

²¹⁰ 17 CFR 240.0-10(a).

issuing entity are most often limited purpose entities in an ABS transaction, we focused on the sponsor in analyzing the potential impact of the proposals under the Regulatory Flexibility Act. Based on our data, we only found one sponsor that could meet the definition of a small broker-dealer for purposes of the Regulatory Flexibility Act.²¹¹ Accordingly, the Commission does not believe that the proposals, if adopted, would have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

We encourage written comments regarding this certification. We request in particular that commentators describe the nature of any impact on small entities and provide empirical data to support the extent of the impact.

X. Statutory Authority and Text of Proposed Rule and Form Amendments

We are proposing the new rules, forms and amendments contained in this document under the authority set forth in Sections 6, 7, 10, 19(a), and 28 of the Securities Act, Sections 13, 23(a), and 36 of the Exchange Act.²¹²

List of Subjects

17 CFR Parts 229, 230, 239, and 249

Advertising, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Securities.

For the reasons set out above, Title 17, Chapter II of the Code of Federal Regulations is proposed to be amended as follows:

PART 229 -- STANDARD INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILING FORMS UNDER SECURITIES ACT OF 1933, SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934 AND ENERGY POLICY AND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1975 -- REGULATION S-K

1. The authority citation for part 229 continues to read in part as follows:

²¹¹ This is based on data from Asset-Backed Alert.

²¹² 15 U.S.C. 777aaa et seq.

* * * *

- (1) * * *

* * * * *

* * * * *

(b) * * *

(36) Certification for shelf offerings of asset-backed securities. For any offering of asset-backed securities (as defined in §229.1101) made on a delayed basis under §230.415(a)(1)(vii), provide the certification required by General Instruction I.B.i.a. of Form SF-3 (referenced in §239.45) exactly as set forth below:

Certification

I, [identify the certifying individual,] certify as of [the date of the final prospectus under Securities Act Rule 424 (17 CFR §239.424)] that:

1. I have reviewed the prospectus relating to [title of all securities, the offer and sale of which are registered] and am familiar with the structure of the securitization, including without limitation the characteristics of the securitized assets underlying the offering, the terms of any internal credit enhancements and the material terms of all contracts and other arrangements entered in to the effect the securitization;
2. Based on my knowledge, the prospectus does not contain any untrue statement of a material fact or omit to state a material fact necessary to make the statements made, in light of the circumstances under which such statements were made, not misleading;
3. Based on my knowledge, the prospectus and other information included in the registration statement of which it is a part, fairly present in all material respects the characteristics of the securitized assets underlying the offering described therein and the risks of ownership of the asset-backed securities described therein, including all credit enhancements and all risk factors relating to the securitized assets underlying the offering that would affect the cash flows sufficient to service payments on the asset-backed securities as described in the prospectus; and

4. Based on my knowledge, taking into account the characteristics of the securitized assets underlying the offering, the structure of the securitization, including internal credit enhancements, and any other material features of the transaction, in each instance, as described in the prospectus, the securitization is designed to produce, but is not guaranteed by this certification to produce, cash flows at times and in amounts sufficient to service expected payments on the asset-backed securities offered and sold pursuant to the registration statement

Date: _____

[Signature]

[Title]

The certification should be signed by the chief executive officer of the depositor or executive officer in charge of securitization of the depositor, as required by General Instruction I.B.1(a) of Form SF-3.

* * * * *

3. Amend §229.1100 by revising paragraph (f) as follows:

§ 229.1100 (Item 1100) General.

* * * * *

(f) Where agreements or other documents in this Regulation AB are specified to be filed as exhibits to a Securities Act registration statement, such agreements or other documents, if applicable, may be incorporated by reference as an exhibit to the registration statement, such as by filing a Form 8-K in the case of offerings registered on Form SF-3

(§239.45 of this chapter). Exhibits, including agreements in substantially final form, must be filed and made part of the registration statement by the date the prospectus is required to be filed under Securities Act Rule 424(h) (§230.424 of this chapter). Final agreements must be filed and made part of the registration statement no later than the date the final prospectus is required to be filed under Securities Act Rule 424 (§230.424 of this chapter).

4. Amend §229.1101 by adding paragraph (m) to read as follows:

§ 229.1101 (Item 1101) Definitions.

* * * * *

(m) Credit Risk Manager means any person appointed by the trustee to review the underlying assets for compliance with the representations and warranties on the underlying pool assets and is not affiliated with any sponsor, depositor, or servicer.

5. Amend §229.1109 to read as follows:

§ 229.1109 (Item 1109) Trustees and other transaction parties.

- (a) Trustees. Provide the following information for each trustee:

- (1) State the trustee's name and describe the trustee's form of organization.

- (2) Describe to what extent the trustee has had prior experience serving as a trustee for asset-backed securities transactions involving similar pool assets, if applicable.

- (3) Describe the trustee's duties and responsibilities regarding the asset-backed securities under the governing documents and under applicable law. In addition, describe any actions required by the trustee, including whether notices are required to investors, rating agencies or other third parties, upon an event of default, potential event of default (and how defined) or other breach of a transaction covenant

and any required percentage of a class or classes of asset-backed securities that is needed to require the trustee to take action.

(4) Describe any limitations on the trustee's liability under the transaction agreements regarding the asset-backed securities transaction.

(5) Describe any indemnification provisions that entitle the trustee to be indemnified from the cash flow that otherwise would be used to pay the asset-backed securities.

(6) Describe any contractual provisions or understandings regarding the trustee's removal, replacement or resignation, as well as how the expenses associated with changing from one trustee to another trustee will be paid.

Instruction to Item 1109(a). If multiple trustees are involved in the transaction, provide a description of the roles and responsibilities of each trustee.

(b) Credit risk manager. Provide the following for each credit risk manager:

(1) State the credit risk manager's name and describe its form of organization.

(2) Describe to what extent the credit risk manager has had prior experience serving as a credit risk manager for asset-backed securities transactions involving similar pool assets.

(3) Describe the credit risk manager's duties and responsibilities regarding the asset-backed securities under the governing documents and under applicable law. In addition, describe any actions required by the credit risk manager, including whether notices are required to investors, rating agencies or other third parties, and any required percentage of a class or classes of asset-backed securities that is needed to require the credit risk manager to take action.

(4) Disclose the manner and amount in which the credit risk manager is compensated.

(5) Describe any limitations on the credit risk manager's liability under the transaction agreements regarding the asset-backed securities transaction.

(6) Describe any contractual provisions or understandings regarding the credit risk manager's removal, replacement or resignation, as well as how the expenses associated with changing from one credit risk manager to another credit risk manager will be paid.

6. Amend §229.1119 by adding paragraph (a)(7) as follows:

§ 229.1119 (Item 1119) Affiliations and certain relationships and related transactions.

* * * * *

(a) * * *

(7) Credit risk manager.

* * * * *

7. Amend §229.1121 by reserving paragraphs (d) and (e) and adding paragraphs (f) and (g) as follows:

§ 229.1121 (Item 1121) Distribution and pool performance information.

* * * * *

(d) *Reserved.*

(e) *Reserved.*

(f) Credit risk manager.

(1) Review by credit risk manager. If during the distribution period a credit risk manager is required to review the underlying assets for compliance with the representations and warranties on the underlying assets, provide the following information, as applicable:

(i) A description of the event(s) that triggered the review by the credit risk manager during the distribution period.

(ii) If the credit risk manager provided to the trustee during the distribution period a report of the findings and conclusions of its review of assets, file the full report as an exhibit to the Form 10-D.

(2) Change in credit risk manager. If during the distribution period a credit risk manager has resigned or has been removed, replaced or substituted, or if a new credit risk manager has been appointed, state the date the event occurred and the circumstances surrounding the change. If a new credit risk manager has been appointed, provide the disclosure required by Item 1109(b) (17 CFR 229.1109(b)), as applicable, regarding such credit risk manager.

(g) Investor communication. Disclose any request received from an investor to communicate with other investors during the reporting period received by the party responsible for making the Form 10-D filings on or before the end date of a distribution period. The disclosure regarding the request to communicate is required to include the name of the investor making the request, the date the request was received, and a description of the method by which other investors may contact the requesting investor.

Instruction. An investor would not be permitted to use the ability to request to communicate with other investors as a mechanism to communicate for purposes other than those related to investors exercising their rights under the terms of the asset-backed security.

PART 230 -- GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS, SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

8. The authority citation for Part 230 continues to read, in part, as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 77b, 77c, 77d, 77f, 77g, 77h, 77j, 77r, 77s, 77z-3, 77sss, 78c, 78d, 78j, 78l, 78m, 78n, 78o, 78t, 78w, 78ll(d), 78mm, 80a-8, 80a-24, 80a-28, 80a-29, 80a-30, and 80a-37, unless otherwise noted.

* * * * *

9. Amend §230.401 by:

- a. Revising the phrase “and (g)(3)” in paragraph (g)(1) to read “,(g)(3), and (g)(4)”;
- b. Adding paragraph (g)(4).

The addition reads as follows:

§ 230.401 Requirements as to proper form.

* * * * *

(g) * * *

(4) Notwithstanding that the registration statement may have become effective previously, requirements as to proper form under this section will have been violated for any offering of securities where the requirements of General Instruction I.A. of Form SF-3 has not been met as of ninety days after the end of the depositor’s fiscal year end prior to such offering.

10. Amend §230.415 by revising paragraph (a)(1)(vii):

§ 230.415 Delayed or continuous offering and sale of securities.

(a) * * *

(1) * * *

(vii) Asset-backed securities (as defined in 17 CFR 229.1101) registered (or qualified to be registered) on Form SF-3 (§ 239.45 of this chapter) which are to be offered and sold on an immediate or delayed basis by or on behalf of the registrant;

Instructions to paragraph (a)(1)(vii): The requirements of General Instruction I.B.1 of Form SF-3 (§ 239.45 of this chapter) must be met for any offerings of an asset-backed security (as defined in 17 CFR 229.1101) registered in reliance on paragraph (a)(1)(vii).

* * * * *

PART 239 – FORMS PRESCRIBED UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT OF 1933

11. The authority citation for Part 239 continues to read in part as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 77f, 77g, 77h, 77j, 77s, 77z-2, 77z-3, 77sss, 78c, 78l, 78m, 78n, 78o(d), 78u-5, 78w(a), 78ll, 78mm, 80a-2(a), 80a-3, 80a-8, 80a-9, 80a-10, 80a-13, 80a-24, 80a-26, 80a-29, 80a-30, and 80a-37, unless otherwise noted.

* * * * *

12. Add §239.45 to read as follows:

§239.45 Form SF-3, for registration under the Securities Act of 1933 of asset-backed securities offered pursuant to certain types of transactions.

This form may be used for registration under the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) of offerings of asset-backed securities, as defined in 17 CFR 229.1101(c). Any registrant which meets the requirements of paragraph (a) may use this Form for the registration of asset-backed securities (as defined in 17 CFR 229.1101(c)) under the Securities Act which are offered in any transaction specified in paragraph (b) provided that

the requirement applicable to the specified transaction are met. Terms used have the same meaning as in Item 1101 of Regulation AB.

(a) Registrant Requirements. Registrants must meet the following conditions in order to use this Form for registration under the Securities Act of asset-backed securities offered in the transactions specified in paragraph (b):

(1) To the extent the depositor or any issuing entity previously established, directly or indirectly, by the depositor or any affiliate of the depositor (as defined in Item 1101 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1101)) is or was at any time during the twelve calendar months and any portion of a month immediately preceding the filing of the registration statement on this Form required to comply with the transaction requirements in paragraphs (b)(1)(i), (b)(1)(ii), and (b)(1)(iii) with respect to a previous offering of asset-backed securities involving the same asset class, the following requirements shall apply:

(i) Such depositor and each such issuing entity must have filed on a timely basis all certifications required by paragraph (b)(1)(i); and

(ii) Such depositor and each such issuing entity must have filed on a timely basis all transaction agreements containing the provisions that are required by paragraphs (b)(1)(ii) and (iii).

If such depositor and issuing entity fail to meet the requirements of paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (ii), such depositor and issuing entity will be deemed to satisfy such requirements for purposes of this Form 90 days after the date it files the information required by paragraphs (a)(1)(i) and (ii).

Instruction to (a)(1). The registrant must provide disclosure in a prospectus that is part of the registration statement that it has met the registrant requirements of paragraph (a)(1).

(2) To the extent the depositor or any issuing entity previously established, directly or indirectly, by the depositor or any affiliate of the depositor (as defined in Item 1101 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1101)) is or was at any time during the twelve calendar months and any portion of a month immediately preceding the filing of the registration statement on this Form subject to the requirements of section 12 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. 78l or 78o(d)) with respect to a class of asset-backed securities involving the same asset class, such depositor and each such issuing entity must have filed all material required to be filed regarding such asset-backed securities pursuant to section 13, 14 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78n or 78o(d)) for such period (or such shorter period that each such entity was required to file such materials). In addition, such material must have been filed in a timely manner, other than a report that is required solely pursuant to Item 1.01, 1.02, 2.03, 2.04, 2.05, 2.06, 4.02(a), 6.01, or 6.03 of Form 8-K (17 CFR 249.308). If Rule 12b-25(b) (17 CFR 240.12b-25(b)) under the Exchange Act was used during such period with respect to a report or a portion of a report, that report or portion thereof has actually been filed within the time period prescribed by that rule. Regarding an affiliated depositor that became an affiliate as a result of a business combination transaction during such period, the filing of any material prior to the business combination transaction relating to asset-backed securities of an issuing entity previously established, directly or indirectly, by such affiliated depositor is excluded from this section, provided such business combination transaction was not part of a plan or scheme to evade the requirements of the Securities Act or the Exchange Act. See the definition of “affiliate” in Securities Act Rule 405 (17 CFR 230.405).

(b) Transaction Requirements. If the registrant meets the registrant requirements specified in paragraph (a) above, an offering meeting the following conditions may be registered on Form SF-3:

(1) Asset-backed securities (as defined in 17 CFR 229.1101) to be offered for cash where the following have been satisfied:

(i) Certification. The registrant files a certification in accordance with Item 601(b)(36) of Regulation S-K (§229.601(b)(36)) signed by the chief executive officer of the depositor or executive officer in charge of securitization of the depositor with respect to each offering of securities that is registered on this form.

(ii) Appointment of a credit risk manager and repurchase request dispute resolution provisions. With respect to each offering of securities that is registered on this form, the pooling and servicing agreement or other transaction agreement, which shall be filed, must provide for the following:

(A) The selection and appointment by the trustee of the issuing entity of a credit risk manager that is not affiliated with any sponsor, depositor, or servicer of the transaction;

(B) The credit risk manager shall have authority to access copies of the underlying documents related to the pool assets;

(C) The credit risk manager shall be responsible for reviewing the underlying assets for compliance with the

representations and warranties on the underlying pool assets. Reviews shall be required, at a minimum, when either (a) or (b) are met:

(a) The credit enhancement requirements, as specified in the underlying transaction agreements, are not met; or

(b) At the direction of investors, pursuant to the processes provided in the transaction agreement and disclosed in the prospectus.

(D) The credit risk manager shall provide a report to the trustee of the findings and conclusions of the review of the assets.

(E) If an asset subject to a repurchase request, pursuant to the terms of the transaction agreements, is not repurchased by the end of a 180-day period beginning when notice is received, then the party submitting such repurchase request shall have the right to refer the matter, at its discretion, to either mediation or third-party arbitration, and the party obligated to repurchase must agree to the selected resolution method.

(iii) Investor communication provision. With respect to each offering of securities that is registered on this form, the pooling and servicing agreement or other transaction agreement, which shall be filed, contains a provision requiring that the party responsible for

making periodic filings on Form 10-D (§249.312) include any request received from an investor to communicate with other investors during the reporting period related to investors exercising their rights under the terms of the asset-backed security. The request to communicate, would be required to include the name of the investor making the request; the date the request was received; and a description of the method by which other investors may use to contact the requesting investor.

Instruction to (b)(1)(iii) If an underlying transaction agreement contains procedures in order to verify that an investor is, in fact, a beneficial owner, the verification procedures may require no more than the following: (1) if the investor is a record holder of the securities at the time of a request to communication, then the investor would not have to provide verification of ownership, and (2) if the investor is not the record holder of the securities, then the person obligated to make the disclosure must receive a written statement from the record holder verifying that, at the time the request is submitted, that the investor beneficially holds the securities.

(iv) Delinquent assets. Delinquent assets do not constitute 20% or more, as measured by dollar volume, of the asset pool as of the measurement date.

(v) Residual value for certain securities. With respect to securities that are backed by leases other than motor vehicle leases, the portion of

the securitized pool balance attributable to the residual value of the physical property underlying the leases, as determined in accordance with the transaction agreements for the securities, does not constitute 20% or more, as measured by dollar volume, of the securitized pool balance as of the measurement date.

- (2) Securities relating to an offering of asset-backed securities registered in accordance with paragraph (b)(1) where those securities represent an interest in or the right to the payments of cash flows of another asset pool and meet the requirements of Securities Act Rule 190(c)(1) through (4) (17 CFR 240.190(c)(1) through (4)).

59. Add Form SF-3 (referenced in §239.45) to read as follows:

Note: The text of Form SF-3 does not, and this amendment will not, appear in the Code of Federal Regulations.

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549**

FORM SF-3

**REGISTRATION STATEMENT UNDER THE SECURITIES ACT OF
1933**

(Exact name of registrant as specified in its charter)

(State or other jurisdiction of incorporation or organization)

(I.R.S. Employer Identification Number)

Commission File Number of depositor: _____

Central Index Key Number of depositor: _____

_____ (Exact
name of depositor as specified in its charter)

Central Index Key Number of sponsor (if available): _____

(Exact
name of sponsor as specified in its charter)

(Address, including zip code, and telephone number, including area code, of registrant's
principal executive offices)

(Name, address, including zip code, and telephone number, including area code, of agent for
service)

(Approximate date of commencement of proposed sale to the public)

If any of the securities being registered on this Form SF-3 are to be offered on a delayed
basis pursuant to Rule 415 under the Securities Act of 1933, check the following box: ☐

If this Form SF-3 is filed to register additional securities for an offering pursuant to Rule
462(b) under the Securities Act, please check the following box and list the Securities Act
registration statement number of the earlier effective registration statement for the same
offering: ☐

If this Form SF-3 is a post-effective amendment filed pursuant to Rule 462(c) under the
Securities Act, check the following box and list the Securities Act registration statement
number of the earlier effective registration statement for the same offering: ☐

CALCULATION OF REGISTRATION FEE

Title of each class of securities to be	Amount to be registered	Proposed maximum offering price	Proposed maximum aggregate	Amount of registration fee
---	----------------------------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

registered		per unit	offering price	
------------	--	----------	----------------	--

Notes to the “Calculation of Registration Fee” Table (“Fee Table”):

1. Specific details relating to the fee calculation shall be furnished in notes to the Fee Table, including references to provisions of Rule 457 (§230.457 of this chapter) relied upon, if the basis of the calculation is not otherwise evident from the information presented in the Fee Table.

2. If the filing fee is calculated pursuant to Rule 457(r) under the Securities Act, the Fee Table must state that it registers an unspecified amount of securities of each identified class of securities and must provide that the issuer is relying on Rule 456(b) and Rule 457(r). If the Fee Table is amended in a post-effective amendment to the registration statement or in a prospectus filed in accordance with Rule 456(b)(1)(ii) (§230.456(b)(1)(ii) of this chapter) , the Fee Table must specify the aggregate offering price for all classes of securities in the referenced offering or offerings and the applicable registration fee.

3. Any difference between the dollar amount of securities registered for such offerings and the dollar amount of securities sold may be carried forward on a future registration statement pursuant to Rule 457 under the Securities Act.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

I. Eligibility Requirements for Use of Form SF-3.

This instruction sets forth registrant requirements and transaction requirements for the use of Form SF-3. Any registrant which meets the requirements of I.A. below (“Registrant Requirements”) may use this Form for the registration of asset-backed securities (as defined in 17 CFR 229.1101(c)) under the Securities Act of 1933 (“Securities Act”) which are

offered in any transaction specified in I.B. below (“Transaction Requirement”) provided that the requirement applicable to the specified transaction are met. Terms used in this form have the same meaning as in Item 1101 of Regulation AB.

A. Registrant Requirements. Registrants must meet the following conditions in order to use this Form SF-3 for registration under the Securities Act of asset-backed securities offered in the transactions specified in I.B. below:

1. To the extent the depositor or any issuing entity previously established, directly or indirectly, by the depositor or any affiliate of the depositor (as defined in Item 1101 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1101)) is or was at any time during the twelve calendar months and any portion of a month immediately preceding the filing of the registration statement on this Form required to comply with the transaction requirements in General Instructions I.B.1(a), I.B.1(b), and I.B.1(c) of this form with respect to a previous offering of asset-backed securities involving the same asset class, the following requirements shall apply:

- (a) Such depositor and each such issuing entity must have filed on a timely basis all certifications required by I.B.1(a); and
- (b) Such depositor and each such issuing entity must have filed on a timely basis all transaction agreements containing the provisions that are required by I.B.1(b) and I.B.1 (c);

If such depositor and issuing entity fail to meet the requirements of I.A.1(a) and I.A.1(b), such depositor and issuing entity will be deemed to satisfy such requirements for purposes of this Form SF-3 90 days after the date it files the information required by I.A.1(a) and I.A.1(b).

Instruction to General Instruction I.A.1: The registrant must provide disclosure in a prospectus that is part of the registration statement that it has met the registrant requirements of I.A.1.

2. To the extent the depositor or any issuing entity previously established, directly or indirectly, by the depositor or any affiliate of the depositor (as defined in Item 1101 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1101)) is or was at any time during the twelve calendar months and any portion of a month immediately preceding the filing of the registration statement on this Form SF-3 subject to the requirements of section 12 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. 78l or 78o(d)) with respect to a class of asset-backed securities involving the same asset class, such depositor and each such issuing entity must have filed all material required to be filed regarding such asset-backed securities pursuant to section 13, 14 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act (15 U.S.C. 78m, 78n or 78o(d)) for such period (or such shorter period that each such entity was required to file such. In addition, such material must have been filed in a timely manner, other than a report that is required solely pursuant to Item 1.01, 1.02, 2.03, 2.04, 2.05, 2.06, 4.02(a), 6.01, or 6.03 of Form 8-K (17 CFR 249.308). If Rule 12b-25(b) (17 CFR 240.12b-25(b)) under the Exchange Act was used during such period with respect to a report or a portion of a report, that report or portion thereof has actually been filed within the time period prescribed by that rule. Regarding an affiliated depositor that became an affiliate as a result of a business combination transaction during such period, the filing of any material prior to the business combination transaction relating to asset-backed securities of an issuing entity previously established, directly or indirectly, by such affiliated depositor is excluded from this section, provided

such business combination transaction was not part of a plan or scheme to evade the requirements of the Securities Act or the Exchange Act. See the definition of “affiliate” in Securities Act Rule 405 (17 CFR 230.405).

B. Transaction Requirements. If the registrant meets the Registrant Requirements specified in I.A. above, an offering meeting the following conditions may be registered on this Form:

1. Offerings for cash where the following have been satisfied:

(a) **Certification.** The registrant files a certification in accordance with Item 601(b)(36) of Regulation S-K (§229.601(b)(36)) signed by the chief executive officer of the depositor or executive officer in charge of securitization of the depositor with respect to each offering of securities that is registered on this form.

(b) **Appointment of a credit risk manager and repurchase request dispute resolution provisions.** With respect to each offering of securities that is registered on this form, the pooling and servicing agreement or other transaction agreement, which shall be filed, must provide for the following:

(A) The selection and appointment by the trustee of the issuing entity of a credit risk manager that is not affiliated with any sponsor, depositor, or servicer of the transaction;

(B) The credit risk manager shall have authority to access copies of the underlying documents related to the pool assets;

(C) The credit risk manager shall be responsible for reviewing the underlying assets for compliance with the representations and warranties on the underlying pool assets. Reviews shall be required, at a minimum, when either (a) or (b) are met:

- (a) The credit enhancement requirements, as specified in the underlying transaction agreements, are not met; or
- (b) At the direction of investors, pursuant to the processes provided in the transaction agreement and disclosed in the prospectus.

(D) The credit risk manager shall provide a report to the trustee of the findings and conclusions of the review of the assets.

(E) If an asset subject to a repurchase request, pursuant to the terms of the transaction agreements, is not repurchased by the end of a 180-day period beginning when notice is received, then the party submitting such repurchase request shall have the right to refer the matter, at its discretion, to either mediation or third-party arbitration, and the party obligated to repurchase must agree to the selected resolution method.

(c) **Investor Communication Provision.** With respect to each offering of securities that is registered on this form, the pooling and servicing agreement or other transaction agreement, which shall be filed, contains a provision requiring that the party responsible for making

periodic filings on Form 10-D (§249.312) include any request received from an investor to communicate with other investors during the reporting period related to investors exercising their rights under the terms of the asset-backed security. The request to communicate would be required to include the name of the investor making the request, the date the request was received, and a description of the method other investors may use to contact the requesting investor.

Instruction to I.B.1(c) If an underlying transaction agreement contains procedures in order to verify that an investor is, in fact, a beneficial owner, the verification procedures may require no more than the following: (1) if the investor is a record holder of the securities at the time of a request to communication, then the investor would not have to provide verification of ownership, and (2) if the investor is not the record holder of the securities, then the person obligated to make the disclosure must receive a written statement from the record holder verifying that, at the time the request is submitted, that the investor beneficially holds the securities.

(d) **Delinquent assets.** Delinquent assets do not constitute 20% or more, as measured by dollar volume, of the asset pool as of the measurement date.

(e) **Residual value for certain securities.** With respect to securities that are backed by leases other than motor vehicle leases, the portion of the securitized pool balance attributable to the residual value of the physical property underlying the leases, as determined in accordance

with the transaction agreements for the securities, does not constitute 20% or more, as measured by dollar volume, of the securitized pool balance as of the measurement date.

2. Securities relating to an offering of asset-backed securities registered in accordance with General Instruction I.B.1. where those securities represent an interest in or the right to the payments of cash flows of another asset pool and meet the requirements of Securities Act Rule 190(c)(1) through (4) (17 CFR 240.190(c)(1) through (4)).

II. Application of General Rules and Regulations.

- A. Attention is directed to the General Rules and Regulations under the Securities Act, particularly Regulation C thereunder (17 CFR 230.400 to 230.494). That Regulation contains general requirements regarding the preparation and filing of registration statements.
- B. Attention is directed to Regulation S-K (17 CFR Part 229) for the requirements applicable to the content of the non-financial statement portions of registration statements under the Securities Act. Where this Form SF-3 directs the registrant to furnish information required by Regulation S-K and the item of Regulation S-K so provides, information need only be furnished to the extent appropriate. Notwithstanding Items 501 and 502 of Regulation S-K, no table of contents is required to be included in the prospectus or registration statement prepared on this Form SF-3. In addition to the information expressly required to be included in a registration statement on this Form SF-3, registrants also may provide such other information as they deem appropriate.

- C. Where securities are being registered on this Form SF-3, Rule 456(c) permits, but does not require, the registrant to pay the registration fee on a pay-as-you-go basis and Rule 457(s) permits, but does not require, the registration fee to be calculated on the basis of the aggregate offering price of the securities to be offered in an offering or offerings off the registration statement. If a registrant elects to pay all or a portion of the registration fee on a deferred basis, the Fee Table in the initial filing must identify the classes of securities being registered and provide that the registrant elects to rely on Rule 456(c) and Rule 457(s), but the Fee Table does not need to specify any other information. When the registrant amends the Fee Table in accordance with Rule 456(c)(1)(ii), the amended Fee Table must include either the dollar amount of securities being registered if paid in advance of or in connection with an offering or offerings or the aggregate offering price for all classes of securities referenced in the offerings and the applicable registration fee.
- D. Information is only required to be furnished as of the date of initial effectiveness of the registration statement to the extent required by Rule 430D. Required information about a specific transaction must be included in the prospectus in the registration statement by means of a prospectus that is deemed to be part of and included in the registration statement pursuant to Rule 430D, a post-effective amendment to the registration statement, or a periodic or current report under the Exchange Act incorporated by reference into the registration statement and the prospectus and identified in a prospectus filed, as required by Rule 430D, pursuant to Rule 424(h) or Rule 424(b) (§230.424(h) or §230.424(b) of this chapter)

III. Registration of Additional Securities Pursuant to Rule 462(b). With respect to the registration of additional securities for an offering pursuant to Rule 462(b) under the Securities Act, the registrant may file a registration statement consisting only of the following: the facing page; a statement that the contents of the earlier registration statement, identified by file number, are incorporated by reference; required opinions and consents; the signature page; and any price-related information omitted from the earlier registration statement in reliance on Rule 430A that the registrant chooses to include in the new registration statement. The information contained in such a Rule 462(b) registration statement shall be deemed to be a part of the earlier registration statement as of the date of effectiveness of the Rule 462(b) registration statement. Any opinion or consent required in the Rule 462(b) registration statement may be incorporated by reference from the earlier registration statement with respect to the offering, if: (i) such opinion or consent expressly provides for such incorporation; and (ii) such opinion relates to the securities registered pursuant to Rule 462(b). *See* Rule 411(c) and Rule 439(b) under the Securities Act.

IV. Registration Statement Requirements. Include only one form of prospectus for the asset class that may be securitized in a takedown of asset-backed securities under the registration statement. A separate form of prospectus and registration statement must be presented for each country of origin or country of property securing pool assets that may be securitized in a discrete pool in a takedown of asset-backed securities. For both separate asset classes and jurisdictions of origin or property, a separate form of prospectus is not required for transactions that principally consist of a particular asset class or jurisdiction which also describe one or more

potential additional asset classes or jurisdictions, so long as the pool assets for the additional classes or jurisdictions in the aggregate are below 10% of the pool, as measured by dollar volume, for any particular takedown.

PART I INFORMATION REQUIRED IN PROSPECTUS

Item 1. Forepart of the Registration Statement and Outside Front Cover Pages of Prospectus.

Set forth in the forepart of the registration statement and on the outside front cover page of the prospectus the information required by Item 501 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.501) and Item 1102 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1102).

Item 2. Inside Front and Outside Back Cover Pages of Prospectus.

Set forth on the inside front cover page of the prospectus or, where permitted, on the outside back cover page, the information required by Item 502 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.502).

Item 3. Transaction Summary and Risk Factors.

Furnish the information required by Item 503 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.503) and Item 1103 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1103).

Item 4. Use of Proceeds.

Furnish the information required by Item 504 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.504).

Item 5. Plan of Distribution.

Furnish the information required by Item 508 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.508).

Item 6. Information with Respect to the Transaction Parties.

Furnish the following information:

- (a) Information required by Item 1104 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1104),
Sponsors;

- (b) Information required by Item 1106 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1106),
Depositors;
- (c) Information required by Item 1107 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1107),
Issuing entities;
- (d) Information required by Item 1108 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1108),
Servicers;
- (e) Information required by Item 1109 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1109),
Trustees;
- (f) Information required by Item 1110 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1110),
Originators;
- (g) Information required by Item 1112 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1112),
Significant Obligor;
- (h) Information required by Item 1117 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1117),
Legal Proceedings; and
- (i) Information required by Item 1119 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1119),
Affiliations and certain relationships and related transactions.

Item 7. Information with Respect to the Transaction.

Furnish the following information:

- (a) Information required by Item 1111 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1111),
Pool Assets and Item 1111A of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1111A), Asset-
level information, and Item 1111B of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1111B),
Grouped account data for credit card pools;

- (b) Information required by Item 202 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.202), Description of Securities Registered and Item 1113 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1113), Structure of the Transaction;
- (c) Information required by Item 1114 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1114), Credit Enhancement and Other Support;
- (d) Information required by Item 1115 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1115), Certain Derivatives Instruments;
- (e) Information required by Item 1116 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1116), Tax Matters;
- (f) Information required by Item 1118 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1118), Reports and additional information; and
- (g) Information required by Item 1120 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1120), Ratings.

Instruction: All registrants are required to file the information required by Item 1111A of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1111A), Asset-level information; Item 1111B of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1111B), Grouped account data for credit card pools; and Item 1113(h) of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1113(h)), Waterfall Computer Program; as exhibits to Form 8-K (17 CFR 249.308) that are filed with the Commission pursuant to Item 6.06 and Item 6.07, respectively, of that form. Incorporation by reference must comply with Item 11 of this Form SF-3.

Item 8. Static Pool.

Furnish the information required by Item 1105 of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1105).

Instruction: Registrants may elect to file the information required by this item as an exhibit to Form 8-K (17 CFR 249.308) that is filed with the Commission pursuant to Item 6.08 of that form. Incorporation by reference must comply with Item 11 of this Form SF-3.

Item 9. Interests of Named Experts and Counsel.

Furnish the information required by Item 509 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.509).

Item 10. Incorporation of Certain Information by Reference.

- (a) The prospectus shall provide a statement that all current reports filed pursuant to Items 6.06, 6.07 and if applicable, 6.08 of Form 8-K pursuant to Section Sections 13(a), 13(c), 14 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, prior to the termination of the offering shall be deemed to be incorporated by reference into the prospectus.
- (b) If the registrant is structured as a revolving asset master trust, the documents listed in (1) and (2) below shall be specifically incorporated by reference into the prospectus by means of a statement to that effect in the prospectus listing all such documents:
 - (1) the registrant's latest annual report on Form 10-K (17 CFR 249.310) filed pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act that contains financial statements for the registrant's latest fiscal year for which a Form 10-K was required to be filed; and
 - (2) all other reports filed pursuant to Section 13(a) or 15(d) of the Exchange Act since the end of the fiscal year covered by the annual report referred to in (1) above.

- (c) The prospectus shall also provide a statement regarding the incorporation of reference of Exchange Act reports prior to the termination of the offering pursuant to one of the following two ways:
- (1) a statement that all subsequently filed by the registrant pursuant to Sections 13(a), 13(c), 14 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, prior to the termination of the offering shall be deemed to be incorporated by reference into the prospectus; or
 - (2) a statement that all current reports on Form 8-K filed by the registrant pursuant to Sections 13(a), 13(c), 14 or 15(d) of the Exchange Act, prior to the termination of the offering shall be deemed to be incorporated by reference into the prospectus.

Instruction. Attention is directed to Rule 439 (17 CFR 230.439) regarding consent to use of material incorporated by reference.

(d)(1) You must state

- (i) that you will provide to each person, including any beneficial owner, to whom a prospectus is delivered, a copy of any or all of the information that has been incorporated by reference in the prospectus but not delivered with the prospectus;
- (ii) that you will provide this information upon written or oral request;
- (iii) that you will provide this information at no cost to the requester; and
- (iv) the name, address, and telephone number to which the request for this information must be made.

Note to Item 11(c)(1). If you send any of the information that is incorporated by reference in the prospectus to security holders, you also must send any exhibits that are specifically incorporated by reference in that information.

(2) You must:

- (i) identify the reports and other information that you file with the SEC;
and
- (ii) state that the public may read and copy any materials you file with the SEC at the SEC's Public Reference Room at 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20549, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. State that the public may obtain information on the operation of the Public Reference Room by calling the SEC at 1-800-SEC-0330. If you are an electronic filer, state that the SEC maintains an Internet site that contains reports, proxy and information statements, and other information regarding issuers that file electronically with the SEC and state the address of that site (<http://www.sec.gov>). You are encouraged to give your Internet address, if available.

Item 11. Disclosure of Commission Position on Indemnification for Securities Act Liabilities.

Furnish the information required by Item 510 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.510).

**PART II
INFORMATION NOT REQUIRED IN PROSPECTUS**

Item 12. Other Expenses of Issuance and Distribution.

Furnish the information required by Item 511 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.511).

Item 13. Indemnification of Directors and Officers.

Furnish the information required by Item 702 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.702).

Item 14. Exhibits.

Subject to the rules regarding incorporation by reference, file the exhibits required by Item 601 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.601).

Item 15. Undertakings.

Furnish the undertakings required by Item 512 of Regulation S-K (17 CFR 229.512).

SIGNATURES

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933, the registrant certifies that it has reasonable grounds to believe that it meets all of the requirements for filing on Form SF-3 and has duly caused this registration statement to be signed on its behalf by the undersigned, thereunto duly authorized, in the City of _____, State of _____, on _____, 20____.

(Registrant)

By

(Signature and Title)

Pursuant to the requirements of the Securities Act of 1933, this registration statement has been signed by the following persons in the capacities and on the dates indicated.

(Signature)

(Title)

(Date)

Instructions.

1. The registration statement shall be signed by the depositor, the depositor's principal executive officer or officers, its principal financial officer, its senior officer in charge of securitization and by at least a majority of its board of directors or persons performing similar functions. If the registrant is a foreign person, the registration statement shall also be signed by its authorized representative in the United States. Where the registrant is a limited partnership, the registration statement shall be signed by a majority of the board of directors of any corporate general partner signing the registration statement.
2. The name of each person who signs the registration statement shall be typed or printed beneath his signature. Any person who occupies more than one of the specified positions shall indicate each capacity in which he signs the registration statement. Attention is directed to Rule 402 concerning manual signatures and to Item 601 of Regulation S-K concerning signatures pursuant to powers of attorney.

* * * * *

PART 249 – FORMS, SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

13. The authority citation for part 249 continues to read in part as follows:

Authority: 15 U.S.C. 78a et seq., 7201 et. seq.; and 18 U.S.C. 1350, unless otherwise noted.

* * * * *

14. Amend Form 10-D (referenced in § 249.312) by reserving Item 1A in Part I and adding Item 1B in Part I as follows:

* * * * *

Item 1A. (Reserved)**Item 1B. Credit Risk Manager and Investor Communication.**

For any transaction that included the provisions required by General Instructions I.B.1(b) and I.B.1(c) on Form SF-3 (referenced in § 239.45), provide the information required by Item 1121(f) and (g) of Regulation AB (17 CFR 229.1121(f) and (g)), as applicable.

* * * * *

By the Commission.

Elizabeth M. Murphy
Secretary

Dated: July 26, 2011