

Spiliopoulos, Maria

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 18 June 2021 5:07 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lattimore, Ralph; CN Office; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: ABGF Competitive Neutrality Complaint - Request for information [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive]

OFFICIAL:Sensitive

[REDACTED],

Many thanks for these questions. We will work through them and revert as soon as we can.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, 18 June 2021 5:00 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Lattimore, Ralph <Ralph.Lattimore@pc.gov.au>; CN Office <cnooffice@pc.gov.au>
Subject: ABGF Competitive Neutrality Complaint - Request for information [SEC=OFFICIAL:Sensitive]

EXTERNAL EMAIL: Do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

OFFICIAL:Sensitive

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for your return call this afternoon.

As discussed, the Australian Government Competitive Neutrality Complaints Office is investigating a complaint into the Australian Business Growth Fund (ABGF). We are currently preparing an in-house draft report that, once drafted, we will provide to APRA, the ABGF, the Treasury and the complainant for comment.

Before doing so, we would like to ensure that we are correct in our understanding of a few matters.

We are aware that APRA revised its capital treatment of ADI investments in the ABGF in [its letter of 9 December 2019](#). The complainant saw this as attributable to the ownership stake of the Australian Government in the ABGF. In considering whether this is the case, we would appreciate a response to the following questions.

- 1) Are there (or have there previously been) any other investment funds similar in design to the ABGF in Australia: that is, joint equity investment funds co-owned by multiple ADIs — but without government involvement?
 - If so, were the relevant ADIs able to access the 250% risk weighting on their investments? If not, what was the reason for that?
- 2) Can APRA clarify whether any new funds similar in form and function to the ABGF would be eligible to receive the same capital treatment, or whether the capital treatment is limited *only* to investments in the ABGF?
 - If the treatment is limited to the ABGF only, why is that the case?

- 3) Our interpretation of APRA's testimony to the Senate Economics Committee, in scrutinising the ABGF legislation, is that APRA would have provided the same treatment to a fund akin to the ABGF had the Australian Government not held an ownership stake. (The phrasing used was that Australian Government ownership 'certainly wasn't a requirement'.)
 - Is our interpretation of this accurate?
- 4) Our interpretation of Section 8(2) of your Act, alongside testimony before the Senate Economics Committee, is that APRA is not required to consider competitive neutrality in relation to the ABGF, because the ABGF itself is not regulated by APRA.
 - Is our interpretation of this accurate?

As discussed, we'd appreciate a brief written response to these questions — but we're happy to meet next week to discuss this further.

And as for our process from here: we will produce a final report after we've received feedback from relevant parties on the draft report. The final report will be a public document, but we will provide APRA with a copy prior to publication.

Happy to discuss further to clarify

Regards,

Australian Government Competitive Neutrality Complaints Office

Productivity Commission

4 National Circuit, Barton ACT 2600

| www.pc.gov.au

The Productivity Commission acknowledges the Traditional Owners of Country throughout Australia and their continuing connection to land, waters and community. We pay our respects to their Cultures, Country and Elders past and present.

This e-mail and attachments (if any) is intended for the original addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, any use or dissemination of this communication is prohibited. Please advise the sender by return e-mail and delete this e-mail.

IMPORTANT NOTICE:

This e-mail is intended solely for the person or organisation to whom it is addressed, and may contain secret, confidential or legally privileged information.

If you have received this e-mail in error or are aware that you are not authorised to have it, you **MUST NOT** use or copy it, or disclose its contents to any person. If you do any of these things, you may be sued or prosecuted.

If you have received this e-mail in error, please contact the sender immediately.