THEMATIC RESEARCH · CREDIT, NON-BANK FINANCE & GLOBAL PLUMBING

The Private Credit Reckoning

How the $3-Trillion Shadow-Lending Boom Most Likely Unwinds, How Bad It Could Realistically Get, and Why the Danger Lives in the Plumbing — Not the Funds

TON618 CAPITAL RESEARCH · AS OF JULY 8, 2026 ·

A point-in-time read of a fast-moving credit episode, not a forecast with a date on it. Data: FRED, the Federal Reserve H.8 release, IMF, FSB, ECB, Bank of England, rating agencies (Fitch, Moody's, S&P), Proskauer's default index, manager disclosures, and primary reporting — every figure as-of dated. Fact ("Data shows...") is separated from opinion ("We believe..."). Point-in-time figures — default rates, NAV discounts, redemption tallies, yields — move fast; treat each as of its stated date. Independently fact-checked against primary sources before release; the Source & Verification Note documents that pass and what remains hedged.

§0 The Argument

Slow burn

MOST-LIKELY PATH: A MULTI-QUARTER WORKOUT, NOT A 2008-STYLE RUPTURE

Two questions, two answers. How does it play out? Most probably as a **slow-motion workout** — rising defaults, forced markdowns, gated redemptions, and a credit squeeze on mid-sized borrowers spread across four-to-eight quarters, not a single cascading week. **How bad could it realistically get?** The credible worst case is a **mid-market credit crunch plus an insurer-and-pension earnings hit and a confidence event** — painful, wealth-destroying, growth-sapping — but **short of a 2008-style banking-solvency crisis**, unless three fast fuses light at once: a redemption run, a mark-credibility (fraud) shock, and a yen-carry unwind.

Private credit — lending to companies by investment funds rather than by banks or public bond markets — grew from a post-2008 niche into a **$1.7-to-2-trillion invested market (closer to $3 trillion counting committed-but-undrawn capital and asset-based finance)** in roughly fifteen years, almost entirely inside lightly-supervised, non-bank vehicles. In 2026 that boom is having its first real stress test. Defaults are at or near record highs, several marquee funds have had to **gate** investor withdrawals (cap or queue redemptions), two fraud-driven bankruptcies (First Brands and Tricolor) exposed that the collateral and the marks could not be trusted, and regulators from the IMF to the Bank of England have escalated to explicit systemic-vulnerability language.

The central tension of this note is a disconnect. Public credit markets are priced for calm — US high-yield spreads sit near multi-year *tights* (option-adjusted spread ≈ 267 basis points), investment-grade ≈ 76 bps, the VIX ≈ 16 — while private credit shows genuine stress beneath a surface that is only marked quarterly, at the manager's discretion. One of those two readings is wrong. Our view is that the public market is not mispricing a

coming crash so much as **correctly pricing a slow problem**: private credit's defining feature — patient, locked-up capital that never has to sell into a panic — is exactly what converts what would have been a crash into a grind.

Our house view. The most probable multi-year resolution is a **protracted shakeout, not a systemic collapse**. The structural safeguards that bulls cite are real and they *worked* through the Q1–Q2 2026 redemption spike — the gates held, and no fund was forced into a disorderly liquidation. But every one of those safeguards has a documented erosion vector (covenant-lite loans, payment-in-kind toggles that let stressed borrowers defer cash interest and hide deterioration, discretionary marks), and — this is the load-bearing judgment of the note — **the systemic risk was never inside the funds. It is in the plumbing around them:** the roughly $2 trillion of bank lending to non-bank financial institutions, the insurance balance sheets now 10-15% allocated to private credit, the retail wrappers promising monthly liquidity against illiquid loans, the global carry trade that quietly financed the whole reach for yield, and four accelerants layered on top — the AI/data-center financing loop, the frozen private-equity exit machine, synthetic risk transfers, and tariffs (§8–§11).

What we conclude, previewed. First, the "this is 2008 again" analogy is *half right*: the ingredients rhyme (rapid credit growth, securitization, opaque valuation, layered leverage) but the mechanics differ where it matters most — private credit is far less leveraged, far less reliant on the short-term wholesale funding that froze in 2008, and buy-and-hold rather than daily-margined. That makes a fast rupture unlikely — but the same opacity that prevents a mark-to-market cascade also *hides* the losses, so calm marks are not the same as no losses (§4). Second, the danger does not need the funds to fail; it needs the *plumbing* to seize — and the single most under-appreciated pipe runs through Tokyo (§7). Third, the twist relative to the 2024 consensus is that **no rate relief is coming**: the Fed's June-2026 projections erased the cuts markets had priced (dot-plot median for year-end up to 3.8% from 3.4% in March), so floating-rate borrowers get no reprieve just as their coverage ratios thin (§12).

The debates we carry honestly as overhangs (not resolved by fiat): (1) is the opacity *hiding* losses or genuinely *reducing* them? (2) Do the gates hold in a second, larger redemption wave, or does one hard gate trigger a confidence cascade? (3) Is the insurer channel a shock-absorber (locked liabilities) or an amplifier (pro-cyclical selling under capital rules)? (4) Does the yen-carry unwind stay a slow bleed or snap the way it did for one week in August 2024? Each has a falsifier, stated where it lives.

---

§1 The Current State of the Private Credit Story

Read this section if you read nothing else; it makes the whole case in plain English.

Imagine that for fifteen years the cheapest money in history went looking for the highest yield it could find. Interest rates were near zero, so pension funds, insurers, and wealthy families could not earn enough on safe bonds. A new industry met that hunger: **private credit** — funds that lend directly to mid-sized companies, skipping the bank and the public bond market. The pitch was seductive: higher interest than public bonds, no stomach-churning daily price swings (because the loans are valued only every quarter, by the manager), and — the industry claimed — almost no losses. Money poured in. The market grew to something like **$3 trillion**.

Two features made it feel safe. The capital is **locked up** — investors in the core funds cannot yank their money on a whim, so the manager never has to dump loans in a panic. And the loans are **senior and secured** — first in line, backed by the borrower's assets. Bulls argued this made private credit *safer* than the public bonds it replaced. For a decade of easy money and no recession, they looked right.

Then the tide went out. Rates rose and stayed high. Because most of these loans carry **floating rates**, the interest bill for borrowers roughly tripled, and weaker companies started to choke. In late 2025 two of them — First Brands (auto parts) and Tricolor (subprime auto lending) — collapsed into bankruptcy, and it turned out they had **pledged the same collateral to multiple lenders at once**. That is fraud, and it did something worse than lose money: it made every investor wonder whether the *marks* — the quarterly values managers assign to loans

nobody trades — could be trusted at all. As JPMorgan's Jamie Dimon put it, "when you see one cockroach, there are probably more."

At the same time, the newer, retail-facing versions of these funds — sold to ordinary investors with a *promise* of monthly or quarterly cash-out — got hit with more withdrawal requests than they could honor. In the first half of 2026, funds run by Ares, Apollo, and Blue Owl received redemption requests running **two-to-eight times** their built-in limits, and had to **gate**: pay out only a fraction and make everyone wait. The lock-ups worked exactly as designed — but "you can't have your money right now" is not what a monthly-liquidity investor signed up for, and it is how confidence starts to erode.

Here is the strange part, and the crux. Despite all this, the **public** markets — where bonds trade every second — are calm. High-yield bond spreads are near their tightest in years. So which is real: the placid public price, or the mounting private stress? **Our answer is that both are, and that is the whole point.** Private credit is not built to crash; it is built to *grind*. The locked capital that stops a fire-sale also stops price discovery, so problems surface slowly — through rising "quiet defaults," loans switched to paying interest with more IOUs instead of cash, funds gating withdrawals, and the healthy loans leaving first so the leftover pool quietly rots. That is a slow burn, not a bonfire. The real question is not whether private-credit funds blow up — they mostly won't, in one dramatic event — but whether the **banks that lend to them, the insurers that own them, and the global cheap-funding trade that fed them** transmit the slow burn into the wider economy. That is where the rest of this note looks.

§2 What Private Credit Is, and How It Reached $3 Trillion

Definitions first (the note stands alone). *Private credit* is lending to companies by non-bank investment funds, held privately rather than traded on an exchange. *Direct lending* — loans, usually senior and secured, to mid-sized companies, often backing private-equity buyouts — is its largest segment. A *business development company (BDC)* is a fund structure (some publicly traded, some "non-traded") built to hold these loans and pass the interest to investors. An *interval fund* is a similar retail wrapper that offers only periodic (e.g. quarterly) redemptions. *Asset-based finance (ABF)* lends against pools of assets — receivables, equipment, consumer loans — rather than a company's cash flow.

- **Size.** The Financial Stability Board (FSB) and IMF put the invested market at roughly **$1.5–2.0 trillion** at end-2024; Moody's projects AUM **past $2 trillion in 2026 and toward ~$4 trillion by 2030**. Popular "$3 trillion" headlines fold in undrawn "dry powder" and asset-based finance. *We use "≈$1.7–2T invested, ≈$3T inclusive" throughout and flag the definition.* [FSB; Moody's]
- **The growth engine.** Private credit filled the space banks vacated after post-2008 regulation made mid-market lending less attractive, and it thrived because zero rates pushed institutional capital to reach for yield. Direct lending alone now roughly *rivals the entire broadly-syndicated leveraged-loan market* at ≈$1.5–2T. [HedgeCo; Mordor]
- **The managers.** A handful of alternative-asset giants dominate — **Apollo** (whose Athene annuity arm recycles insurance premiums into credit), **Ares** (the largest publicly-traded BDC platform), **Blackstone** (whose BCRED is the largest non-traded BDC), **Blue Owl**, plus KKR, HPS, Golub, and Antares. *(Firm-level credit-AUM figures vary by source and are best read off each manager's own filings; see the Source & Verification Note.)*
- **The retail turn.** The frontier of growth is *semi-liquid* wrappers — non-traded BDCs and interval funds sold to individuals — and a policy push to admit private assets into 401(k) retirement plans. This is precisely where the liquidity mismatch (illiquid loans, redeemable shares) is sharpest, and where 2026's stress concentrated (§6). [PwC]

§3 The Cracks So Far

Defaults — read them as three lenses, never one number. The single most common error in the current commentary is quoting a single default rate. There are (at least) three, measuring different universes:

MEASURE	RATE	WHAT IT CAPTURES	AS OF
Proskauer Private Credit Default Index	**2.73%**	Cash-pay defaults in Proskauer's own tracked book (697 loans, $189.2B)	Q1 2026
Fitch (private-credit universe)	**≈6.0%**	Broader, more distressed universe; record since Fitch began tracking (Aug 2024)	April 2026
S&P "true" rate (incl. LMEs)	**≈5%**	Headline plus *liability-management exercises* and selective defaults — the "quiet defaults"	2026
Moody's baseline (spec-grade)	**<3%**	Rating-agency baseline; sees improvement into year-end	YE2026 est.

The gap between "2.73%" and "6%" is not a contradiction — it is the story. A **liability-management exercise (LME)** is a restructuring that avoids a formal default (an amend-and-extend, a distressed debt exchange); an **LME is a default in substance that doesn't show up in the headline rate.** S&P calls the surge in these "alarming." The direction of travel — Proskauer's index rose from 1.84% (Q3'25) to 2.46% (Q4'25) to 2.73% (Q1'26) — is unambiguous. [Proskauer; Fitch via Bloomberg; S&P; Moody's]

Payment-in-kind (PIK). *PIK* lets a borrower pay interest with more debt instead of cash. Some PIK is healthy (structured into a growth deal); "bad PIK" is a stressed borrower deferring cash it doesn't have. PIK-paying loans are ≈12.8% of BDC loan balances (broadly stable), **but PIK now supplies a rising ≈6–8% of BDC investment income** — non-cash income that flatters reported earnings while cash coverage erodes, a classic way deterioration hides in plain sight. The FSB found that PIK toggles are associated with a 1–2 percentage-point rise in *next-quarter* delinquency, and that roughly **60% of recent private-credit defaults involved a deferral or conversion to PIK** first — i.e. PIK is often the waiting room for default, not an alternative to it. [Alternative Credit Investor; Lord Abbett/EY; FSB]

Marks and the discount signal. Private loans are *marked to model* — valued by the manager, not the market. The cleanest external check is the **discount to net asset value (NAV)** on *publicly-traded* BDCs, where the market votes daily on the private marks. That vote is skeptical: the public BDC index trades **≈17% below NAV** (≈80 cents on the dollar of stated value), with Blue Owl's vehicle ≈−22%, Goldman Sachs BDC (GSBD) at a record ≈−28%, and Ares narrowest (≈3–9% through 2026). The market is saying the marks are too high. [Mercer Capital; Institutional Investor]

The redemption spike (Q1–Q2 2026). Non-traded BDCs and interval funds cap redemptions (typically 5% of NAV per quarter). Multiple funds blew through the caps:

FUND (MANAGER)	REQUESTS	CAP	OUTCOME
Ares Strategic Income (≈$10.7B)	11.6% (Q1) → 14.4% (Q2)	5%	Pro-rated; ≈43% then ≈35% honored
Apollo Debt Solutions BDC	11.2% (Q1) → 16.8% (Q2)	5%	≈45¢/$ (Q1, ≈$730M) → ≈30¢/$ (Q2)
Blue Owl OCIC (≈$34B) / OTIC (≈$5B)	21.9% / 40.7% (Q1)	5%	Gated pro-rata
Cliffwater interval fund (≈$33B)	≈14%	7%	Gated
Blackstone BCRED	≈7.9% of NAV	raised 5%→7%	Limit lifted to 7%, residual ≈0.9% covered by ≈$400M firm/employee capital

The gates held — which is the bull's proof the structure works — but ≈$14 billion of investor money is, in Bloomberg's word, "trapped," and the request-to-cap gap is itself the thing to watch (§14). [Bloomberg; PitchBook; CNBC]

The fraud shock. *First Brands* (Ch. 11, Sept 2025) had ≈**$2.3B of fabricated / double- and triple-pledged receivables**; a federal indictment followed in Jan 2026. UBS booked **>$500M** (via its O'Connor unit, now being wound down); Jefferies flagged **≈$715M** of "questionable receivables." *Tricolor* (Ch. 7, Sept 2025) allegedly double-pledged identical subprime-auto loan pools across warehouse lines (≈$800M); JPMorgan took a **$170M** charge-off and Fifth Third ≈$170–200M. The dollar losses are contained; the damage to *trust in the marks and the collateral* is not. [CNBC; Banking Dive; Bloomberg]

§4 Why This Is Structurally Slower Than 2008 — and Why That Cuts Both Ways

The comparison everyone reaches for is subprime. It is instructive precisely because it is *half* right.

Where the 2008 analogy holds. Rapid credit growth into weaker borrowers; securitization (private-credit CLOs echo the CDOs of 2008); reliance on optimistic, opaque valuations; and layers of intermediation between the source and the use of the money (Jim Chanos's charge). The ECB drew the explicit scale parallel: US private credit ≈$1.4T at end-2024 is *comparable in size to the ≈$1.5T subprime market* of the mid-2000s.

Where it breaks — and this is decisive.

- **Leverage.** Subprime securitization ran on ≈20× warehouse leverage; private-credit funds are generally far less levered (though the IMF warns leverage hides in "multiple layers"). Lower leverage means smaller forced-selling multipliers.
- **Funding.** 2008 froze because the system funded long, illiquid assets with overnight wholesale money that ran. Private credit is funded by **locked-up, closed-end LP capital** — the classic run channel is largely absent. This is the strongest "safer" argument, and it is genuine.
- **Scale in context.** At ≈$1.7–2T, private credit is, on common estimates, only ≈**3% of total US household-plus-business debt** — versus mortgages at ≈60% of debt at the 2006–07 peak. The base is smaller relative to the economy. *(The 3% figure is a market-commentary estimate, not a single official statistic; we use it as an order-of-magnitude anchor.)*
- **Monitoring.** Direct lenders hold the borrower relationship and (sometimes) maintenance covenants, and can restructure earlier than an atomized securitization chain.

The catch. The very thing that prevents a 2008-style mark-to-market cascade — no daily marks, no forced sales, no price discovery — is also what *suppresses visibility of the losses*. A calm mark is not a small loss; it may be an unobserved one. The 2024 IMF GFSR named the specific hazard: a **"first-mover advantage"** in stale-valued semi-liquid funds, where early redeemers exit at inflated NAVs and stragglers eat the correction — the incentive that turns an orderly problem into a run. So the honest read is not "private credit is safe." It is: **private credit will not crash the way 2008 did; it will bleed the way the S&L crisis did** — slow, forbearance-laden, extend-and-pretend, losses smeared across years rather than detonated in a quarter. The nearest live template is the 2015–16 energy-credit episode, when the Third Avenue Focused Credit Fund gated and then liquidated — a sector-contained preview of the liquidity-mismatch failure now feared at scale.

---

§5 Transmission I: Banks and the NDFI Plumbing

Banks mostly do not hold private-credit loans directly. They do something that matters more for contagion: they **lend to the funds** — subscription lines, NAV facilities, leverage. That is the first pipe.

- **The macro series.** Federal Reserve H.8 "loans to non-depository financial institutions (NDFIs)" reached **≈$1,989 billion** for the week ending June 24, 2026 — it first crossed $1T in early 2024 (≈$323B in 2015) and has compounded at ≈17–18%/yr since 2015 versus ≈4% for total bank loans. (NDFI is broader than private credit — it includes mortgage and consumer intermediaries, PE funds, and insurers — so it overstates the pure private-credit slice, but it is the pipe.) [Fed H.8; ABA; FDIC]
- **The private-credit slice.** Direct bank lending *to private-credit funds* is estimated at **≈$300B** (Moody's), with the FSB citing ≈$220B of committed lines but noting commercial estimates of $270–500B — *the spread between those figures is itself the evidence of opacity.* Exposure is concentrated: the four largest US banks (JPMorgan, Bank of America, Wells Fargo, Citi) each carry >$100B of NDFI loans and together ≈48% of the total. [FSB; Advisor Perspectives; S&P Global]
- **Named exposures.** JPMorgan ≈**$22.2B** of private-credit-fund financing (Moody's, mid-2025; note: this is financing exposure, not a loss) and has since restricted new private-credit lending after marking down some loans; **Deutsche Bank** disclosed ≈**$30B** (€25.9B, ≈5% of its loan book) in March 2026; UK banks carry ≈**£173B** of banking-book exposure to private-market funds and sponsor-backed corporates (Bank of England). [Fool; Bloomberg; BoE]
- **The regional-bank node.** Zions and Western Alliance disclosed fraud-tainted loans in October 2025 (Zions a ≈$50M charge-off; a related investor group tied to ≈$270M of troubled debt across lenders) — small in dollars, but a reminder that the transmission to *smaller* banks with thinner capital is where a contained problem becomes a regional scare. [Bloomberg; Reuters]

The feedback loop bears fear: redemptions force markdowns → stale marks get exposed → banks pull NDFI credit lines to protect themselves → funds lose leverage precisely when they need it → more forced sales. April 2026's Senior Loan Officer survey already shows banks tightening standards on every NDFI loan category.

---

§6 Transmission II: Insurers, Annuities & the Retail Wrappers

If banks are the first pipe, **insurance balance sheets are the reservoir** — and the amplifier bears worry about most.

- **The insurer channel.** Private-credit assets at US life insurers grew >20% in 2025 to ≈**10% of total assets — and >15% at private-equity-affiliated insurers** (Athene/Apollo, Global Atlantic/KKR); the IMF, measuring the broader private-and-structured-credit bucket, puts it near **35% of North American insurers' investment portfolios**. These insurers pair long-dated annuity liabilities with higher-yielding private credit — often credit *originated by the same manager* that owns the insurer, a conflict the IMF singles out for "special attention."

The IMF warns the instruments are frequently complex, internally- or affiliate-rated, and carry thinner capital buffers than their risk implies. Under stress, capital rules can force **pro-cyclical selling** — the opposite of the locked-capital shock-absorber the funds enjoy. The ECB's stress scenario put euro-area pension-fund losses at −5–6% of assets and insurers ≈−4%. [IMF GFSR; ECB FSR]

- **The offshore layer.** A growing share of these liabilities is reinsured through Bermuda and the Cayman Islands, where capital and disclosure regimes differ — adding a cross-border opacity layer regulators are only beginning to map. *(Directionally well-established; precise sizing is not cleanly sourced and we do not assert a figure.)*
- **The retail wrappers.** The fastest-growing distribution channel — non-traded BDCs, interval funds, and the push of private assets into 401(k) retirement plans (an August-2025 executive order directs regulators to open defined-contribution plans to private equity, private credit, and other alternatives, typically via target-date funds) — is structurally the most fragile: it promises periodic liquidity against assets that have none. The policy tension is stark: the retail door is being *opened* at the same moment the redemption plumbing is being *stress-tested*. This is where the Q1–Q2 2026 gating happened (§3), and where a confidence event would first show. Boaz Weinstein's phrase — "the financial alchemy of promising liquidity that isn't there" — is the bear thesis in seven words. [PwC; Bloomberg/CNBC]

The distinction that matters: the *institutional, locked-up* core of private credit is a shock absorber. The *retail, semi-liquid, insurer-funded* periphery is a shock *amplifier*. The market's growth has been fastest exactly in the periphery.

---

§7 Global Plumbing: Japan, the Carry Trade & JGBs

The pipe that runs through Tokyo — indirect, slow-moving, and the most under-priced link in the chain.

There is no contract between a private-credit borrower in Ohio and a Japanese life insurer. The connection is **the global price of money**, and it runs through two channels.

Channel one — the yen as the world's funding currency. For two decades the Bank of Japan pinned interest rates near zero, making the yen the cheapest borrowing on earth. Global investors borrowed cheap yen and deployed it into higher-yielding assets — the **carry trade** — and levered credit strategies were downstream beneficiaries of that ocean of cheap liquidity. As the BoJ normalizes (it exited negative rates and yield-curve control in 2024, then hiked from 0.25% to 0.75% by December 2025 and to ≈1.0% by mid-2026), the cost of the yen funding leg rises and the carry unwinds. The world got a one-week preview in **August 2024**: a partial unwind, triggered by a BoJ hike into a weak US jobs print, sent the Nikkei down ≈12% in a single session (its worst since 1987) and spiked the VIX toward 65 before it reversed. Crucially, the BIS's post-mortem found that the *speculative* carry legs unwound then — but the far larger *structural* Japanese positions (the pension and life-insurer foreign-bond books) largely did **not**. The big, slow repatriation is still ahead, not behind.

Channel two — the vanishing Japanese buyer. Japanese life insurers, banks, and pensions are enormous buyers of *foreign* credit — US and European investment-grade, leveraged loans, CLO tranches, and increasingly private-credit allocations — precisely because domestic bonds paid nothing. That premise has broken:

- The **10-year JGB (Japanese government bond) yield is ≈2.8%** — its highest since the late 1990s, up from ≈2.1% at the start of 2026. A Japanese institution can now hit its return target *at home, unhedged, with zero credit or currency risk.*
- With the US–Japan rate gap wide, the cost of hedging the currency on foreign bonds guts the hedged return — pushing Japanese capital to **repatriate**. Japan sold ≈**$30 billion of US Treasuries in Q1 2026**, the fastest pace in four years.

- The cautionary template already exists: **Norinchukin**, the Japanese agricultural bank and one of the world's largest CLO holders, booked a **≈¥1.8 trillion (≈$12.6B) net loss for FY2024** unwinding foreign sovereign bonds after wrong-way rate bets — its CEO resigned, and it announced plans to shed ¥10T+ of US and European bonds. That is exactly what forced selling from this cohort looks like.

Why it matters for private credit. Rising JGB yields do two things at once: they **raise the global risk-free discount rate** against which every illiquid, higher-yielding private loan is implicitly priced, and they **remove a structural marginal buyer** of the foreign risk-credit that private-credit-adjacent markets depend on. Neither is a same-day contagion wire — this is a slow tightening lever, not a detonator. But it is also the fast fuse in the tail: a *disorderly* carry unwind (BoJ forced to hike faster, yen surging) is one of the three events that could turn §12's slow burn into §13's crunch, because it hits global risk assets in days, not quarters. Japan is not the cause of private credit's cracks. It is the clamp that can tighten them — quietly for years, or violently in a week.

---

§8 Accelerant I: The AI & Data-Center Financing Loop

Private credit did not merely lend into the AI boom — it became the boom's balance sheet, and its single most concentrated bet.

Definitions: a *hyperscaler* is a large cloud/AI operator (Meta, Microsoft, Oracle, Amazon); a *special-purpose vehicle (SPV)* is a standalone entity that holds one project's assets and debt off the sponsor's balance sheet.

- **Private credit is now a primary financier of the AI data-center buildout.** Meta's ≈$30B financing for its "Hyperion" data center in Louisiana — the largest such private deal on record — was structured as a large private-placement (144A) bond offering led by **Blue Owl (which took an ≈80% equity stake) and PIMCO**, with a Meta entity holding ≈20%. Beyond Meta, this private data-center debt market — 144A placements plus direct lending — has grown quickly, with tens of billions more raised (≈$40B of 144A placements in recent months alone). [Meta/Blue Owl; Bisnow]
- **The circularity.** The structure closes a loop: hyperscalers design the projects, private-credit funds finance them, and **insurers hold the paper** — US life insurers now have on the order of $1T tied to private credit (§6). It is the same manager-insurer nexus as §6, now wrapped around a single, correlated, capital-intensive theme with an unproven return on investment.
- **The concentration.** Private credit's most concentrated corporate sector is software and technology, where **≈46% of software loans mature within four years** — precisely the borrowers whose business models AI could disrupt. The industry is therefore long the AI buildout *and* long the incumbents AI threatens: correlated risk on both sides of the trade.
- **The crack already showing.** The value of some AI-specific collateral — notably the GPUs backing certain facilities — began falling in **early 2026**; lenders are tightening leasing and debt terms on "shifting sentiment," and **Blue Owl stepped back from Oracle's ≈$10B Michigan project.** Axios's framing: "private credit woes could become data-center difficulties." [Axios; DCD]
- **Why it exacerbates.** The AI capex boom is at once *masking* the weak real economy (it is carrying GDP while hiring stalls) and *concentrating* private credit's risk into one correlated bet. If the capex cycle cools, private credit is the financing layer that absorbs the markdown first — and the insurers behind it take the second-round loss the ECB warned about (§6).

---

§9 Accelerant II: The Frozen Private-Equity Exit Machine

Private credit's borrowers are mostly private equity's companies — and private equity has lost the ability to sell them.

Definitions: *DPI (distributions to paid-in)* is cash actually returned to fund investors relative to what they put in; a *NAV loan* is a loan secured against a fund's whole portfolio of companies; a *continuation vehicle* is a new fund a manager sets up to buy an asset from its own older fund — selling to itself, in effect.

- **The exit routes are shut.** Most direct-lending loans finance **private-equity-owned companies**, and since 2022 the exits that repay them — IPO, strategic sale, sponsor-to-sponsor M&A — have largely frozen. Industry distributions have run **below 15% of NAV for four straight years, an industry record**; for 2019-vintage funds the median **DPI was just 22% five years in**. [Allianz; uplevered]
- **The workaround is more leverage.** Unable to exit, sponsors lean on **NAV loans (≈$100B in 2024)**, **continuation vehicles (≈75% of the largest PE firms have used at least one)**, and a record **>$225B secondaries market (2025, +40% year-over-year)** — devices that defer the reckoning and, in the NAV-loan case, stack leverage on top of leverage. [CAIA; Reed Smith]
- **The vicious loop with private credit.** The refinancing channel that has funded PE distributions since 2023 *is* private credit — and private-credit stress is now **closing that channel exactly when it is most needed.** Meanwhile ≈**40% of private-credit borrowers already run negative free cash flow** (per the IMF's October-2025 GFSR, up markedly from earlier this decade), so the loans cannot be repaid out of operations either. [IMF GFSR Oct 2025]
- **Why it exacerbates.** A private loan is meant to be repaid when the sponsor sells the company. If the sponsor *cannot* sell, the loan is extended, amended, or switched to PIK — pushing duration and default risk out in time rather than resolving it. The PE-and-private-credit symbiosis that powered the boom now transmits stress both ways: frozen exits trap the loans, and stressed loans freeze the exits.

---

§10 Accelerant III: Synthetic Risk Transfers and Circular Leverage

The pipe almost no one outside the regulators is watching — where risk sold out of the banks quietly comes back in.

Definition: a *synthetic risk transfer (SRT)* — also "significant risk transfer" — is a trade in which a bank keeps a loan portfolio on its books but buys credit protection on it from an outside investor, freeing regulatory capital; the investor takes the first-loss risk for a fee.

- **Scale and speed.** The IMF estimates banks synthetically transferred **more than €1 trillion of assets between 2016 and 2024.** Euro-area corporate SRTs alone exceeded **€300B in 2024 (≈5× the 2018 level)**, and US issuance — smaller — grew an estimated **≈400% in 2024.** [BIS; IMF]
- **Who buys. Credit funds — private-credit managers and hedge funds — are the main SRT investors, accounting for more than half of the trades since 2016,** frequently using *embedded leverage* to lift returns. [IMF]
- **The "circles of risks."** The FSB's own phrase. Risk transferred *out* of the banking system can circle *back*, because **the same banks issuing SRTs often finance the funds buying them** — so the capital relief is partly illusory and the leverage becomes interconnected across institutions. The Basel Committee, BIS, and FSB all published on this in 2026, focused on rollover risk, investor concentration, and this back-leverage. [FSB; BIS]
- **Why it exacerbates.** An SRT is the same NDFI back-leverage entanglement as §5 — bank lends to fund, fund takes the bank's credit risk, bank finances the fund's purchase — but *synthetic* and even less visible. In a stress the first-loss investor (a credit fund) absorbs losses while still owing its financing bank, and the "capital relief" the bank booked can reverse precisely when capital is scarcest.

---

§11 Accelerant IV: Tariffs and the Margin Squeeze

Beneath the financial plumbing, a real-economy shock is thinning the cash flows every private loan depends on.

- **Tariffs land hardest on private credit's borrowers.** The 2026 trade environment hits mid-market companies that, unlike large caps, **lack the pricing power and sourcing flexibility** to pass on or re-route higher input costs — so the hit flows straight to operating margins. S&P's title is the summary: "Tariffs, Slow Growth, and Uncertainty Amplify Risks for Private Credit." [S&P Global]
- **The damage is already in the data. 61% of private-credit borrowers reported weaker EBITDA margins over the past year,** the largest cluster (≈35%) seeing contraction of 0 to −250 basis points (Morningstar DBRS) — and, again, ≈**40% run negative free cash flow** (IMF). [Morningstar DBRS; IMF GFSR Oct 2025]
- **Why it exacerbates.** Every other factor in this note works through *financing* — discount rates, leverage, liquidity. Tariffs work through the *income statement*: they shrink the borrower cash flow that services floating-rate debt at a ≈3.6% base rate, tightening interest coverage from the operating side while §12's higher-for-longer rate path tightens it from the cost side. It is the pincer that turns "higher-for-longer" from a headwind into a default driver.

---

§12 How It Most Likely Plays Out (Base Case)

Our base case: a protracted shakeout over ≈4–8 quarters, contained to a credit-quality problem rather than a liquidity-system failure. This is also, broadly, the consensus of the IMF's and FSB's "serious but not yet systemic" framing, Powell's "no broader credit issue," and Moody's improving baseline — with the bears (Weinstein, Chanos) dissenting that the calm is manufactured.

The mechanism of the slow burn, in sequence:

1. **Defaults and "bad PIK" keep grinding higher** as floating-rate borrowers roll into a *higher-for-longer* rate world (§below). Headline rates stay deceptively low; the "true" rate (with LMEs) keeps climbing.
2. **Adverse selection concentrates the rot.** Healthy borrowers refinance out (into the reviving syndicated-loan and bond markets); the weak stay. The residual fund books quietly deteriorate even as averages look stable.
3. **Marks drift down quarter by quarter**, validated belatedly by the public-BDC discount. Redemption gates stay up; capital slowly rotates from private credit into liquid public bonds — a *rotation*, not a fire sale.
4. **Banks tighten NDFI lines at the margin**, and mid-sized companies that depended on private credit face a **credit squeeze** — the real-economy cost, felt as slower hiring and investment rather than a market crash.

The rate twist that makes this cycle different. The 2024 consensus assumed rate cuts would rescue floating-rate borrowers. That relief has been *withdrawn*: the Fed's June-2026 projections lifted the year-end median to **3.8%** (from 3.4% in March), erased the cuts markets had priced, and a bloc of participants now projects *hikes*. With SOFR ≈3.62% and the funds rate at 3.50–3.75%, borrowers get **no reprieve** just as coverage ratios thin. This extends the workout and raises the default path — but it does not, by itself, convert grind into rupture.

Why not a rupture, in the base case. The maturity wall is *deferred, not gone*: aggressive refinancing collapsed 2026–27 leveraged-loan maturities to ≈$59B, pushing the real wall to **2028 (≈$301B)**. That buys the workout time. Locked capital keeps preventing forced liquidation. The gates hold. The result is a long, quiet erosion — uncomfortable, but survivable for the system.

Signposts that we are on the base-case path (not the bear path): public BDC discounts stabilize rather than widen; redemption requests recede back toward the caps; HY spreads stay contained below ≈400 bps; no *second* fraud/mark-credibility event; the yen-carry unwind stays gradual.

§13 How Bad It Could Realistically Get (Bear Case, Bounded)

The credible worst case is a mid-market credit crunch plus an insurer/pension earnings hit and a genuine confidence event — not a 2008-style banking-solvency crisis. We bound it deliberately, because the un-bounded "it's the next subprime" claim fails on the mechanics in §4.

The bear mechanism (how the fast fuses light):

1. A **redemption run** — the request-to-cap gap widens further and one marquee fund gates *hard* or suspends → confidence cascades across the semi-liquid complex as the "first-mover advantage" turns rational individual exits into a collective run.
2. A **mark-credibility shock** — a *third* First-Brands-style fraud, or a large bank marking its NDFI book down sharply → the market stops believing *any* private marks and reprices the whole opaque complex at once.
3. A **carry unwind** — the BoJ forced to move faster, the yen surges, global de-risking spikes HY spreads and the VIX in days (§7).

The danger is **coincidence**: any one of these is absorbable; all three within a quarter is the scenario that overwhelms the shock-absorbers. And the four accelerants of §8–§11 load the dice — a cooling AI-capex cycle (§8) marking down the most concentrated sector, frozen PE exits (§9) trapping the loans, synthetic-risk-transfer back-leverage (§10) amplifying the bank feedback, and tariffs (§11) hollowing borrower cash flow — so that any single fuse is likelier to catch. In that world, the insurer channel flips from reservoir to amplifier (pro-cyclical selling under capital rules), the NDFI feedback loop bites (banks pull lines into falling marks), and the mid-market credit squeeze deepens into a genuine credit crunch that drags growth.

Why it is still bounded — the numbers that cap the tail:

- Private credit is ≈**3% of US household-and-business debt** — too small a base to be a system-wide solvency event the way ≈60%-of-debt mortgages were.
- The ECB's own stress scenario contains **bank losses at ≤1.3% of equity** even as pensions take −5–6% and insurers ≈−4% — i.e. a hit to *savers and returns*, not to *bank solvency*.
- The funding channel that made 2008 systemic (overnight wholesale runs) is largely absent; locked capital genuinely slows the cascade.

So "how bad" resolves to: **a wealth and growth event — years of sub-par returns for the LPs, pensioners and insurers who own this paper, a credit crunch for mid-sized employers, regional-bank scares, and a volatility spike — but with the banking core intact.** The genuine unbounded tail requires the opacity to be hiding *far* larger losses than disclosed (possible, unknowable by construction) *and* the three fuses to light together. That combination is, in our assessment, low-probability but high-impact — a real tail to understand, not the central expectation.

A gap we flag honestly: no credible source offers an aggregate system-wide dollar loss estimate for 2026–27; the quantified work is default-rate and scenario-percentage based. Anyone quoting a precise total-loss number is guessing.

§14 What to Watch Next (The Dashboard)

The forward indicators that distinguish *healing* from *worsening*, with current readings:

INDICATOR	NOW	WORSENING →	HEALING →
Public BDC discount to NAV	≈17% (≈80¢)	widening past 2022 lows	converging toward par
Redemption request vs cap	≈2–8× caps (Q1–Q2'26)	a hard gate / suspension	requests recede to caps
PIK share of BDC income	≈6–8%	rising with non-accruals	rolling over
Default rate (true, incl. LMEs)	≈5%	toward 8% (software/AI)	back below 3%
Bank→NDFI loan growth (H.8)	≈$1.99T, still rising	*stall/reversal* (banks pull back)	steady, orderly
HY OAS	≈267 bps	breakout toward 400–500	range-bound
10Y JGB / yen	≈2.8% / carry intact	disorderly spike, yen surge	gradual, telegraphed
Regional-bank stress	−10%+ from peak	fresh fraud/charge-off	stabilizes
Data-center collateral / AI capex	values softening (since Jan'26)	lenders retreat, deals pulled	leasing/terms firm up
PE distributions (DPI)	<15% of NAV, 4 yrs	exits stay frozen, NAV loans rise	IPO/M&A window reopens
SRT issuance & back-leverage	US +≈400% ('24)	concentration/rollover strain	issuance orderly, dispersed
Borrower margins / negative FCF	61% weaker; ≈40% neg-FCF	tariffs deepen contraction	margins stabilize

The tell that the regime is shifting from slow to fast is *co-movement*: the JGB, HY-spread, and BDC-discount signals moving together, in the same week, is worth more than any one of them moving alone.

§15 House View

The call. Private credit's first real stress test resolves, most probably, as a **multi-quarter workout, not a crash** — because the asset class is engineered to grind, not to rupture, and the Q1–Q2 2026 gates proved the plumbing held under real pressure. The realistic worst case is a **mid-market credit crunch, an insurer/pension earnings hit, regional-bank scares, and a volatility spike — with the banking core intact** — reserving true-systemic outcomes for the low-probability case where hidden losses are far larger than disclosed *and* a redemption run, a mark-credibility shock, and a carry unwind coincide. **Confidence: moderate.** The structural read, the regulator consensus, and the base-rate history agree; the genuine unknown — by construction — is what the un-marked books actually hold.

What would change our view (observable, with thresholds): a *second* marquee fraud or a large bank taking a sharp NDFI markdown (→ mark-credibility shock, escalate); the public-BDC discount widening decisively past its 2022 lows while a fund gates hard (→ run risk); HY OAS breaking 400 bps (→ public market confirming the

stress); a *disorderly* yen move with the 10Y JGB gapping higher (→ the fast fuse). Conversely, discounts converging and requests receding toward caps would confirm the benign base case.

The steelman against us. The bears (Weinstein, Chanos) may be right that the calm is *manufactured* — that stale marks are hiding a subprime-scale hole, that the "first-mover advantage" makes a run inevitable once it starts, and that the bank/insurer/retail entanglement is denser than any regulator has mapped. If the opacity is concealing losses an order of magnitude beyond the disclosed default rates, our "bounded" tail is not bounded. We hold the base case because the leverage, funding, and scale mechanics genuinely differ from 2008 — but a thesis worth publishing is one worth trying to break, and this is where it breaks.

What the analysis implies — a lens, not a recommendation. This note is written to explain the crisis, not to advise anyone to act on it, and it makes no recommendation to buy, sell, or avoid any security or asset. Three understandings fall out of the work. First, the *liquid* markets hold the truth the private marks withhold: public high-yield spreads and listed-BDC discounts reprice daily, so they — not the quarterly NAVs — are where deterioration surfaces first, and they are the honest place to watch this play out. Second, *sequence* matters more than level — a gradual climb in defaults and redemption gates is the base case, while the risk of a fast break lies in the three fuses of §13 lighting together. Third, because a private-credit crunch is fundamentally a *liquidity-tightening* event, its most consequential spillover to the wider economy and markets runs through financial conditions — the same net-liquidity and global-money-supply lens through which the broader macro picture is best read. The aim throughout is comprehension of what is happening and what could happen next, so that a reader can judge it for themselves.

§16 Disclosures

Information only. This material is published by TON618 Capital for information purposes only. Nothing here is an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any security, fund interest, or digital asset, and nothing here is personalized investment advice or a recommendation regarding any instrument.

Publisher's exclusion. All research is published solely as general, impersonal information of regular circulation. It is not tailored to the objectives or circumstances of any individual and is not issued in connection with compensation from any client. The Fund has no clients and distributes all research free of charge. On that basis it publishes in reliance on the publisher's exclusion from the definition of "investment adviser" under the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 (§202(a)(11)(D); cf. *Lowe v. SEC*, 472 U.S. 181 (1985)).

Registration & conflicts. TON618 Capital is not registered as an investment adviser or broker-dealer in any capacity. The Fund is a Bitcoin fund and may hold or transact in the securities or digital assets it discusses; material conflicts are disclosed where they exist. As of the date of this note the Fund holds **no position in any private-credit manager, BDC, bank, or other single security named herein**; it maintains a strategic Bitcoin allocation, and to the extent this note bears on global liquidity conditions that inform that allocation, the reader should weigh that as a material interest. The Fund receives no compensation from any party in connection with this research.

Use of AI. Artificial intelligence is used in the creation of this research. All methodology and data integrity are reviewed and approved before publication by TON618 Capital's Chief Investment Officer, **Keyth Beck**; errors may nonetheless occur, and readers should verify independently.

CFA. This report was prepared to align with CFA Institute analytical standards (methodology only). CFA® and Chartered Financial Analyst® are registered trademarks owned by CFA Institute. That reference describes the analytical framework applied; it does not imply the report was prepared, reviewed, or authored by a CFA charterholder, and the report is not issued, reviewed, endorsed, certified, or approved by — nor affiliated with — CFA Institute.

Risk & feedback. Past performance is not indicative of future results. Digital assets and equities are volatile and may result in total loss of capital. Corrections and feedback are welcome — please direct them to CIO **Keyth Beck** at **keyth@ton618capital.com**.

Source & Verification Note

This note synthesizes five independent research sweeps (market structure & stress, transmission channels, historical analogues & expert positions, forward catalysts, and a dedicated pass on the four accelerants of §8–§11) and was then run through adversarial claim-verification passes before release. That pass confirmed the large majority of the note's ~60 discrete numeric and attribution claims against primary sources and corrected six: the H.8 NDFI series first crossed $1T in **early 2024** (not mid-2025), compounding at ≈17–18%/yr since 2015 (not 23%/yr since 2010); **GSBD is Goldman Sachs BDC, not a Golub vehicle** (the ≈−28% record discount stands); the FSB private-credit report is dated **May 6, 2026** (not June); the Apollo redemption row now separates Q1 (≈45¢/$) from the worse Q2 (≈30¢/$); the Blackstone BCRED mechanic was a repurchase-limit lift to 7% with the residual covered by ≈$400M of firm/employee capital (not a simple 5%-cap "meet"); and the PIK figure is stated cleanly as PIK's share of BDC investment income (≈6–8%). **Current market levels are FRED-dated July 7–8, 2026:** fed funds target 3.50–3.75%, effective fed funds 3.63%, SOFR 3.62%, high-yield OAS ≈267 bps, investment-grade OAS ≈76 bps, 10-year Treasury 4.55%, VIX ≈16.1.

High-confidence, multiply-sourced: the Q1–Q2 2026 redemption-gate episode (Ares, Apollo, Blue Owl, Cliffwater, Blackstone) and its figures; the First Brands and Tricolor bankruptcies, fraud allegations, and named bank losses (UBS, Jefferies, JPMorgan, Fifth Third); the Fed H.8 NDFI figure (≈$1.99T, wk. ending 6/24/26); Deutsche Bank's ≈$30B disclosure and the BoE's ≈£173B; the regulator escalation (IMF GFSR Apr 2026, FSB May 6 2026, ECB May 2026, BoE July 2026); Dimon's "cockroach" warning (Oct 2025) *and* his separate "probably not systemic" qualifier; Powell's "no broader credit issue"; the three-lens default framing (Proskauer 2.73%, Fitch ≈6%, S&P "true" ≈5%, Moody's <3% baseline); the June-2026 Fed dot-plot shift to a 3.8% year-end median; and, in the accelerant sections, Meta's ≈$30B Hyperion financing (a 144A private placement led by Blue Owl and PIMCO, Blue Owl ≈80%) and Blue Owl's Oracle-Michigan pullback (§8), PE distributions <15% of NAV for four years, ≈22% median DPI for 2019-vintage funds, and NAV loans ≈$100B (§9), the IMF's >€1T SRT estimate with US issuance +≈400% in 2024 and the FSB's "circles of risks" framing (§10), and the borrower-margin readings (§11). The accelerant pass corrected four items: the §8 data-center financing runs through 144A private placements plus direct lending (not "off-balance-sheet SPVs"), and only Blue Owl and PIMCO are named where sourced; the AI-collateral softening is scoped to GPU-backed facilities; the 61%/35% margin stat is attributed to **Morningstar DBRS** (not S&P Global, whose report supplies the tariff framing); and the ≈40%-negative-FCF figure is attributed to the **IMF's October-2025 GFSR**, with the precise prior-year comparator dropped as unverified.

Deliberately hedged, not asserted as hard fact: firm-level *credit-AUM* rankings for individual managers (best read off each firm's own filings — our figures are indicative); the offshore-reinsurance sizing (channel is well-established, precise magnitude is not cleanly sourced); Ares's self-reported <1bp historical loss rate (manager-sourced, treated skeptically); conflicting private-credit recovery-rate studies (≈33% vs ≈69% — the literature genuinely disagrees); and the more environment-specific macro backdrop (the identity of the Fed chair and the specific inflation trigger behind the hawkish turn), which we reference only as context, leaning on the dot-plot data rather than the narrative. No credible source offers an aggregate system-wide dollar-loss estimate for 2026–27; we decline to invent one.

Version 1.1 · analyst: TON618 Thematic Research.