

Understanding the complexity premium in lower middle market asset-backed specialty finance

For institutional investors evaluating private credit, one of the most persistent misconceptions is that a higher return must simply be compensation for higher expected loss. That intuition is directionally useful in commoditized markets, where assets are standardized and price is a relatively transparent summary of risk. It is less reliable in lower middle market asset-backed specialty finance (ABF), where the return premium can reflect not only credit risk, but also the cost and scarcity of sourcing, structuring, monitoring, servicing, and managing highly customized transactions.



Jay Braden

Chief Executive Officer,
Co-Chief Investment Officer
Mesirow Alternative Credit



Tim Joyce

Co-Chief Investment Officer
Mesirow Alternative Credit

The central point is straightforward: a wider spread is not, by itself, proof of higher expected losses. It may instead be compensation for complexity, illiquidity, operational intensity, and limited competition. The investment question is therefore not “How wide is the spread?” but “What exactly is the spread paying for, and what controls convert that spread into risk-adjusted return?”

In plain English, a complexity premium is the additional yield an investor may earn for providing capital to transactions that are difficult to source, analyze, structure, document, monitor, or manage. It is compensation for the specialized expertise and operating infrastructure required to understand and control the investment. It is not necessarily compensation for a higher probability of default or a higher expected loss. This is distinct from an illiquidity premium, which compensates investors for committing capital to investments that cannot be readily sold.

Decomposing the spread

Expected loss is only one component of the spread in ABF. In traditional corporate lending, expected loss is often framed as probability of default multiplied by loss given default. In ABF, the analysis is more granular. The lender must assess both the specialty-finance platform and the underlying collateral pool: origination quality, servicing, collections, delinquencies, prepayments, recoveries and the legal enforceability of the lender’s rights. The structure then determines how much of that collateral performance must deteriorate before the lender’s principal is impaired.

A transaction can be operationally difficult without being proportionately more loss-prone. A \$25 million bilateral facility may require as much legal work, data integration, collateral analysis, and ongoing surveillance as a much larger transaction. A large bank or scaled private-credit platform may rationally decline that opportunity because the fee and spread do not justify the fixed cost of execution. A specialized manager, however,

may be able to perform the work efficiently and earn a premium that reflects the scarcity of that capability.

The lower middle market amplifies this effect. Facilities in this segment often range from \$15 million to \$75 million and involve specialty-finance companies that are either too small or too operationally complex to access the public securitization markets efficiently, while also falling below the transaction-size thresholds of many large credit funds. The result is a market with less competition, more bilateral negotiation, and greater opportunity to obtain favorable economics and structural protections. The premium is not “free yield”. Rather, it is payment for doing work that many potential lenders cannot or will not do.

Why asset-backed structure changes the risk equation

ABF is not simply direct lending with different collateral. In sponsor-backed direct lending, underwriting typically centers on a single company’s enterprise value, leverage, adjusted EBITDA, and refinancing or exit prospects. In ABF, the lender underwrites a platform’s ability to originate and service assets, often a pool of financial assets which includes tens of thousands or even millions of loans, leases, receivables, or other contractual cash flows. That creates a different set of risks and potential protections.

Granularity reduces idiosyncratic exposure. A borrower’s financial performance remains important, as they originate, service, and report on the collateral. But the repayment source is primarily tied to a pool of collateral with many underlying obligors, across several vintages, with diversification criteria for geographies, source of collateral, use of proceeds, and several other concentration limits that ensure that diversification.

Structures are also designed to reduce loss severity. Asset-backed facilities typically incorporate several protective features, including a lien on assets held in bankruptcy-remote special purpose vehicles, collateral eligibility criteria, conservative advance rates, covenants, and deposit account control arrangements. These features are designed to keep collateral and cash flows within a controlled structure and to provide early-warning and intervention rights before a problem becomes a realized principal loss.

Headline yield should not be evaluated independently from advance rates, eligibility rules, concentration limits, first-loss capital, cash waterfalls, servicing arrangements, and lender remedies.

Consider a simplified illustration. If a lender advances \$80 against \$100 of eligible collateral, the structure begins with a 20% collateral cushion. On top of that, the expected cashflow from the \$100 of collateral can be \$120, or 1.2x the collateral value, after losses. If the collateral pool experiences a 10% loss, \$108 of cash flow remains (\$90 @ 1.2x), which is still substantially more than the \$80 loan balance before considering ongoing collections, recoveries, servicing, and other structural protections. A high spread paired with conservative leverage and strong cash controls in an ABF transaction can produce a different risk profile compared to a high spread on an unsecured or even a senior secured holding company loan.

The manager is the control system

The complexity premium is only attractive if the manager can underwrite and manage the complexity. The same features that create opportunity can create losses: weak servicing, poor data quality, commingled cash, excessive advance rates, concentration, correlated stress across a collateral pool, or delayed intervention.

For this reason, institutional diligence should focus on the operating system behind the portfolio. Relevant questions include:

- How frequently are loan-level and pool-level data received and reconciled?
- Are eligibility tests, advance rates, and concentration limits adjusted when performance deteriorates?
- Does the lender control collection accounts and cash waterfalls?
- Are backup servicers identified and actionable?
- Does underwriting stress both collateral performance and platform-level liquidity?
- Can the manager demonstrate recovery experience across cycles?

Conclusion

In lower middle market asset-backed specialty finance, wider spreads do not automatically mean higher expected losses. They may reflect a market’s compensation for small transaction sizes, bespoke structuring, operational intensity, illiquidity, limited competition, and the specialized expertise required to manage millions of underlying contracts.

The right conclusion is not that complexity eliminates risk. It is that complexity can be the source of return when it creates a barrier to entry and when the manager has the infrastructure to control the associated risks. For institutional investors, the analytical task is to separate spread from expected loss, and then determine whether the manager is being paid to accept risk, or being paid to perform work that others cannot efficiently execute.

About Mesirow

Mesirow is an independent, employee-owned financial services firm founded in 1937. Headquartered in Chicago, with offices around the world, we serve clients through a personal, custom approach to reaching financial goals and acting as a force for social good. With capabilities spanning Private Capital & Currency, Capital Markets & Investment Banking, and Advisory Services, we invest in what matters: our clients, our communities and our culture. To learn more, visit [mesirow.com](https://www.mesirow.com), follow us on [LinkedIn](#) and subscribe to [Spark](#), our quarterly newsletter.

For institutional investors. Information presented is for informational purposes only and does not intend to make an offer or solicitation for investment in any holdings. Nothing contained herein constitutes an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy an interest in any Mesirow investment vehicle. Any offer can only be made to Qualified and/or "accredited" investors as appropriately defined in the Offering Memorandum particular to any investment. The Memorandum contains important information concerning risk factors and other material aspects of the investment and should be read carefully before an investment decision is made. All investments involve risk and unless otherwise stated, are not guaranteed. Be sure to consult with a tax professional before implementing any investment strategy. | United Kingdom Investors: In the United Kingdom, this communication is directed only at persons who fall within the definition of a "professional client" as defined in COBS 3.5 of the FCA handbook. | Bastion is a division of Mesirow Financial Holdings, Inc. ("MFHI"). Bastion is an SEC-registered investment advisor. Mesirow refers to Mesirow Financial Holdings, Inc. and its divisions, subsidiaries and affiliates. The Mesirow and Bastion name and logo are registered service marks of Mesirow Financial Holdings, Inc. © 2026, Mesirow Financial Holdings, Inc. All rights reserved. Any opinions expressed are subject to change without notice. Past performance is not indicative of future results.