



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to:

Securitisation 2016

9th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into securitisation work

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

A&L Goodbody
Association for Financial Markets in Europe
Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro
Ashurst LLP
Baker & McKenzie – Santiago
Bell Gully
Brodies LLP
Caspi & Co.
Cervantes Sainz
Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira
Drew & Napier LLC
Elvinger Hoss Prussen
Estudio Beccar Varela
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Frost & Fire Consulting
Gárdos Füredi Mosonyi Tomori Law Office
K&L Gates Studio Legale Associato
King & Spalding LLP

King & Wood Mallesons
Latham & Watkins LLP
LECAP
Levy & Salomão Advogados
Maples and Calder
McMillan LLP
Nishimura & Asahi
Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd
Roschier Advokatbyrå AB
Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP
Shearman & Sterling LLP
Sidley Austin LLP
Stibbe
Tsibanoulis & Partners
Verita Legal (K. Argyridou & Associates LLC)
Vieira de Almeida & Associados –
Sociedade de Advogados, R.L.
Wadia Ghandy & Co.



Contributing Editor



Mark Nicolaides,
Latham & Watkins LLP

Sales Director
Florjan Osmani

Account Directors
Oliver Smith, Rory Smith

Sales Support Manager
Toni Hayward

Editor
Tom McDermott

Senior Editor
Rachel Williams

Chief Operating Officer
Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor
Alan Falach

Group Publisher
Richard Firth

Published by
Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design
F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source
iStockphoto

Printed by
Ashford Colour Press Ltd
April 2016

Copyright © 2016
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-910083-91-8
ISSN 1745-7661

Strategic Partners



General Chapters:

1	Documenting Receivables Financings in Leveraged Finance and High Yield Transactions – James Burnett & Mo Nurmohamed, Latham & Watkins LLP	1
2	CLOs and Risk Retention in the U.S. and EU: Complying with the Rules – Craig Stein & Paul N. Watterson, Jr., Schulte Roth & Zabel LLP	8
3	US Taxation, Including FATCA, of Non-US Investors in Securitisation Transactions – David Z. Nirenberg, Ashurst LLP	14
4	The Transformation of Securitisation in an Evolving Financial and Regulatory Landscape – Bjorn Bjerke & Charles Thompson, Shearman & Sterling LLP	25
5	Reviving Securitisation in Europe: the Journey Lengthens – Richard Hopkin, Association for Financial Markets in Europe	32

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

6	Albania	Frost & Fire Consulting: Franci Nuri	36
7	Argentina	Estudio Beccar Varela: Javier L. Magnasco & María Victoria Pavani	46
8	Australia	King & Wood Mallesons: Anne-Marie Neagle & Ian Edmonds-Wilson	56
9	Belgium	Stibbe: Ivan Peeters & Philip Van Steenwinkel	67
10	Brazil	Levy & Salomão Advogados: Ana Cecília Manente & Fernando de Azevedo Peraçoli	78
11	Canada	McMillan LLP: Don Waters & Rob Scavone	89
12	Cayman Islands	Maples and Calder: Scott Macdonald & Christopher Wall	100
13	Chile	Baker & McKenzie – Santiago: Jaime Munro Cabezas & Cristóbal Larrain Baraona	109
14	China	King & Wood Mallesons: Roy Zhang & Zhou Jie	120
15	Cyprus	Verita Legal (K. Argyridou & Associates LLC): Karolina Argyridou & Fotini Kaimaklioti	133
16	England & Wales	Sidley Austin LLP: Rupert Wall & Rachpal Thind	142
17	France	Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP: Hervé Touraine & Olivier Bernard	157
18	Germany	King & Spalding LLP: Dr. Werner Meier & Dr. Axel J. Schilder	170
19	Greece	Tsibanoulis & Partners: Emmanouil Komis & Evangelia Kyttari	185
20	Hong Kong	King & Wood Mallesons: Paul McBride & YuCheng Lin	195
21	Hungary	Gárdos Füredi Mosonyi Tomori Law Office: Erika Tomori & Péter Gárdos	208
22	India	Wadia Ghandy & Co.: Shabnum Kajiji & Nihans Basheer	218
23	Indonesia	Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro: Freddy Karyadi & Novario Asca Hutagalung	228
24	Ireland	A&L Goodbody: Peter Walker & Jack Sheehy	238
25	Israel	Caspi & Co.: Norman Menachem Feder & Oded Bejarano	250
26	Italy	K&L Gates Studio Legale Associato: Andrea Pinto & Vittorio Salvadori di Wiesenhoff	262
27	Japan	Nishimura & Asahi: Hajime Ueno & Koh Ueda	275
28	Luxembourg	Elvinger Hoss Prussen: Philippe Prussen & Marie Pirard	290
29	Mexico	Cervantes Sainz: Diego Martínez Rueda-Chapital	301
30	Netherlands	Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP: Mandeep Lotay & Ivo van Dijk	311
31	New Zealand	Bell Gully: Murray King & Jennifer Gunser	326

Continued Overleaf →

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.



Country Question and Answer Chapters:

32	Portugal	Vieira de Almeida & Associados – Sociedade de Advogados, R.L.: Paula Gomes Freire & Mariana Padinha Ribeiro	339
33	Russia	LECAP: Elizaveta Turbina & Ivan Mahalin	353
34	Scotland	Brodies LLP: Bruce Stephen & Marion MacInnes	364
35	Singapore	Drew & Napier LLC: Petrus Huang & Ron Cheng	374
36	Spain	Cuatrecasas, Gonçalves Pereira: Héctor Bros & Elisenda Baldrís	387
37	Sweden	Roschier Advokatbyrå AB: Johan Häger & Dan Hanqvist	405
38	Switzerland	Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd: Oliver Widmer & Urs Klöti	416
39	USA	Latham & Watkins LLP: Lawrence Safran & Kevin T. Fingeret	428

EDITORIAL

Welcome to the ninth edition of *The International Comparative Legal Guide to: Securitisation*.

This guide provides the international practitioner and in-house counsel with a comprehensive worldwide legal analysis of the laws and regulations of securitisation.

It is divided into two main sections:

Five general chapters. These chapters are designed to provide readers with a comprehensive overview of key securitisation issues, particularly from the perspective of a multi-jurisdictional transaction.

Country question and answer chapters. These provide a broad overview of common issues in securitisation laws and regulations in 34 jurisdictions.

All chapters are written by leading securitisation lawyers and industry specialists and we are extremely grateful for their excellent contributions.

Special thanks are reserved for the contributing editor, Mark Nicolaides of Latham & Watkins LLP, for his invaluable assistance.

Global Legal Group hopes that you find this guide practical and interesting.

The *International Comparative Legal Guide* series is also available online at www.iclg.co.uk.

Alan Falach LL.M.
Group Consulting Editor
Global Legal Group
Alan.Falach@glgroup.co.uk

Ireland



Peter Walker



Jack Sheehy

A&L Goodbody

1 Receivables Contracts

- 1.1 Formalities. In order to create an enforceable debt obligation of the obligor to the seller: (a) is it necessary that the sales of goods or services are evidenced by a formal receivables contract; (b) are invoices alone sufficient; and (c) can a receivable “contract” be deemed to exist as a result of the behaviour of the parties?**

To be enforceable against the obligor a debt obligation need not be evidenced by a formal written contract, but must be evidenced as a matter of contract or deed. Contracts may be written, oral or partly written and partly oral. An invoice could itself constitute the contract between the seller and obligor if the standard elements of a contract are present. Where a contract is oral, evidence of the parties’ conduct may be used in determining the terms of the contract. A contract may also be implied based on a course of conduct or dealings between the parties.

- 1.2 Consumer Protections. Do your jurisdiction’s laws: (a) limit rates of interest on consumer credit, loans or other kinds of receivables; (b) provide a statutory right to interest on late payments; (c) permit consumers to cancel receivables for a specified period of time; or (d) provide other noteworthy rights to consumers with respect to receivables owing by them?**

Consumer credit agreements are regulated by the Consumer Credit Act 1995 (as amended) (the **CCA**) and the European Communities (Consumer Credit Agreements) Regulations 2010 (as amended) (the **CCA Regulations**).

There is no statutory interest rate cap, but under the CCA if the cost of credit under a credit agreement is excessive it may be unenforceable. In addition, pursuant to Section 149 of the CCA a “credit institution” (as defined under the CCA) must notify the Central Bank of Ireland (the **CBI**) of any increase of any existing charge it imposes on its customers (or any new charge not previously notified to the CBI) and the CBI may direct the credit institution to refrain from imposing or changing the charge.

There is no statutory right to interest on late payments, but contractual “default interest” may be imposed (as long as the rate of such default interest is not so high as to constitute a penalty).

If a consumer credit agreement does not comply with the requirements of the CCA, the creditor may not be able to enforce it. Certain clauses in a receivables contract with a consumer could be also found to be unfair under the European Communities (Unfair

Terms in Consumer Contracts) Regulations 1995 (the **UTCCR Regulations**) and hence unenforceable.

The Consumer Protection Code (the **CPC**) of the CBI also imposes obligations on “regulated entities” in their dealings with their “customers”. The Consumer Protection Act 2007 contains a general prohibition on unfair, misleading, aggressive and prohibited trading practices that could result in a contract with a consumer being rendered void or unenforceable.

- 1.3 Government Receivables. Where the receivables contract has been entered into with the government or a government agency, are there different requirements and laws that apply to the sale or collection of those receivables?**

Under the Prompt Payments of Accounts Act 1997, all Irish public bodies and contractors on public sector contracts must pay amounts due to their suppliers promptly (i.e. on or before the due date in the contract or, if there is no due date (or no written contract), within 45 days of receipt of the invoice or delivery of the global services).

In certain circumstances, enforceability of receivables contracts with the government/a government agency could potentially be an issue as a result of the law of sovereign immunity.

2 Choice of Law – Receivables Contracts

- 2.1 No Law Specified. If the seller and the obligor do not specify a choice of law in their receivables contract, what are the main principles in your jurisdiction that will determine the governing law of the contract?**

Contracts entered into on or after 17 December 2009 will be governed by Regulation (EC) 593/2008 of 17 June 2008 (**Rome I**). Contracts entered into prior to 17 December 2009 will be subject to the Contractual Obligations (Applicable Law) Act, 1991, pursuant to which the Rome convention on the law applicable to contractual obligations (the **Rome Convention**) was enacted in Ireland.

Under Rome I in the absence of an express choice of law in a contract, the applicable law of the contract will be that of the country with which it has the “closest connection”, which is the country where the party who is to perform the contract has its habitual residence or its central administration (unless the contract is within one of a number of defined classes for which specific rules apply or is manifestly more closely connected with the law of a different country, or if it is sufficiently certain from the terms or circumstances of the contract which law the parties intended to apply).

Similarly, under the Rome Convention the applicable law of a contract is presumed to be that of the country with which it has the “closest connection” (i.e. the country where the party performing the contract has its habitual residence or its central administration). However, if the contract is a commercial or professional contract, the applicable law will be the law of the place in which the principal place of business of the party performing the contract is situated or, where performance is to be effected through a place of business other than the principal place of business of that party, the country in which that other place of business is situated.

If the contract falls outside the scope of Rome I or the Rome Convention, Irish common law principles will determine the applicable law by reference to the parties’ intentions. If the parties’ intention cannot be established, the applicable law will be the law with which the contract has its “closest and most real connection”.

2.2 Base Case. If the seller and the obligor are both resident in your jurisdiction, and the transactions giving rise to the receivables and the payment of the receivables take place in your jurisdiction, and the seller and the obligor choose the law of your jurisdiction to govern the receivables contract, is there any reason why a court in your jurisdiction would not give effect to their choice of law?

In those circumstances, the Irish courts should give effect to the choice of Irish law.

2.3 Freedom to Choose Foreign Law of Non-Resident Seller or Obligor. If the seller is resident in your jurisdiction but the obligor is not, or if the obligor is resident in your jurisdiction but the seller is not, and the seller and the obligor choose the foreign law of the obligor/seller to govern their receivables contract, will a court in your jurisdiction give effect to the choice of foreign law? Are there any limitations to the recognition of foreign law (such as public policy or mandatory principles of law) that would typically apply in commercial relationships such as that between the seller and the obligor under the receivables contract?

As discussed above, Rome I and the Rome Convention provide that the parties to a contract may freely choose the law of their contract and that choice is generally only overridden if it conflicts with mandatory rules or public policy. Contracts falling outside the scope of Rome I or the Rome Convention will be subject to standard Irish common law principles which also generally support the parties’ right to choose the governing law of their contract and will only displace their choice in exceptional circumstances.

2.4 CISG. Is the United Nations Convention on the International Sale of Goods in effect in your jurisdiction?

No, it is not.

3 Choice of Law – Receivables Purchase Agreement

3.1 Base Case. Does your jurisdiction’s law generally require the sale of receivables to be governed by the same law as the law governing the receivables themselves? If so, does that general rule apply irrespective of which law governs the receivables (i.e., your jurisdiction’s laws or foreign laws)?

Irish law does not require the sale of receivables to be governed by the law governing the receivables themselves. Whether under Rome I, the Rome Convention or principles of Irish common law, the parties to a contract can (subject to certain exceptions) choose the law of any country to govern the contract, irrespective of the law governing the receivable.

However, whether a receivable has been validly sold and whether such sale has been perfected will generally be a matter for the law governing the receivable and not the law governing the receivables sale agreement. Furthermore, the enforceability of the receivables against the obligor may be determined by the law of the jurisdiction in which the obligor is located.

3.2 Example 1: If (a) the seller and the obligor are located in your jurisdiction, (b) the receivable is governed by the law of your jurisdiction, (c) the seller sells the receivable to a purchaser located in a third country, (d) the seller and the purchaser choose the law of your jurisdiction to govern the receivables purchase agreement, and (e) the sale complies with the requirements of your jurisdiction, will a court in your jurisdiction recognise that sale as being effective against the seller, the obligor and other third parties (such as creditors or insolvency administrators of the seller and the obligor)?

Yes, it should.

3.3 Example 2: Assuming that the facts are the same as Example 1, but either the obligor or the purchaser or both are located outside your jurisdiction, will a court in your jurisdiction recognise that sale as being effective against the seller and other third parties (such as creditors or insolvency administrators of the seller), or must the foreign law requirements of the obligor’s country or the purchaser’s country (or both) be taken into account?

See section 2 and question 3.1 above. In addition, under Rome I and the Rome Convention, laws other than the governing law of the receivables purchase agreement may sometimes be taken into account. For instance, where a contract is governed by Irish law but will be performed in a place other than Ireland, the Irish courts might apply certain mandatory provisions of the law of the country where the contract is to be performed (if the contract would be otherwise rendered unlawful in that country).

- 3.4 Example 3: If (a) the seller is located in your jurisdiction but the obligor is located in another country, (b) the receivable is governed by the law of the obligor's country, (c) the seller sells the receivable to a purchaser located in a third country, (d) the seller and the purchaser choose the law of the obligor's country to govern the receivables purchase agreement, and (e) the sale complies with the requirements of the obligor's country, will a court in your jurisdiction recognise that sale as being effective against the seller and other third parties (such as creditors or insolvency administrators of the seller) without the need to comply with your jurisdiction's own sale requirements?**

As per section 2 and questions 3.1 and 3.3 above, under Rome I and the Rome Convention where there is an express choice of law by the parties to a contract, the Irish courts should recognise the choice of law and assess the validity of the contract in accordance with the law chosen by the parties.

However, certain mandatory principles of Irish law cannot be disapplied and the courts might not apply the parties' chosen law to the extent it conflicted with those mandatory principles.

- 3.5 Example 4: If (a) the obligor is located in your jurisdiction but the seller is located in another country, (b) the receivable is governed by the law of the seller's country, (c) the seller and the purchaser choose the law of the seller's country to govern the receivables purchase agreement, and (d) the sale complies with the requirements of the seller's country, will a court in your jurisdiction recognise that sale as being effective against the obligor and other third parties (such as creditors or insolvency administrators of the obligor) without the need to comply with your jurisdiction's own sale requirements?**

Yes. See section 2 and questions 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4 above.

- 3.6 Example 5: If (a) the seller is located in your jurisdiction (irrespective of the obligor's location), (b) the receivable is governed by the law of your jurisdiction, (c) the seller sells the receivable to a purchaser located in a third country, (d) the seller and the purchaser choose the law of the purchaser's country to govern the receivables purchase agreement, and (e) the sale complies with the requirements of the purchaser's country, will a court in your jurisdiction recognise that sale as being effective against the seller and other third parties (such as creditors or insolvency administrators of the seller, any obligor located in your jurisdiction and any third party creditor or insolvency administrator of any such obligor)?**

Yes. See section 2 and questions 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 above.

4 Asset Sales

- 4.1 Sale Methods Generally. In your jurisdiction what are the customary methods for a seller to sell receivables to a purchaser? What is the customary terminology – is it called a sale, transfer, assignment or something else?**

In Ireland receivables are most commonly sold by way of equitable (or legal) assignment. Other methods which are more rarely used

include: a declaration of trust over the receivables (or over the proceeds of the receivables): a sub-participation; or a novation. An outright sale of receivables may be described as a "sale", a "transfer" or an "assignment", although "assignment" often indicates a transfer of the rights in respect of the receivables (and not the obligations), while a "transfer" often indicates a transfer of both rights and obligations by way of novation. The phrase "security assignment" is often used to distinguish a transfer by way of security from an outright assignment.

- 4.2 Perfection Generally. What formalities are required generally for perfecting a sale of receivables? Are there any additional or other formalities required for the sale of receivables to be perfected against any subsequent good faith purchasers for value of the same receivables from the seller?**

A sale of receivables by way of an outright legal assignment is perfected by the delivery of notice in writing of the sale to the obligor(s) of the relevant receivables in accordance with the requirements of Section 28(6) of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act 1877 (the **Judicature Act**). The provision of notice does not of itself result in the transfer becoming a legal (as opposed to an equitable) assignment as certain other formalities are also required, namely: (i) the assignment must be in writing under the hand of the assignor; (ii) it must be of the whole of the debt; and (iii) it must be absolute and not by way of charge. If the assignment does not fulfil all these requirements, it will likely take effect as an equitable assignment so that any subsequent assignment effected by the seller which is fully compliant with the Judicature Act requirements will take priority if notified to the obligor prior to the date on which the original assignment is notified to the obligor.

A novation of receivables (i.e. of both the rights and obligations in respect of such receivables) requires the written consent of the obligor, the seller and the purchaser.

- 4.3 Perfection for Promissory Notes, etc. What additional or different requirements for sale and perfection apply to sales of promissory notes, mortgage loans, consumer loans or marketable debt securities?**

The transfer requirements for promissory notes (as well as other negotiable instruments) are governed by the Bills of Exchange Act 1882, which provides that they are transferable by delivery (or delivery and endorsement).

Mortgage loans and their related mortgages may be transferred by way of assignment. For a mortgage over real property in order to effect a full legal (rather than just equitable) assignment, the transfer will need to be registered at the Land Registry or the Registry of Deeds (whether the land is registered or unregistered). Most residential mortgage-backed securitisation transactions are structured as an equitable assignment of mortgage loans and their related mortgages to avoid giving notice to the underlying mortgagors and registering the transfer. Under the CBI's Code of Conduct on the Transfer of Mortgages (if applicable), a loan secured by a mortgage of residential property may not be transferred without the written consent of the borrower (the relevant consent is usually obtained under the mortgage origination documentation).

Questions 8.3 and 8.4 below outline some of the regulatory requirements in relation to consumer loans. Under the CCA Regulations, a consumer must be provided with notice of any transfer by the creditor of its loan, except where the original creditor continues to service the credit. Under the CPC where part of a regulated business is transferred by a regulated entity (including a

transfer of consumer loans), at least two months' notice must be provided to affected consumers if the transfer is to another regulated entity (and one month if it is not).

Marketable debt securities in bearer form may be transferred by delivery and endorsement; in registered form, by registration of the transferee in the relevant register. Dematerialised marketable securities may be transferred by debiting the clearing system account of the purchaser (or its custodian or nominee/intermediary).

4.4 Obligor Notification or Consent. Must the seller or the purchaser notify obligors of the sale of receivables in order for the sale to be effective against the obligors and/or creditors of the seller? Must the seller or the purchaser obtain the obligors' consent to the sale of receivables in order for the sale to be an effective sale against the obligors? Whether or not notice is required to perfect a sale, are there any benefits to giving notice – such as cutting off obligor set-off rights and other obligor defences?

A seller or purchaser need not notify the obligors to effect a valid equitable sale of the receivables (which would be effective against the seller). However, in order for a legal sale of the receivables to be effected (enforceable against both the seller and the underlying obligor) written notice would need to be provided (and ideally, from an evidentiary perspective, the underlying obligor would acknowledge the notice).

The obligors' consent is not required for the sale to be effective against them.

If notice is not provided: (i) obligors can discharge their debts by paying the seller; (ii) obligors may set-off claims against the seller even if they accrue after the assignment; (iii) a subsequent assignee without notice of the prior assignment would take priority over the claims of the initial purchaser; and (iv) the purchaser cannot sue the obligor in its own name, but must join the seller as co-plaintiff.

4.5 Notice Mechanics. If notice is to be delivered to obligors, whether at the time of sale or later, are there any requirements regarding the form the notice must take or how it must be delivered? Is there any time limit beyond which notice is ineffective – for example, can a notice of sale be delivered after the sale, and can notice be delivered after insolvency proceedings against the obligor or the seller have commenced? Does the notice apply only to specific receivables or can it apply to any and all (including future) receivables? Are there any other limitations or considerations?

See also the response above to question 4.3.

Notice must be in writing and given to the obligor at the time of, or after the sale (preferably after), but there is no particular form specified. The notice should clearly state that the obligor must pay the assignee (the purchaser) from then on.

There is no specific time limit for the giving of notices set down in the Judicature Act and notice can be given to obligors post-insolvency of the obligor or the seller (including pursuant to an irrevocable power of attorney granted by the seller). The notice should only apply to specific receivables.

4.6 Restrictions on Assignment – General Interpretation. Will a restriction in a receivables contract to the effect that “None of the [seller’s] rights or obligations under this Agreement may be transferred or assigned without the consent of the [obligor]” be interpreted as prohibiting a transfer of receivables by the seller to the purchaser? Is the result the same if the restriction says “This Agreement may not be transferred or assigned by the [seller] without the consent of the [obligor]” (i.e., the restriction does not refer to rights or obligations)? Is the result the same if the restriction says “The obligations of the [seller] under this Agreement may not be transferred or assigned by the [seller] without the consent of the [obligor]” (i.e., the restriction does not refer to rights)?

Either of the first two formulations would likely be interpreted by an Irish court as prohibiting a transfer of relevant receivables by the seller to the purchaser (see our response to question 4.7 below).

In the last instance, the seller will implicitly have the authority to assign its rights to a purchaser (but not its obligations) as in the absence of an express contractual prohibition on the assignment of rights, the receivables may be assigned without the obligor's consent.

4.7 Restrictions on Assignment; Liability to Obligor. If any of the restrictions in question 4.6 are binding, or if the receivables contract explicitly prohibits an assignment of receivables or “seller’s rights” under the receivables contract, are such restrictions generally enforceable in your jurisdiction? Are there exceptions to this rule (e.g., for contracts between commercial entities)? If your jurisdiction recognises restrictions on sale or assignment of receivables and the seller nevertheless sells receivables to the purchaser, will either the seller or the purchaser be liable to the obligor for breach of contract or tort, or on any other basis?

Restrictions on assignment or transfers of receivables are generally enforceable in Ireland. As noted in question 4.6 above, if a contract is silent on the question of assignment, then a contract (and the receivables arising thereunder) will normally be freely assignable. If an assignment is effected in breach of a contractual prohibition on assignment it will be ineffective as between the obligor, the seller and the purchaser, but should still be effective as between the seller and purchaser.

4.8 Identification. Must the sale document specifically identify each of the receivables to be sold? If so, what specific information is required (e.g., obligor name, invoice number, invoice date, payment date, etc.)? Do the receivables being sold have to share objective characteristics? Alternatively, if the seller sells *all* of its receivables to the purchaser, is this sufficient identification of receivables? Finally, if the seller sells *all* of its receivables *other than* receivables owing by one or more specifically identified obligors, is this sufficient identification of receivables?

The sale document must specify the receivables being sold with sufficient clarity that they are identifiable and distinguishable from the rest of the seller's assets. The receivables being sold need not

share objective characteristics but normally a portfolio of receivables being sold is all of the same type. To our knowledge, the scenario has not been considered by the Irish courts but a purported sale of all of a seller's receivables other than those owing by specifically identified obligors might be effective if the contract sufficiently identifies the receivables not being sold.

4.9 Respect for Intent of Parties; Economic Effects on Sale. If the parties describe their transaction in the relevant documents as an outright sale and explicitly state their intention that it be treated as an outright sale, will this description and statement of intent automatically be respected or will a court enquire into the economic characteristics of the transaction? If the latter, what economic characteristics of a sale, if any, might prevent the sale from being perfected? Among other things, to what extent may the seller retain: (a) credit risk; (b) interest rate risk; (c) control of collections of receivables; or (d) a right of repurchase/redemption without jeopardising perfection?

If a transaction is expressed to be an outright sale and the sale agreement (and other documents) purports to effect an outright sale, but this does not reflect the actual agreement between the parties, the purported sale could be recharacterised as a secured loan. Irrespective of the label given to a transaction by the parties, the court will look at its substance (including the particular economic characteristics of the transaction) and will examine whether it creates rights and obligations consistent with a sale.

English case law (which is only of persuasive authority in the Irish courts and is not binding on them) has established a number of key questions which must be considered when determining whether a transaction is a sale rather than a secured loan:

- (i) Is the transaction a “sham”, (i.e. do the transaction documents accurately reflect the intention of the parties or is there some other agreement or agreements that constitute the real transaction between the parties)?
- (ii) Does the seller have the right to reacquire the receivables?
- (iii) Does the purchaser have to account for any profit made by it on the sale of the receivables?
- (iv) Is the seller required to compensate the purchaser if it ultimately realises the acquired receivables for an amount less than the amount paid?

Although it will depend on the particular circumstances, the fact that the seller remains as servicer/collection agent of the receivables post-sale, or retains some degree of credit risk in respect of the receivables post-sale, is not considered to be inconsistent with the transfer being treated as a sale (rather than a secured loan).

There is no Irish case law on the point, but a right of repurchase/redemption for the seller would likely be inconsistent with the transaction being one of true sale. However, if the seller has only a right to ask the purchaser to sell the receivables back, such an arrangement might not be inconsistent with a true sale.

If the sale is recharacterised as a secured loan, the assets “sold” will remain on the seller's balance sheet and the loan will be shown as a liability of the seller. In addition, as it is not the practice in Ireland to make “back-up” security filings, the security may not have been registered and may be void in an insolvency of the seller for lack of registration.

In addition to recharacterisation, sale transactions are also vulnerable under certain provisions of the Irish Companies Act 2014 (the **Companies Act**) such as Section 443 (*power of court to order the return of assets improperly transferred*) and Section 604 (*unfair preferences*) of the Companies Act.

4.10 Continuous Sales of Receivables. Can the seller agree in an enforceable manner to continuous sales of receivables (i.e., sales of receivables as and when they arise)? Would such an agreement survive and continue to transfer receivables to the purchaser following the seller's insolvency?

Yes. However, the sale of the receivables would need to be by way of an equitable assignment (an agreement whereby a seller purports to sell receivables on a continuous basis will generally take effect as an agreement to assign); the receivables will then be automatically equitably assigned as and when they come into existence.

See question 6.5 for the effect the seller's insolvency could have on such an agreement to assign.

4.11 Future Receivables. Can the seller commit in an enforceable manner to sell receivables to the purchaser that come into existence after the date of the receivables purchase agreement (e.g., “future flow” securitisation)? If so, how must the sale of future receivables be structured to be valid and enforceable? Is there a distinction between future receivables that arise prior to or after the seller's insolvency?

Yes. See question 4.10 above – an assignment of a receivable not in existence at the time of the agreement, but which will be ascertainable in the future, is treated as an agreement to assign and should give rise to an equitable assignment as soon as the receivable comes into existence. See question 6.5 for the effect the seller's insolvency could have on such an agreement to assign.

4.12 Related Security. Must any additional formalities be fulfilled in order for the related security to be transferred concurrently with the sale of receivables? If not all related security can be enforceably transferred, what methods are customarily adopted to provide the purchaser the benefits of such related security?

Related security will typically be capable of being assigned in the same manner as the receivables themselves. It is important, however, to ensure that the assignment provisions are consistent. The transfer or assignment of certain types of security may require additional formalities (some of which are referred to in question 4.3 above).

4.13 Set-Off; Liability to Obligor. Assuming that a receivables contract does not contain a provision whereby the obligor waives its right to set-off against amounts it owes to the seller, do the obligor's set-off rights terminate upon its receipt of notice of a sale? At any other time? If a receivables contract does not waive set-off but the obligor's set-off rights are terminated due to notice or some other action, will either the seller or the purchaser be liable to the obligor for damages caused by such termination?

Until notice of the sale of the receivables contract is provided to the relevant underlying obligor, the obligor will be entitled to exercise any rights of set-off against the purchaser even if they accrue after the date of the sale. It would likely depend on the circumstances, but if an obligor's set-off rights were terminated due to notice or for some other valid reason, the seller or purchaser should not be liable to the obligor for damages caused as a result.

5 Security Issues

5.1 Back-up Security. Is it customary in your jurisdiction to take a “back-up” security interest over the seller’s ownership interest in the receivables and the related security, in the event that an outright sale is deemed by a court (for whatever reason) not to have occurred and have been perfected?

It is not customary in Ireland to take such a “back-up” security when the intention is to effect an outright sale of the relevant receivable.

5.2 Seller Security. If it is customary to take back-up security, what are the formalities for the seller granting a security interest in receivables and related security under the laws of your jurisdiction, and for such security interest to be perfected?

See question 5.3 (below).

5.3 Purchaser Security. If the purchaser grants security over all of its assets (including purchased receivables) in favour of the providers of its funding, what formalities must the purchaser comply with in your jurisdiction to grant and perfect a security interest in purchased receivables governed by the laws of your jurisdiction and the related security?

Security is most commonly taken over receivables by way of a legal (or equitable) assignment or a charge over book debts.

Receivables assigned by way of security will create a mortgage over the receivables, either legal (if the requirements of the Judicature Act are followed – see question 4.2 above) or (in the absence of these requirements) equitable. Prior to the perfection of an equitable mortgage by notice to the obligor, the assignee’s security will be subject to prior equities (such as rights of set-off and other defences), and will rank behind a later assignment (where the later assignee has no notice of the earlier assignment and has itself given notice to the obligor). In addition, the obligor will be able to discharge its debt by continuing to pay the assignor (as described in questions 4.4 and 4.5).

Alternatively, a fixed or floating charge could be granted over the receivables. In comparison to a mortgage (which is a transfer of title together with a condition for re-assignment on redemption), a charge is a mere encumbrance on the receivables, giving the chargee a preferential right to payment out of the receivables in priority to other creditors of the relevant company.

A fixed charge is typically granted over specific receivables and attaches to those receivables upon the creation of the fixed charge. In comparison, a floating charge is normally granted over a class of assets (both present and future) which, prior to the occurrence of a “crystallisation event”, can continue to be managed in the ordinary course of the chargor’s business. On the occurrence of a crystallisation event, the floating charge will attach to the particular class of the chargor’s assets, effectively becoming a fixed charge over those assets. The chargee’s degree of control over the receivable is the determining factor in distinguishing a fixed from floating charge (and in that regard the Irish courts look at the substance of the security created, rather than how it is described or named).

In terms of perfection, if an Irish company grants security over certain types of assets (including receivables constituting book debts) (i.e. it creates a “registrable charge” for the purposes of the Companies Act), it must register short particulars of the security

created with the Irish Registrar of Companies (the **Registrar of Companies**) within 21 days of its creation (see below for outline of the new priority register under the Companies Act).

Section 408(1) of the Companies Act specifically excludes security interests over the following assets from the registration requirement:

- (a) cash;
- (b) money credited to an account of a financial institution, or any other deposits;
- (c) shares, bonds or debt instruments;
- (d) units in collective investment undertakings or money market instruments; or
- (e) claims and rights (such as dividends or interest) in respect of any thing referred to in any of paragraphs (b) to (d).

The expression “charge” which now excludes the assets referred to in section 408(1) above, was drafted to give effect to recommendations of the Irish Company Law Review Group, the group involved with drafting the Companies Act and in accordance with the exceptions to the registration requirements envisaged under Directive 2002/47/EC on Financial Collateral Arrangements as implemented in Ireland by way of the European Communities (Financial Collateral Arrangements) (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations 2011 (the **Regulations**). It should be noted that “cash” has not been defined in the Companies Act but is defined in the Regulations as “money credited to an account” or a claim for the repayment of money (for example, money market deposits).

Prior to the enactment of the Companies Act, registration of a charge did not determine priority, such that as long as a charge was filed within the 21-day period after creation, a prior created charge would take priority over a subsequently created charge even where that later charge was registered first. However, the Companies Act changed this position, implementing a priority register so that the priority of charges is now linked to the date of receipt by the Registrar of Companies of the particulars of the charge, rather than the date of creation of the charge. Practically speaking this means that filing in the Companies Registration Office should be effected immediately after closing or as soon as possible thereafter.

Failure to register a registrable security interest within 21 days of its creation will result in that security interest being void as against the liquidator and any creditors of the company which created the registrable charge. However, an unregistered charge will still be valid as against the chargor, provided the chargor is not in liquidation.

5.4 Recognition. If the purchaser grants a security interest in receivables governed by the laws of your jurisdiction, and that security interest is valid and perfected under the laws of the purchaser’s country, will it be treated as valid and perfected in your jurisdiction or must additional steps be taken in your jurisdiction?

The relevant security must be valid and perfected under the laws of Ireland and under the governing law of the security, in order for it to be given effect by the Irish courts. If the security over the receivables is created by a purchaser which is an Irish company and the receivables are situated in Ireland, details of the security will generally need to be filed with the Registrar of Companies within 21 days of its creation (see question 5.3 above).

Since the enactment of the Companies Act, details of security over the receivables created by a purchaser which is a foreign company where the receivables are situated in Ireland, does not need to be filed with the Registrar of Companies. Only charges submitted against an Irish or external company already registered with the CRO will be accepted.

5.5 Additional Formalities. What additional or different requirements apply to security interests in or connected to insurance policies, promissory notes, mortgage loans, consumer loans or marketable debt securities?

A security assignment is usually taken over insurance policies.

Security over mortgage or consumer loans will be created by mortgage or charge. An equitable mortgage is typically created over the mortgage securing a mortgage loan.

The type of security over marketable debt securities depends on whether the relevant securities are bearer or registered, certificated, immobilised or dematerialised and/or directly-held or indirectly-held: (i) directly-held and certificated debt securities, where registered, are generally secured by legal mortgage (by entry of the mortgagee on the relevant register) or by equitable mortgage or charge (by security transfer or by agreement for transfer or charge); (ii) security over bearer securities may be created by mortgage or pledge (by delivery together with a memorandum of deposit) or charge (by agreement to charge); and (iii) security may be created over indirectly-held certificated debt securities by legal mortgage (by transfer, either to an account of the mortgagee at the same intermediary or by transfer to the mortgagee's intermediary or nominee via a common intermediary) or by equitable mortgage or charge (by agreement of the intermediary to operate a relevant securities account in the name of the mortgagor containing the debt securities to the order/control of the chargee).

Section 408 of the Companies Act specifically excludes security interests over shares, bonds or debt instruments from the registration of a security interest requirement. If the security interest contributes a "security financial collateral arrangement", the Financial Collateral Regulations may apply (see question 5.3 above).

5.6 Trusts. Does your jurisdiction recognise trusts? If not, is there a mechanism whereby collections received by the seller in respect of sold receivables can be held or be deemed to be held separate and apart from the seller's own assets until turned over to the purchaser?

Ireland recognises trusts, and a trust over collections received by the seller in respect of sold receivables should be recognised under the laws of Ireland (provided it is validly constituted).

5.7 Bank Accounts. Does your jurisdiction recognise escrow accounts? Can security be taken over a bank account located in your jurisdiction? If so, what is the typical method? Would courts in your jurisdiction recognise a foreign law grant of security (for example, an English law debenture) taken over a bank account located in your jurisdiction?

Ireland recognises the concept of money held in escrow in a bank account. Security may be taken over a bank account in Ireland and is typically taken by way of a charge or security assignment. Security over a credit balance granted by a depositor in favour of the bank at which such deposit is held can only be achieved by way of charge (not by assignment). If the security constitutes a "security financial collateral arrangement" over "financial collateral" within the meaning of the Financial Collateral Regulations, then those regulations should apply (as to which, see question 5.3 above).

Foreign-law governed security over an Irish situated bank account must be valid under both Irish law and the foreign law in order for it to be given effect by the Irish courts (see question 5.4 above).

5.8 Enforcement over Bank Accounts. If security over a bank account is possible and the secured party enforces that security, does the secured party control all cash flowing into the bank account from enforcement forward until the secured party is repaid in full, or are there limitations? If there are limitations, what are they?

Normally, notice of the creation of security over the account is provided to the bank with which the account is held, and an acknowledgment sought that the bank will, *inter alia*, (upon notification that the security has become enforceable) act in accordance with the instructions of the secured party. If such an acknowledgment has been obtained, once the secured party enforces its security over the relevant bank account, the bank should follow its instructions in respect of all cash in (or flowing into) the account until the obligations owed to the secured party are discharged in full.

However, this control is conferred on the secured party by contract – the bank could refuse to act in accordance with the secured party's instructions. Furthermore, rights of set-off (under statute, common law or contract) might be exercisable in respect of the cash in the account to the detriment of the secured party. Finally, under Irish banking crisis resolution legislation, the CBI and the Minister for Finance have powers to direct the activities of Irish credit institutions in certain circumstances, and the exercise of such powers could interfere with the secured party's control over the bank account.

5.9 Use of Cash Bank Accounts. If security over a bank account is possible, can the owner of the account have access to the funds in the account prior to enforcement without affecting the security?

This depends on the type of security granted over the account/account balance. If a floating charge is granted, the fact the owner of the account may access funds in the account should not affect the validity of the floating charge. However, if the security granted purports to be a fixed charge, the more freely the owner can access the funds in the account, the less likely the charge would actually be treated as a fixed charge and the more likely it would be recharacterised as being a floating charge.

6 Insolvency Laws

6.1 Stay of Action. If, after a sale of receivables that is otherwise perfected, the seller becomes subject to an insolvency proceeding, will your jurisdiction's insolvency laws automatically prohibit the purchaser from collecting, transferring or otherwise exercising ownership rights over the purchased receivables (a "stay of action")? If so, what generally is the length of that stay of action? Does the insolvency official have the ability to stay collection and enforcement actions until he determines that the sale is perfected? Would the answer be different if the purchaser is deemed to only be a secured party rather than the owner of the receivables?

The appointment of a liquidator or an examiner to an insolvent Irish company imposes an automatic stay of action against the entity, but if the receivables have been transferred by legal assignment, the sale will have already been perfected, and the stay should not affect the purchaser's ability to enforce its rights in the receivables.

In the event that a winding up order is issued against the seller and a liquidator is appointed while there is no general stay of action

(albeit a liquidator could seek to set aside any existing proceedings), a plaintiff will need the leave of the court to issue new proceedings against a company in a court ordered liquidation.

As regards examinership, a stay of action can be imposed for up to 100 calendar days where the seller goes into examinership (an examiner's appointment is initially for 70 days, but may be extended by another 30 days with the sanction of the court).

If the seller has been appointed as the servicer of the receivables, the stay of action could block the purchaser from enforcing the servicing contract, and any amounts held by the servicer in respect of the receivables (if not held on trust for the purchaser under a valid and binding trust arrangement) could be deemed to form part of the insolvency estate of the servicer, rather than being the property of the purchaser.

If only an equitable assignment has been effected (i.e. no notice has been given to an obligor), an obligor may continue to pay the seller. Normally, the seller will hold any such amounts on trust for the purchaser, but if no such trust has been created, such amounts will likely form part of the seller's insolvency estate and the purchaser would be an unsecured creditor of the seller in respect of those amounts.

6.2 Insolvency Official's Powers. If there is no stay of action under what circumstances, if any, does the insolvency official have the power to prohibit the purchaser's exercise of rights (by means of injunction, stay order or other action)?

See question 6.1 above. Assuming the receivables have been sold by legal assignment or by means of a subsequently perfected equitable assignment, an Irish insolvency official appointed over the seller should not be able to prohibit the purchaser's exercise of its rights (unless there has been a fraudulent preference or an improper transfer of company assets, as described in our response to question 6.3 below).

6.3 Suspect Period (Clawback). Under what facts or circumstances could the insolvency official rescind or reverse transactions that took place during a "suspect" or "preference" period before the commencement of the insolvency proceeding? What are the lengths of the "suspect" or "preference" periods in your jurisdiction for (a) transactions between unrelated parties, and (b) transactions between related parties?

Under Section 443 of the Companies Act, if a liquidator can show that any company property was disposed of and the effect was to "perpetrate a fraud" on either the company, its creditors or its members, the High Court may, if just and equitable, order any person who appears to have "use, control or possession" of the property or the proceeds of the sale or development thereof, to deliver it or pay a sum in respect of it to the liquidator on such terms as the High Court sees fit.

Section 604(2) of the Companies Act provides that any conveyance, mortgage, delivery of goods, payment, execution or other act relating to property made or done by or against a company, which is unable to pay its debts as they become due to any creditor, within six months of the commencement of a winding up of the company with a view to giving such creditor (or any surety or guarantor of the debt due to such creditor) a preference over its other creditors, will be invalid. Case law (under the equivalent provision of the Companies Act 1963) indicates that a "dominant intent" must be shown on the part of the entity concerned to prefer a creditor over

other creditors. Furthermore, Section 604 is only applicable if at the time of the conveyance, mortgage or other relevant act, the company was already insolvent. Where the conveyance, mortgage, etc. is in favour of a "connected person", the six-month period is extended to two years.

Section 597 of the Companies Act renders invalid (except to the extent of monies actually advanced or paid, or the actual price or value of goods or services sold or supplied, to the company at the time of or subsequently to the creation of, and in consideration for the charge, or to interest on that amount at the appropriate rate) floating charges on the property of a company created within 12 months before the commencement of the winding up of that company (unless the company was solvent immediately after the creation of the charge). Where the floating charge is created in favour of a "connected person", the 12-month period is extended to two years.

6.4 Substantive Consolidation. Under what facts or circumstances, if any, could the insolvency official consolidate the assets and liabilities of the purchaser with those of the seller or its affiliates in the insolvency proceeding?

Irish law gives an Irish court the power, in certain circumstances, to treat the assets and liabilities of one company as though they were assets and liabilities of any other.

An Irish court may exercise its equitable jurisdiction and treat two or more companies as a single entity if this conforms to the economic and commercial realities of the situation, and the justice of the case so requires.

Furthermore, if an Irish company goes into liquidation or examination, the Companies Act specifies particular scenarios where an Irish court has the power to "make such order as it thinks fit" in respect of transactions entered into by that company to restore the position to what it would have been if it had not entered into the transaction. In addition, in certain limited instances, a court may "pierce the corporate veil".

Also, depending on the particular case, a court may: (i) order that the appointment of an examiner to a company be extended to a "related company" of the company in examination; (ii) (if it is just and equitable to do so) order that any related company of a company being liquidated pay some or all of the debts of the company in liquidation (a "contribution order"); or (iii) provide that where two or more "related companies" are being wound up (and it is just and equitable to do so), both companies be wound up together as if they were one company (a "pooling order").

However, case law suggests that the above powers/orders will only be exercised/granted in exceptional circumstances.

6.5 Effect of Insolvency on Receivables Sales. If insolvency proceedings are commenced against the seller in your jurisdiction, what effect do those proceedings have on (a) sales of receivables that would otherwise occur after the commencement of such proceedings, or (b) sales of receivables that only come into existence after the commencement of such proceedings?

If a true sale of the receivables (including future receivables) has already been effected, the purchase price for the receivables has been paid (subject to the matters described in questions 6.1 and 6.3 above), and no further action is required by the seller, the seller's insolvency should not of itself affect the purchaser's rights as purchaser of the receivable.

If a receivables purchase agreement has been entered into, but the purchase price is not paid prior to the seller's insolvency, the purchaser will be left as an unsecured creditor of the seller.

6.6 Effect of Limited Recourse Provisions. If a debtor's contract contains a limited recourse provision (see question 7.3 below), can the debtor nevertheless be declared insolvent on the grounds that it cannot pay its debts as they become due?

A contractual provision limiting the recourse of the creditors of the debtor (as specified in question 7.3 below) is likely to be valid as a matter of Irish law (although such provisions have not yet been adjudicated upon by the Irish courts). Accordingly, if all of the debtor's contracts contain a limited recourse provision whereby its creditors agree to limit their recourse to the debtor (and assuming the limited recourse provision operates correctly), it should not be possible for the debtor to be declared insolvent on grounds that it cannot pay its debts as they become due.

7 Special Rules

7.1 Securitisation Law. Is there a special securitisation law (and/or special provisions in other laws) in your jurisdiction establishing a legal framework for securitisation transactions? If so, what are the basics?

Yes. Section 110 of the Taxes Consolidation Act 1997 (the TCA) allows for the special treatment of Irish companies (**Section 110 SPVs**) under which securitisations and other structured transactions can be effected. Section 110 SPVs can either be private limited companies (**CLS**) or designated activity companies (**DAC**) incorporated under the Companies Act which, if they meet the conditions set out in Section 110, have their profits calculated for Irish tax purposes as if they were carrying on a trade. Where it is envisaged that a Section 110 SPV will issue debt securities it must be registered as a DAC.

This enables them to take deductions for all expenditure, in particular, interest payments that must be made on the debt instruments issued by them. This ensures that there is very little or no Irish tax payable by Section 110 SPVs. This legislative regime has facilitated the development of securitisation in Ireland, and Section 110 SPVs have been used in numerous cross-border securitisations.

There are also generous exemptions available from Irish withholding tax on payments of interest made by Section 110 SPVs which are structured to fall within the securitisation legislation (these are discussed in more detail in question 9.1). One clear advantage for Section 110 SPVs is that they can make payments of "profit dependent" interest without any negative implications and can use straight "pass through" structures, for example, collateralised debt obligations.

In order to avail of the relief under Section 110, the company must be a "qualifying company", i.e. it must:

- (i) be resident in Ireland;
- (ii) acquire "qualifying assets";
- (iii) carry on in Ireland a business of holding, managing, or both the holding and management of, qualifying assets;
- (iv) apart from activities ancillary to that business, carry on no other activities;
- (v) the market value of the qualifying assets is not less than €10 million on the day on which they are first acquired; and

- (vi) have notified the Revenue Commissioners that it is or intends to be a Section 110 company.

A company shall not be a qualifying company if any transaction or arrangement is entered into by it otherwise than by way of a bargain made at arm's length.

The definition of "qualifying assets" is non-exhaustive and includes shares, bonds, receivables, other securities, futures, etc.

7.2 Securitisation Entities. Does your jurisdiction have laws specifically providing for establishment of special purpose entities for securitisation? If so, what does the law provide as to: (a) requirements for establishment and management of such an entity; (b) legal attributes and benefits of the entity; and (c) any specific requirements as to the status of directors or shareholders?

Irish law does not specifically provide for the establishment of special purpose entities for securitisation transactions, but see question 7.1 above.

7.3 Limited-Recourse Clause. Will a court in your jurisdiction give effect to a contractual provision in an agreement (even if that agreement's governing law is the law of another country) limiting the recourse of parties to that agreement to the available assets of the relevant debtor, and providing that to the extent of any shortfall the debt of the relevant debtor is extinguished?

A contractual provision limiting the recourse of the creditors of an entity to its available funds is likely to be valid under Irish law (whether the contract's governing law is Irish or the law of another country – see question 6.6 above).

7.4 Non-Petition Clause. Will a court in your jurisdiction give effect to a contractual provision in an agreement (even if that agreement's governing law is the law of another country) prohibiting the parties from: (a) taking legal action against the purchaser or another person; or (b) commencing an insolvency proceeding against the purchaser or another person?

Although there is little authority in Irish law, it is likely that an Irish court would give effect to contractual provisions (whether governed by Irish law or the law of another country) prohibiting the parties to the relevant contract from taking legal action (or commencing an insolvency proceeding) against the purchaser or another person.

It is possible that an Irish court would consider an insolvency winding-up petition even if it were presented in breach of a non-petition clause. A party may have statutory or constitutional rights to take legal action against the purchaser/another person, which may not be contractually disappplied and a court could hold that the non-petition clause was contrary to Irish public policy on the grounds referred to above (i.e. ousting of court jurisdiction and/or Irish insolvency laws).

7.5 Priority of Payments "Waterfall". Will a court in your jurisdiction give effect to a contractual provision in an agreement (even if that agreement's governing law is the law of another country) distributing payments to parties in a certain order specified in the contract?

An Irish court should generally give effect to a contractual provision (whether the contract's governing law is Irish or the law of another

country) distributing payments to an Irish company's creditors in a certain order. However, in an insolvency of an Irish company, certain creditors are given preferential status by statute and so the contractual priority of payments provision could be altered.

7.6 Independent Director. Will a court in your jurisdiction give effect to a contractual provision in an agreement (even if that agreement's governing law is the law of another country) or a provision in a party's organisational documents prohibiting the directors from taking specified actions (including commencing an insolvency proceeding) without the affirmative vote of an independent director?

An Irish court should give effect to such a provision or article in an Irish company's articles of association.

However, any provision which purports to restrict or limit the directors' ability to bring insolvency proceedings may be invalid on public policy grounds or as incompatible with the directors' statutory duties.

8 Regulatory Issues

8.1 Required Authorisations, etc. Assuming that the purchaser does no other business in your jurisdiction, will its purchase and ownership or its collection and enforcement of receivables result in its being required to qualify to do business or to obtain any licence or its being subject to regulation as a financial institution in your jurisdiction? Does the answer to the preceding question change if the purchaser does business with other sellers in your jurisdiction?

If the underlying obligors are consumers, the CCA (and the other consumer protection legislation and codes discussed in question 1.2 above and question 8.4 below) may be applicable (irrespective of whether the purchaser is dealing with one or more sellers in Ireland). The CCA provides for the licensing of three categories of activity, acting as: (i) a moneylender; (ii) a credit intermediary; or (iii) a mortgage intermediary. If the underlying obligors are natural persons and there is any form of credit being provided, consideration should be had to the retail credit firm authorisation requirements of the CBI under the Central Bank Act 1942 to 2013 (the CBA). In addition, under Irish data protection legislation, the purchaser might need to register with the Irish Data Protection Commissioner as a "data controller" or a "data processor".

If a purchaser holds the legal title to a credit and (i) where that credit was advanced by an Irish bank or a EU regulated entity authorised to provide credit in Ireland, (ii) is advanced to one or more natural persons within the state or with certain micro, small or medium sized enterprises, and (iii) chooses to service the loan itself, it may be required to be authorised as a "credit servicing firm" as defined in the Consumer Protection (Regulation of Credit Servicing Firms) Act 2015 (the **Credit Servicing Act**) by the CBI and will be subject to the CBI's various codes (as discussed in question 1.2 above and question 8.4 below). If, however, the relevant purchaser appoints a credit servicer who is either (i) a regulated financial services provider authorised to provide credit in Ireland, or (ii) an authorised "credit servicing firm" itself, (whether incorporated in Ireland or elsewhere within the EEA) to service the loans/credit, the purchaser will not be required to be authorised under the Credit Servicing Act.

8.2 Servicing. Does the seller require any licences, etc., in order to continue to enforce and collect receivables following their sale to the purchaser, including to appear before a court? Does a third party replacement servicer require any licences, etc., in order to enforce and collect sold receivables?

The seller does not need a licence in order to continue to enforce and collect receivables following their sale to the purchaser, as debt collection is not a specifically licensed activity in Ireland. However, with respect to any credit agreement it continues to service, it will be required to be authorised as a "credit servicing firm" as defined in the Credit Servicing Act (see question 8.1 above) and comply with applicable Irish consumer protection legislation (e.g. the CPC). The seller would also need to be registered with the Data Protection Commissioner. Where the seller continues to act as servicer with respect to residential mortgage loans, it will need to be authorised to perform such role by the CBI. Any standby or replacement servicer would require the same licences and authorisations.

8.3 Data Protection. Does your jurisdiction have laws restricting the use or dissemination of data about or provided by obligors? If so, do these laws apply only to consumer obligors or also to enterprises?

The Irish Data Protection Act, 1988 and the Irish Data Protection (Amendment) Act 2003 (the **DPA**s) restrict the use and dissemination of personal data in relation to "data subjects", which are "individuals" (i.e. natural persons and not corporate entities).

The DPAs regulate the collection, processing, use and disclosure of data and provide, *inter alia*, that such data must be kept for one or more specified and lawful purposes only, that it must be used and disclosed only in ways compatible with those purposes, and be kept safe and secure.

8.4 Consumer Protection. If the obligors are consumers, will the purchaser (including a bank acting as purchaser) be required to comply with any consumer protection law of your jurisdiction? Briefly, what is required?

If the obligors are "consumers" then a bank acting as purchaser will need to comply with the terms of its authorisation and the applicable codes of conduct/advertising rules (e.g. the CPC) or other Irish consumer protection laws, including the CCA, the CCA Regulations and the UTCCR Regulations.

The CCA imposes a number of obligations on credit intermediaries and also provides protections to consumers (e.g. by regulating the advertising of consumer credit, and by bestowing a "cooling-off" period in favour of the consumer after signing an agreement).

The CCA Regulations apply to loans to consumers where the amount lent is between €200 and €75,000. The main provisions of the CCA relate to, *inter alia*: (i) standardisation of the information to be contained in a credit agreement; (ii) standardisation of pre-contractual information; and (iii) a full 14-day "right of withdrawal" for consumers from the relevant credit agreement.

Where there is a significant imbalance in the parties' rights and obligations under a consumer contract to the detriment of the consumer, the UTCCR Regulations may apply. The UTCCR Regulations contain a non-exhaustive list of terms which will be deemed "unfair" and the list includes terms which attempt to exclude or limit the legal liability of a seller in the event of the death of, or personal injury to, a consumer due to an act or omission by the seller, or, require any consumer who

fails to fulfil his obligation to pay a disproportionately high sum in compensation. If a term is unfair it will not be binding on the consumer. However, the contract should continue to bind the parties, if it is capable of continuing in existence without the unfair term.

The CPC imposes general obligations on “regulated entities” dealing with “customers” in Ireland (primarily “consumers”), to act honestly, fairly and professionally and with due skill, care and diligence in the best interests of their customers and to avoid conflicts of interest.

If there is no obligation on a non-bank purchaser to provide any funding to a consumer, then it should not need to be licensed, but might still need to comply with the CCA, the UTCCR Regulations, the CPC and the CCA Regulations (if applicable).

8.5 Currency Restrictions. Does your jurisdiction have laws restricting the exchange of your jurisdiction's currency for other currencies or the making of payments in your jurisdiction's currency to persons outside the country?

Ireland does not have any exchange control laws. Certain financial transfer orders in place from time to time may restrict payments to certain countries, groups and individuals subject to UN sanctions.

9 Taxation

9.1 Withholding Taxes. Will any part of payments on receivables by the obligors to the seller or the purchaser be subject to withholding taxes in your jurisdiction? Does the answer depend on the nature of the receivables, whether they bear interest, their term to maturity, or where the seller or the purchaser is located? In the case of a sale of trade receivables at a discount, is there a risk that the discount will be recharacterised in whole or in part as interest? In the case of a sale of trade receivables where a portion of the purchase price is payable upon collection of the receivable, is there a risk that the deferred purchase price will be recharacterised in whole or in part as interest?

It is usually possible to structure a securitisation (especially when using a Section 110 SPVs) so that payments on receivables are not subject to Irish withholding tax.

There is a general obligation to withhold tax from any payment of yearly interest made by an Irish company. The rate of withholding is currently 20 per cent. Therefore, in principle, if the debtor is an Irish person and the receivable has a maturity of more than one year, it is likely this withholding obligation will arise. Interest paid by Irish debtors to a Section 110 SPVs should come within an exemption from interest withholding tax.

Exemptions also exist for interest payments made by a Section 110 SPVs. There is an exemption for interest paid by a Section 110 SPVs to a person who is resident for the purpose of tax in an EU Member State (other than Ireland) or in a country with which Ireland has a double tax treaty (except in a case where the person is a company where such interest is paid to the company in connection with a trade or a business which is carried on in Ireland by the company through a branch or agency).

There is also an exemption for interest paid on a quoted eurobond, where either:

- (a) the person by or through whom the payment is made is not in Ireland, i.e. non Irish paying agent; or

- (b) the payment is made by or through a person in Ireland, and either:
 - (i) the quoted eurobond is held in a recognised clearing system (Euroclear and Clearstream SA are so recognised); or
 - (ii) the person who is a beneficial owner of the quoted eurobond and who is beneficially entitled to the interest is not resident in Ireland and has made a declaration to this effect.

A quoted eurobond means a security which:

- (a) is issued by a company;
- (b) is quoted on a recognised stock exchange; and
- (c) carries a right to interest.

In the case of a sale of trade receivables, deferred purchase price should not be recharacterised in whole, or in part, as interest. It should be considered to be a payment made for the acquisition of the receivables, and not a payment of interest. Likewise a sale of receivables at a discount should not of itself result in amounts subsequently paid on the receivables being treated as annual interest subject to withholding tax.

9.2 Seller Tax Accounting. Does your jurisdiction require that a specific accounting policy is adopted for tax purposes by the seller or purchaser in the context of a securitisation?

A company qualifying for the favourable Irish tax treatment provided for by Section 110 of the TCA will be, subject to certain adjustments required by law, subject to Irish corporation tax on its profit according to its profit and loss account prepared in accordance with generally accepted commercial accounting principles in Ireland as at 31 December 2004 (i.e. before the introduction of IFRS), unless it elects otherwise.

9.3 Stamp Duty, etc. Does your jurisdiction impose stamp duty or other documentary taxes on sales of receivables?

An agreement for the sale of, or an instrument effecting the sale of, debt having an Irish legal *situs* may be chargeable to Irish stamp duty absent an exemption. An instrument effecting the transfer of debt having a non-Irish *situs* may also be chargeable to Irish stamp duty, absent an exemption, if it is executed in Ireland or if it relates to something done or to be done in Ireland. There are certain exemptions from Irish stamp duty that may be relevant, such as the debt factoring exemption or loan capital exemption. A transfer by way of novation should not give rise to stamp duty.

9.4 Value Added Taxes. Does your jurisdiction impose value added tax, sales tax or other similar taxes on sales of goods or services, on sales of receivables or on fees for collection agent services?

Ireland does apply VAT on the sale of goods and services. The standard rate of VAT is 23 per cent.

A purchaser will be required to register and account, on a reverse charge basis, for Irish VAT at the rate of 23 per cent on the receipt by it of certain services from persons established outside Ireland. These services would include legal, accounting, consultancy and rating agency services and also financial services to the extent that those financial services are not exempt from Irish VAT.

The sale of receivables should be exempt from VAT. The services of a collection agent would normally qualify for exemption.

Where a purchaser would not be engaged in making VAT taxable supplies in the course of its business, it would not be able to recover VAT (1) payable by it in respect of the receipt of services outlined in the paragraph above, or (2) charged to it by suppliers of VAT-taxable services (e.g. the provision of legal, accounting and audit services by Irish providers, the provision of trustee and administration services).

9.5 Purchaser Liability. If the seller is required to pay value added tax, stamp duty or other taxes upon the sale of receivables (or on the sale of goods or services that give rise to the receivables) and the seller does not pay, then will the taxing authority be able to make claims for the unpaid tax against the purchaser or against the sold receivables or collections?

It depends on the nature of the VAT charge that arose. If the supply is received from an Irish supplier that should have levied VAT, then unless there is a contractual provision enabling the seller to claim the VAT off the purchaser, the person the Revenue Commissioners

would make a claim against would be the seller. However, in the case of reverse charge services received from abroad, the accountable person would be the purchaser and the Revenue Commissioners could claim against the purchaser. In an arm's length transaction stamp duty should be for the account of the purchaser only.

9.6 Doing Business. Assuming that the purchaser conducts no other business in your jurisdiction, would the purchaser's purchase of the receivables, its appointment of the seller as its servicer and collection agent, or its enforcement of the receivables against the obligors, make it liable to tax in your jurisdiction?

Liability to Irish corporation tax may arise if the purchaser is "carrying on a trade" in Ireland. The term "trade" is a case law-derived concept and there is no useful statutory definition of the term. However, in general, the purchase, collection and enforcement of the receivable should not be considered as "trading" under Irish law and the purchaser should not incur any Irish tax liabilities.



Peter Walker

A&L Goodbody
25–28 North Wall Quay
Dublin 1
Ireland

Tel: +353 1 649 2202
Email: pwalker@algoodbody.com
URL: www.algoodbody.com

Peter Walker is a partner in the banking financial services department of A&L Goodbody and is head of the Capital Market and Structured Product group within the firm. His principal practice areas are asset-backed finance, debt capital markets, structured products and private equity finance. Recent transactions which Peter has been involved with include a number of domestic securitisations (RMBS, auto loan & other asset classes), numerous performing and non-performing loan portfolio acquisitions and disposals (both secured and unsecured), trade receivable securitisations (multi-jurisdictional and purely domestic), CLOs, and the establishment of acquisition platforms and loan origination platforms. Peter also regularly advises on application of the Market Abuse and Prospectus Regulations and netting/insolvency issues.



Jack Sheehy

A&L Goodbody
Augustine House, 6A Austin Friars
London EC2N 2HA
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 207 382 0800
Email: jsheehy@algoodbody.com
URL: www.algoodbody.com

Jack Sheehy is a partner in the banking financial services department of A&L Goodbody and resident in our London office. His principal practice areas are debt capital markets, private equity finance and general banking and restructurings. Recent transactions include a number of loan portfolio acquisitions, financings of loan portfolio acquisitions, high yield bond issues, CLOs, securitisation restructurings and the establishment of asset acquisition and loan origination platforms.

A&L Goodbody



A&L Goodbody is internationally recognised as a leading Irish corporate law firm. Headquartered in Dublin, with offices in Belfast, London, New York, San Francisco and Palo Alto, the firm has a total staff of over 600. A&L Goodbody acts for domestic and global corporations, financial institutions, intermediaries and government. The firm advises on every area of business law including corporate and commercial, M&A, banking and financial services, taxation, property, as well as litigation and private client work.

The A&L Goodbody Securitisation and Capital Markets Group is one of the largest practices of its kind in Ireland. The Group acts for a range of institutions including investment banks, retail banks, private equity/hedge funds and corporates. In each case, the group has acted both on the borrower and lender sides. The sort of transaction the group has advised on include domestic and international securitisations (including RMBS, CMBs, CLOs and CDOs), debt repackaging, bond issues, EMTN programmes, FRN issues, commercial paper programmes, certificates of deposit programmes and other debt capital market issuances. In addition, the group has played a significant role in the establishment and operation of a number of acquisition and origination platforms and loan portfolio acquisitions and disposals.

Other titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks



59 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL, United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720 / Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: sales@glgroup.co.uk