



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to: **Lending & Secured Finance 2019**

7th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into lending and secured finance

Allen & Overy LLP
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune
Asia Pacific Loan Market Association (APLMA)
Astrea
Baker & McKenzie LLP
Bravo da Costa, Saraiva – Sociedade de Advogados
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP
Carey
Carey Olsen Jersey LLP
Cordero & Cordero Abogados
Crales & Urcullo
Cuatrecasas
Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
Dechert LLP
Dillon Eustace
Drew & Napier LLC
E & G Economides LLC
E. Schaffer & Co.
Fellner Wratzfeld & Partners
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP
Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.

Haynes and Boone, LLP
Hogan Lovells International LLP
Holland & Knight
HSBC
IKT Law Firm
Jadek & Pensa
JPM Janković Popović Mitić
Kelobang Godisang Attorneys
King & Wood Mallesons
Latham & Watkins LLP
Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law
Lloreda Camacho & Co.
Loan Market Association
Loan Syndications and Trading Association
Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg S.à r.l.
Macesic & Partners LLC
Maples Group
Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal
McMillan LLP
Milbank LLP
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Nielsen Nørager Law Firm LLP

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP
Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd
Pinheiro Neto Advogados
PLMJ Advogados
Ploum
Proskauer Rose LLP
Rodner, Martínez & Asociados
Sardelas Liarikos Petsa Law Firm
Seward & Kissel LLP
Shearman & Sterling LLP
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Škubla & Partneri s. r. o.
SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschutz
Rechtsanwaltsgesellschaft mbH
Trofin & Asociații
TTA – Sociedade de Advogados
Wakefield Quin Limited
Walalangi & Partners (in association with Nishimura & Asahi)
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
White & Case LLP





Contributing Editor

Thomas Mellor, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Publisher

Rory Smith

Sales Director

Florjan Osmani

Account Director

Oliver Smith

Senior Editors

Caroline Collingwood
Rachel Williams

Editor

Sam Friend

Group Consulting Editor

Alan Falach

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

Stephens & George
Print Group
April 2019

Copyright © 2019

Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-912509-65-2
ISSN 2050-9847

Strategic Partners



Editorial Chapters:

1	Loan Syndications and Trading: An Overview of the Syndicated Loan Market – Bridget Marsh & Tess Virmani, Loan Syndications and Trading Association	1
2	Loan Market Association – An Overview – Nigel Houghton & Hannah Vanstone, Loan Market Association	6
3	Asia Pacific Loan Market Association – An Overview – Andrew Ferguson, Asia Pacific Loan Market Association (APLMA)	12

General Chapters:

4	An Introduction to Legal Risk and Structuring Cross-Border Lending Transactions – Thomas Mellor & Marcus Marsh, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	15
5	Global Trends in the Leveraged Loan Market in 2018 – Joshua W. Thompson & Corey Fevzi, Shearman & Sterling LLP	20
6	Developments in Delayed Draw Term Loans – Meyer C. Dworkin & Samantha Hait, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	26
7	Commercial Lending in a Changing Regulatory Environment, 2019 and Beyond – Bill Satchell & Elizabeth Leckie, Allen & Overy LLP	30
8	Acquisition Financing in the United States: Will the Boom Continue? – Geoffrey R. Peck & Mark S. Wojciechowski, Morrison & Foerster LLP	34
9	A Comparative Overview of Transatlantic Intercreditor Agreements – Lauren Hanrahan & Suhrod Mehta, Milbank LLP	39
10	A Comparison of Key Provisions in U.S. and European Leveraged Loan Agreements – Sarah M. Ward & Mark L. Darley, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	46
11	The Global Subscription Credit Facility and Fund Finance Markets – Key Trends and Forecasts – Michael C. Mascia & Wesley A. Misson, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP	59
12	Recent Developments in U.S. Term Loan B – Denise Ryan & Kyle Lakin, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP	63
13	The Continued Growth of European Covenant Lite – James Chesterman & Jane Summers, Latham & Watkins LLP	70
14	Cross-Border Loans – What You Need to Know – Judah Frogel & Jonathan Homer, Allen & Overy LLP	73
15	Debt Retirement in Leveraged Financings – Scott B. Selinger & Ryan T. Rafferty, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP	82
16	Analysis and Update on the Continuing Evolution of Terms in Private Credit Transactions – Sandra Lee Montgomery & Michelle Lee Iodice, Proskauer Rose LLP	88
17	Secondments as a Periscope into the Client and How to Leverage the Secondment Experience – Alanna Chang, HSBC	95
18	Trade Finance on the Blockchain: 2019 Update – Josias Dewey, Holland & Knight	98
19	The Global Private Credit Market: 2019 Update – Jeff Norton & Ben J. Leese, Dechert LLP	104
20	Investment Grade Acquisition Financing Commitments – Julian S.H. Chung & Stewart A. Kagan, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP	109
21	Acquisition Financing in Latin America: Navigating Diverse Legal Complexities in the Region – Sabrena Silver & Anna Andreeva, White & Case LLP	114
22	Developments in Midstream Oil and Gas Finance in the United States – Elena Maria Millerman & John Donaleski, White & Case LLP	121
23	Margin Loans: The Complexities of Pre-IPO Acquired Shares – Craig Unterberg & LeAnn Chen, Haynes and Boone, LLP	127
24	Credit Agreement Provisions and Conflicts Between US Sanctions and Blocking Statutes – Roshelle A. Nagar & Ted Posner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP	132
25	SOFR So Good? The Transition Away from LIBOR Begins in the United States – Kalyan (“Kal”) Das & Y. Daphne Coelho-Adam, Seward & Kissel LLP	137

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.

General Chapters:

26	Developments in the Syndicated Term Loan Market: Will Historical Distinctions from the High-Yield Bond Market Be Restored? – Joseph F. Giannini & Adrienne Sebring, Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP	141
27	Green Finance – Alex Harrison & Andrew Carey, Hogan Lovells International LLP	144
28	U.S. Tax Reform and Effects on Cross-Border Financing – Patrick M. Cox, Baker & McKenzie LLP	149

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

29	Angola	Bravo da Costa, Saraiva – Sociedade de Advogados / PLMJ: Bruno Xavier de Pina & Joana Marques dos Reis	159
30	Argentina	Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal: Juan M. Diehl Moreno & Diego A. Chighizola	165
31	Australia	King & Wood Mallesons: Yuen-Yee Cho & Elizabeth Hundt Russell	174
32	Austria	Fellner Wratzfeld & Partners: Markus Fellner & Florian Kranebitter	183
33	Belgium	Astrea: Dieter Veestraeten	193
34	Bermuda	Wakefield Quin Limited: Erik L Gotfredsen & Jemima Fearnside	199
35	Bolivia	Crales & Urcullo: Andrea Mariah Urcullo Pereira & Daniel Mariaca Alvarez	207
36	Botswana	Kelobang Godisang Attorneys: Wandipa T. Kelobang & Laone Queen Moreki	214
37	Brazil	Pinheiro Neto Advogados: Ricardo Simões Russo & Leonardo Baptista Rodrigues Cruz	221
38	British Virgin Islands	Maples Group: Michael Gagie & Matthew Gilbert	230
39	Canada	McMillan LLP: Jeff Rogers & Don Waters	237
40	Cayman Islands	Maples Group: Tina Meigh	247
41	Chile	Carey: Diego Peralta	255
42	China	King & Wood Mallesons: Stanley Zhou & Jack Wang	262
43	Colombia	Lloreda Camacho & Co.: Santiago Gutiérrez & Juan Sebastián Peredo	269
44	Costa Rica	Cordero & Cordero Abogados: Hernán Cordero Maduro & Ricardo Cordero B.	276
45	Croatia	Macesic & Partners LLC: Ivana Manovel	284
46	Cyprus	E & G Economides LLC: Marinella Kilikitas & George Economides	292
47	Denmark	Nielsen Nørager Law Firm LLP: Thomas Melchior Fischer & Peter Lyck	300
48	England	Allen & Overy LLP: David Campbell & Oleg Khomenko	307
49	Finland	White & Case LLP: Tanja Törnkvist & Krista Rekola	316
50	France	Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP: Emmanuel Ringeval & Cristina Radu	324
51	Germany	SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschutz Rechtsanwalts-gesellschaft mbH: Dr. Dietrich F. R. Stiller & Dr. Andreas Herr	335
52	Greece	Sardelas Liarikos Petsa Law Firm: Panagiotis (Notis) Sardelas & Konstantina (Nantia) Kalogiannidi	344
53	Hong Kong	King & Wood Mallesons: Richard Mazzochi & Khin Voong	352
54	Indonesia	Walalangi & Partners (in association with Nishimura & Asahi): Luky I. Walalangi & Siti Kemala Nuraida	360
55	Ireland	Dillon Eustace: Conor Keaveny & Richard Lacken	366
56	Israel	E. Schaffer & Co.: Ehud (Udi) Schaffer & Shiri Ish Shalom	375
57	Italy	Allen & Overy Studio Legale Associato: Stefano Sennhauser & Alessandra Pirozzolo	381
58	Ivory Coast	IKT Law Firm: Annick Imboua-Niava & Osther Tella	390
59	Japan	Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Taro Awataguchi & Yuki Kohmaru	396
60	Jersey	Carey Olsen Jersey LLP: Robin Smith & Laura McConnell	404
61	Luxembourg	Loyens & Loeff Luxembourg S.à r.l.: Antoine Fortier-Grethen	414
62	Mexico	Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.: José Ignacio Rivero Andere & Jacinto Avalos Capin	422
63	Mozambique	TTA – Sociedade de Advogados / PLMJ: Gonçalo dos Reis Martins & Nuno Morgado Pereira	430

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

64	Netherlands	Ploum: Tom Ensink & Alette Brehm	437
65	Portugal	PLMJ Advogados: Gonalo dos Reis Martins	445
66	Romania	Trofin & Asociații: Valentin Trofin & Mihaela Atanasiu	452
67	Russia	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Grigory Marinichev & Alexey Chertov	462
68	Serbia	JPM Janković Popović Mitić: Nenad Popović & Nikola Poznanović	470
69	Singapore	Drew & Napier LLC: Pauline Chong & Renu Menon	477
70	Slovakia	Škubla & Partneri s. r. o.: Marián Šulík & Zuzana Moravčíková Kolenová	487
71	Slovenia	Jadek & Pensa: Andraž Jadek & Žiga Urankar	494
72	South Africa	Allen & Overy LLP: Lionel Shawe & Lisa Botha	504
73	Spain	Cuatrecasas: Manuel Follía & Iñigo Várez	514
74	Sweden	White & Case LLP: Carl Hugo Parment & Tobias Johansson	525
75	Switzerland	Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd: Oliver Widmer & Urs Klöti	532
76	Taiwan	Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Hsin-Lan Hsu & Odin Hsu	541
77	UAE	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Victoria Mesquita Wlazlo & Amanjit K. Fagura	549
78	USA	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Thomas Mellor & Rick Eisenbiegler	564
79	Venezuela	Rodner, Martínez & Asociados: Jaime Martínez Estévez	576

EDITORIAL

Welcome to the seventh edition of *The International Comparative Legal Guide to: Lending & Secured Finance*.

This guide provides corporate counsel and international practitioners with a comprehensive worldwide legal analysis of the laws and regulations of lending and secured finance.

It is divided into three main sections:

Three editorial chapters. These are overview chapters and have been contributed by the LSTA, the LMA and the APLMA.

Twenty-five general chapters. These chapters are designed to provide readers with an overview of key issues affecting lending and secured finance, particularly from the perspective of a multi-jurisdictional transaction.

Country question and answer chapters. These provide a broad overview of common issues in lending and secured finance laws and regulations in 51 jurisdictions.

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

Special thanks are reserved for the contributing editor Thomas Mellor of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius 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.com.

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

Credit Agreement Provisions and Conflicts Between US Sanctions and Blocking Statutes

Roshelle A. Nagar



Ted Posner



Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

Introduction

Most credit agreements contain representations and covenants affirming, requiring or prohibiting actions by the credit group, including general provisions regarding compliance with applicable laws. Under current market standards for US law-governed credit agreements, most lenders also expect to receive specific representations and covenants from the credit group with respect to compliance with sanctions laws and regulations promulgated by sanctions authorities in the US, EU, the United Nations Security Council and the UK. While US entities should be familiar with US sanctions restrictions and would generally have policies and procedures in place to ensure compliance, the same credit agreement provisions often apply to non-US subsidiaries and sometimes to their affiliates. For a multinational entity, this expanded group could include far-flung foreign subsidiaries as well as their officers, directors and employees, thereby creating potential monitoring issues for entities and individuals that would not necessarily expect to be restricted from doing business with persons sanctioned under US law. As a result, not only might a non-US entity inadvertently fail to comply with credit agreement sanctions provisions, but in some cases it may also be bound by foreign laws that are inconsistent with, or in some cases contravene, certain US sanctions, thereby leading to potential conflicts with US law.

A. US Sanctions Regime

Economic and trade sanctions are administered by the United States government (the “US”) primarily (though not exclusively) through the Department of State, the Department of Commerce and the Office of Foreign Assets Control (“OFAC”), an agency within the Department of the Treasury. The US utilises sanctions to implement US foreign policy and national security goals. Each sanctions programme targets specific countries, regimes, industries and related entities and individuals and addresses different objectives. Sanctions programmes are supported by one or more statutory authorities, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, which grants authority to the President of the United States that “may be exercised to deal with any unusual or extraordinary threat, which has its source in whole or in substantial part outside of the United States, to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States...”.¹ Among other things, US sanctions prohibit US persons from engaging in specified transactions with foreign persons and entities that are included on OFAC’s Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons List (the “SDN List”). Sanctions can be comprehensive or limited to specific individuals or entities, or to specified agencies, instrumentalities or industries of a target country

or regime. They can also take different forms: primary sanctions (addressed to activities of US persons); and secondary sanctions (addressed to activities of non-US persons).

Primary sanctions are those that apply to activities of US persons that have a direct jurisdictional nexus with the United States. The scope of US persons that are subject to OFAC regulations and other sanctions regimes is broad. It includes US citizens and permanent resident green card holders wherever located, US registered entities and their foreign branches, foreign persons to the extent of their activities while physically located in the US and, in certain cases, foreign subsidiaries that are owned or controlled by US persons. The individual sanctions programmes operate to prohibit or restrict economic activity between US persons or entities and a sanctioned country or sanctioned persons, entities or industries.

Secondary, or extra-territorial, sanctions have an impact on an even broader group of persons. They are intended to deter certain activities of non-US persons that may not otherwise be subject to US jurisdiction with a goal of further isolating the target of the sanctions. Since they indirectly target foreign individuals and entities for engaging in activities with countries, entities, individuals or industries that are subject to US sanctions, they can potentially sweep into their net transactions with no direct nexus to the US. For example, a foreign entity that engages in a sanctioned activity with Iran outside of the US in a transaction that does not involve US persons could potentially expose itself to sanctions by the US, notwithstanding such foreign entity’s lack of direct activities with US persons. This connection to the US can result from the foreign person’s efforts to access the US financial system or otherwise conduct business in a way that indirectly relates to US persons. The potential scope of secondary sanctions expands in concert with the growing list of sanctioned countries, individuals and entities.

The use of secondary sanctions by the US is on the rise. An example of new sanctions legislation is the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, which became law in August 2017 and imposed secondary sanctions targeting Iran, Russia and North Korea and related persons and entities. Throughout 2018, further sanctions were imposed against specified Russian individuals and entities as punishment for allegedly meddling with the US 2016 presidential election (though a number of these additional sanctions were subsequently lifted), although such sanctions do not prohibit US entities from generally engaging in business with Russia. For example, secondary sanctions targeting Russia can be imposed against any person who knowingly engages in significant activities undermining cybersecurity on behalf of Russia or in transactions with persons that are part of the Russian government’s defence or intelligence sectors. Sanctions have also been imposed or expanded by the US against Syria, Cuba and Venezuela. Recently, much

attention has been focused on the US sanctions that were reimposed against Iran in connection with the US withdrawal from the Iran nuclear agreement, including secondary sanctions prohibiting, among other things, transactions with or the provision of financial messaging services to the Central Bank of Iran and other Iranian financial institutions, and the trading and transportation of Iranian petroleum products. This has had a direct impact on the other agreement signatories, as it significantly increased the risk of foreign countries, persons and entities acting in contravention of secondary sanctions as a result of their commercial dealings with Iran.

OFAC has the power to bring enforcement actions, issue civil penalties and, together with the Department of Justice, initiate criminal actions for primary sanctions violations. A number of financial institutions have been subject to sanctions-related enforcement actions in recent years. Most actions involve inadvertent violations such as inadvertently processing transactions through US financial institutions on behalf of corporate customers owned by entities and individuals on the SDN list, and have been settled with OFAC for relatively small amounts or just a warning. Wilful conduct, such as directly processing US financial transactions for sanctioned Iranian entities, can result in much more substantial penalties. If a foreign individual or entity not otherwise subject to US jurisdiction engages in restricted conduct with a sanctioned person, it would not be subject to administrative or criminal enforcement by the US since such foreign person or entity cannot “violate” US secondary sanctions by engaging in such sanctionable activity. The most common repercussions for a foreign person or entity that acts in contravention of US secondary sanctions would be the imposition of restrictions upon their ability to conduct business in the US. This could result, for example, in being excluded from accessing the US financial systems, limited or blocked in its ability to receive exports from the US, denied assistance from the US Export-Import Bank or prohibited from contracting with the US government. Individuals could have their visas revoked or be otherwise excluded from the US, and any property owned by such individual or entity located in the US could be frozen. Secondary sanctions may also impact the willingness of US persons to engage in commercial dealing with non-US persons because of concerns that such US counterparty would themselves indirectly be operating in contravention of primary sanctions. As an example, a US person could be held liable for financing or “facilitating” a commercial transaction by a non-US person that would be prohibited if conducted by a US person.

B. Blocking Statutes

Numerous countries have objected to attempts by the US to impose its sanctions laws on an extraterritorial basis – that is, to purport to restrict the activities of non-US persons. In response to the US secondary sanctions, some countries have enacted “blocking statutes” to address the impact of such sanctions on local individuals and entities. Examples of blocking statutes include Canada’s 1992 Blocking Order (the “1992 Blocking Order”), which was enacted pursuant to Canada’s Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act (“FEMA”), an enabling statute that allows the Canadian government to pass orders blocking the effects of extraterritorial sanctions. In a commercial loan transaction, for example, if any of the credit parties are Canadian entities they will be subject to blocking statutes promulgated under FEMA, potentially setting up a direct conflict between compliance with credit agreement provisions and compliance with applicable law of their home jurisdiction.

The 1992 Blocking Order was intended to block the application in Canada of the US embargo against Cuba. It requires Canadian corporations and their directors, officers and employees to notify the

Attorney General of Canada of any “directive, instruction, intimation of policy or other communication relating to an extraterritorial measure of the United States in respect of any trade or commerce between Canada and Cuba that the Canadian corporation, director or officer has received from a person who is in a position to direct or influence the policies of the Canadian corporation in Canada”² and prohibits such Canadian entities and individuals from complying with such extraterritorial sanctions. It also requires Canadian entities and individuals to report any such sanctions compliance requests to the Canadian Attorney General.

Similarly, in 1996, the European Union (the “EU”) established Council Regulation (EC) No 2271/96 (the “EU Blocking Statute”) to address the challenges faced by EU persons engaging in international trade and commerce that was subject to the extraterritorial application of US sanctions then existing against Cuba, Libya and Iran. Such EU persons include, among others, residents in the EU, companies incorporated in the EU (including EU subsidiaries of US-incorporated companies with their principal place of business in the EU but excluding EU branches of US-incorporated companies), nationals of an EU Member State, shipping companies established outside the EU and controlled by nationals of EU Member States and any other natural persons within the EU, including territorial waters and air space (“EU Operators”). In response to the US withdrawal from the Iran agreement, the EU Blocking Statute was amended on June 6, 2018 to include within its scope all of the reimposed US-Iran sanctions with effect from August 7, 2018.

The aim of the EU Blocking Statute is, among other things, to address the impact of US extraterritorial sanctions on EU Operators doing business with Iran and other countries subject to US sanctions that is otherwise permitted under EU regulations. Given the EU’s existing commitment to the Iran agreement, it does not believe that its domestic operators should be subject to restrictions imposed by US extraterritorial legislation. The EU Blocking Statute attempts to block the application of the US sanctions that would restrict EU Operators from doing business with Iran. It further imposes an obligation on EU Operators to notify the European Commission if their economic and financial interests are impacted by any US sanction covered by the EU Blocking Statute. As the US increases its pressure on Iran through additional secondary sanctions, EU Operators are put in the unenviable position of having to choose between compliance with US law and compliance with the laws of their home jurisdiction. Since an EU Operator that is a subsidiary of a US entity is considered a US person for purposes of US sanctions laws and an EU person for purposes of EU law, it would be in direct conflict with the EU Blocking Statute if it restricts its business with Iran in order to comply with US primary sanctions. This conflict is increasingly a matter of focus for both lenders and multinational borrowers.

C. Potential Conflicts

The conflicting rules between the US secondary sanctions and the EU Blocking Statute create theoretical conflict of laws issues, but more importantly, they create practical challenges for EU Operators that go to the core of their commercial operations. EU operators that conduct their business in compliance with EU law may potentially face retaliatory consequences from the US for engagement in activities that are contrary to US policies. An EU financial institution may opt to stop processing financial transactions with Iranian entities, for example, but if it does so in order to avoid US secondary sanctions it would be in breach of the EU Blocking Statute. EU exporters conducting business with Iran in compliance with EU law may find their access to the US financial system and

access to US bank accounts restricted, which can create cash flow issues for the company. Similarly, EU Operators may be unable to receive payments from their Iranian customers or contributions from Iranian shareholders if such customers and shareholders no longer have access to SWIFT (the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication). This tension may force companies to rethink the way they do business. While many EU Operators have stopped doing business with Iran in the wake of the latest round of US sanctions, some companies have been reluctant to submit to the pressures of the US to isolate Iran from international trade and restrict its access to financial systems. Given the threat of being excluded from the US banking system, the prevalence of the US dollar in global trade, the possibility of being penalised for engaging in transactions with an SDN and the possibility that key corporate officers may be prohibited from entering the US, it can be anticipated that most EU Operators, including European banks, are likely to adhere to the US-Iran sanctions, even if that means acting contrary to the EU Blocking Statute.

D. Credit Agreements

Banks and other financial institutions are affected by sanctions more than operators in other industries and bear the heaviest burdens both with respect to blocking property and property interests of those on the SDN List and monitoring transactions to ensure compliance with sanctions regimes. Banks and other financial institutions are extremely sensitive to the reputational risk and civil fines and potentially criminal penalties resulting from non-compliance with US sanctions. As a result, in recent years, there has been increased scrutiny by lenders regarding compliance with sanctions-related representations and covenants in credit agreements. Credit agreements typically contain representations that the borrower and all or a specific subset of its subsidiaries (the “Credit Group”) are in compliance with all laws that are applicable to the Credit Group and their properties and specifically that such Credit Group and its directors, officers and employees, and in many cases, agents and affiliates of the Credit Group are also in compliance with certain economic or financial sanctions. Whether the representations regarding compliance by agents and affiliates, and in certain cases, employees, are qualified by knowledge is a negotiated point and the outcomes vary depending on the strength of the relationship and relative negotiating leverage among the relevant borrower and their lenders. As sanctions regimes generally impose strict liability for lenders and compliance is generally unqualified, lenders have legitimate concerns about being held directly liable for financing or facilitating violations of sanctions. As such, lenders would want the sanctions representations and covenants to apply as broadly as possible to all applicable jurisdictions, while borrowers would seek to limit the scope to key sanctions regimes only, such as those that are administered or enforced by the US, the United Nations Security Council, the EU and the UK. A broad jurisdictional scope may be problematic for a multinational company where, on the one hand, certain of its subsidiaries are required to comply with US sanctions laws, and, on the other hand, other subsidiaries are prohibited from complying with US sanctions laws due to the application of blocking statutes that prohibit such compliance.

Given the complexities arising from multinational companies operating in different countries that have their own specific sanctions regimes or blocking statutes, it is appropriate for sanctions representations and covenants in credit agreement to be tailored to the specific circumstances of each Credit Group and the syndicate of lenders party to such credit agreements. By way of example, if the Credit Group includes both US and Canadian subsidiaries, it would be problematic for Canadian subsidiaries to be subject to

a sanctions representation or covenant that includes compliance with US sanctions against Cuba and Canadian credit parties might request a related carve out. This is because Canada’s 1992 Blocking Order prohibits compliance by Canadian entities with US sanctions targeting Cuba. Similarly, under section 7 of the German Foreign Trade Ordinance, German nationals and German branches of foreign organisations (so long as such German branches are managed in Germany and maintain separate accounts) are prohibited from participating in a boycott against foreign trade. As a result, it may be prudent to carve out German credit parties with respect to representations and covenants relating to compliance with US sanctions against Iran. As a general matter, where such conflict of laws may exist, one possible approach is for the applicable representation and covenant that is made by or with respect to such non-US person to be qualified by and be subject to any foreign laws that are applicable to such non-US person. Entities and individuals may also apply to OFAC for the issuance of licences to engage in transactions that otherwise would be prohibited. For example, certain individuals and organisations, such as those on the SDN List, are prohibited from receiving US exports. If there are transactions that may be lawfully undertaken by specified subsidiaries in the Credit Group (e.g. limited activities that are permitted under a licence), such activities will need to be appropriately carved out from restrictions relating to the sanctions regimes that are the subject of the sanctions representation and covenant.

Credit agreements also typically contain a representation and an affirmative covenant that proceeds of the loans will not be used in violation of sanctions. One often negotiated point between lenders and the Credit Group is whether the Credit Group can rely on a knowledge qualifier as to how the loan proceeds are used. From the perspective of a lender, the preferable position would be a flat representation and covenant that requires the Credit Group and its directors, officers, employees and agents not to use loan proceeds to directly or indirectly finance or facilitate any activities, business or transactions of or with any person or country subject to sanctions. On the other hand, a borrower would prefer the representation and covenant to be qualified by knowledge (i.e. the formulation to read “directly or, to its knowledge, indirectly”) for the practical reason that a Credit Party cannot make meaningful representations or covenants about downstream or indirect uses of proceeds undertaken or to be undertaken without its knowledge or control. Negotiations on the inclusion of any knowledge qualifier will ultimately depend on an “allocation of risk” analysis as between the lenders and the Credit Group, as well as negotiating leverage and client relationships. Financial sponsors, which banks count among their best customers, routinely see knowledge qualifiers and more narrowly defined references to sanctions regimes in the credit agreements of their portfolio companies due to their close relationship with the banks and relatively strong negotiating leverage.

Although lenders conduct rigorous “know-your-customer” diligence on their customers, the strict liability nature of many sanctions regimes means that such diligence will not protect lenders against liability if they are found liable for violating such sanctions. Expectations regarding sanctions diligence vary widely, both amongst lenders and among borrowers. The scope of sanctions diligence often depends on the nature of the underlying transaction and the intended use of loan proceeds and generally focuses on issues (with respect to the Credit Group and, if applicable, the target in an acquisition financing) relating to the type and geographic scope of the business it conducts and the Credit Party’s legal and compliance policies and procedures. Such issues include personnel training requirements, whether there are business transactions, direct or indirect, with sanctioned individuals, entities, countries or regions and whether the company has made sanctions-related disclosures or has been subject to related

investigations or penalties in the past. If, for example, the borrower (and target, in an acquisition financing) is a US company that has no direct international operations, and does not conduct international business through third parties, or if the proceeds of loans under a credit facility are being used exclusively to repay indebtedness that is specifically identified, the lenders may opt to undertake more limited diligence. Under other circumstances, lenders need to conduct more robust diligence to understand the borrower's (or, if applicable, the acquisition target's) potential connection to sanctioned countries, regions, entities and individuals and the manner in which the loan proceeds will be used.

In addition, credit agreements typically contain an affirmative covenant that the Credit Group will maintain in effect and enforce policies and procedures that are designed to ensure compliance by such Credit Group and the directors, officers, employees and agents of such Credit Group with applicable sanctions. Prior to agreeing to such covenant, it would be prudent for counsel to confirm with its borrower clients that they do, in fact, have policies in place to promote compliance with the sanctions regimes that are within the scope of the sanctions representations and covenants. It is also important for borrowers to periodically update their internal policies with respect to sanctions compliance in a way that is appropriate for the current legal landscape and that will enable the Credit Group to comply with both their legal and contractual obligations.

E. European Union

In an attempt to navigate conflicts between US and EU laws, the EU Blocking Statute contains a mechanism to allow an EU Operator to seek authorisation from the EU Commission to permit it to comply with US sanctions. EU Operators requesting the authorisation must specifically identify the US sanction listed in the EU Blocking Statute that they are seeking to fully or partially comply with. The onus is on the applicant to demonstrate how non-compliance with US sanctions would cause serious harm to the interests of either the EU Operator or the EU. To determine whether "serious harm" will occur within the circumstances presented by the applicant, the EU Commission will consider, among other things, the nature and origin of the damage to the EU Operator's or the EU's interest, whether there is substantial nexus between the EU Operator and the US and any preventative measures that could be taken by the EU Operator to mitigate the resulting damage or the effects on the economic activities of the EU Operator from non-compliance with the applicable US sanctions.

Notwithstanding the existence of the EU Blocking Statute, EU Operators are free to conduct business in accordance with their own corporate policies and practices as they may independently discontinue doing business with Iran based on commercial considerations, such as perceived credit risk of an Iranian counterparty or other geopolitical

concerns with doing business in the Middle East. At this stage, it is not clear if many EU Operators will seek authorisations under the EU Blocking Statute for permission to comply with US sanctions.

F. Conclusion

The conflicts between US secondary sanctions and non-US blocking laws create compliance issues for multinational companies with operations in the US and in non-US jurisdictions, which may affect their ability to make sanctions-related representations and comply with sanctions-related covenants in their credit facilities. As it is typical for representations (including the representation with respect to sanctions) to be brought down with each borrowing under the credit agreement and for the Credit Group to confirm that there are no outstanding defaults, multinational companies with subsidiaries in both the US and non-US jurisdictions that are seeking access to funding must also carefully consider whether the Credit Group as a whole is able to make such representations and comply with such covenants on a going-forward basis or whether, as noted above, specific exceptions are required for certain subsidiaries. Without question, potential exposure to secondary sanctions introduces an added level of complexity to the competing concerns of lenders and borrowers in the commercial loan context. However, it is important to keep in mind that while Iran, for example, is subject to comprehensive US sanctions, there are other situations where US sanctions may apply only to certain individuals, entities and business sectors of a sanctioned country without prohibiting *all* business activities with that country. This means that a "one size fits all" approach to dealing with compliance with sanctions laws in credit agreements may not always result in outcomes that are workable for all parties, and care should always be taken to tailor credit agreement terms to address both the concerns of the lenders and a particular Credit Group's business realities.

Endnotes

1. International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C.A. §§ 1701 (West 2019).
2. Foreign Extraterritorial Measures (United States) Order, 1992, SOR/92-584 (Can.).

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank finance associate Wansi Leung and litigation associate Timothy Welch for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of this chapter.

**Roshelle A. Nagar**

Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10153
USA

Tel: +1 212 310 8023
Email: roshelle.nagar@weil.com
URL: www.weil.com

Roshelle Nagar is of counsel in the New York office of Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP and a member of the firm's Banking and Finance group. Her practice focuses on the representation of financial institutions, private equity sponsors and corporate borrowers in a variety of domestic and international financing transactions. These transactions include leveraged loan and acquisition financings, subscription credit facilities and asset-based loans, as well as letter of credit facilities, restructurings and margin loan facilities. Ms. Nagar is active in *pro bono* matters and sits on the Board of Directors of Accion East, the largest provider of microfinance in the United States.

**Ted Posner**

Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
2001 M Street NW, Suite 600
Washington DC 20036
USA

Tel: +1 202 682 7064
Email: ted.posner@weil.com
URL: www.weil.com

Ted Posner is a partner in the International Arbitration and Trade practice in Weil, Gotshal & Manges' Washington, DC office. From 1999 to 2009, Mr. Posner worked on international trade and investment law and policy in the legislative and executive branches of the U.S. Government. He counselled members of the committees with jurisdiction over these issues in the U.S. House of Representatives and then in the U.S. Senate. In 2002, he joined the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), where he counselled trade negotiators and represented the United States in proceedings before dispute settlement panels and the Appellate Body of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in cases including the U.S.-EU Airbus dispute and the U.S.-Canada Softwood Lumber dispute. From 2008 to 2009, Mr. Posner was director for international trade and investment at the National Security Council (NSC).

In private practice, Mr. Posner draws on his experience with U.S. and international law of trade and investment, as reflected in the agreements of the World Trade Organization (WTO), free trade agreements, and investment treaties. His practice covers international arbitration, strategic counselling relating to international trade and investment agreements and legislation, and national security reviews by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) and related proceedings.

Weil

Founded in 1931, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP has been a preeminent provider of legal services for more than 80 years. With approximately 1,100 lawyers in offices on three continents, Weil has been a pioneer in establishing a geographic footprint that has allowed the Firm to partner with clients wherever they do business. The Firm's four departments, Corporate, Litigation, Business Finance & Restructuring, and Tax, Executive Compensation & Benefits, and more than two dozen practice groups are consistently recognised as leaders in their respective fields. Weil has become a highly visible leader among major law firms for its innovative diversity and *pro bono* initiatives, the product of a comprehensive and long-term commitment which has ingrained these values into our culture. Our proven, demonstrated experience allows the Firm to provide clients with unmatched legal services. Please see www.weil.com for more information, including awards and rankings.

Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Anti-Money Laundering
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Cybersecurity
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Financial Services Disputes
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Investor-State 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 Investment Funds
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms

glg global legal group

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

www.iclg.com