CLIFFORD

CHANCE

May 2011

The New OHADA Uniform Act on Security

The Council of Ministers of the member states[1] of the Treaty for the Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa ("**OHADA**") adopted a new uniform act on security on 15 December 2010 (the "**New Uniform Act**"). Published in the OHADA Official Journal on 15 February 2011, the New Uniform Act entered into effect automatically in each member state, without any further formalities, on 16 May 2011.[2] The New Uniform Act governs all security created on or after 16 May 2011. All security created before 16 May 2011 will continue to be governed by the uniform act on security dated 17 April 1997 (the "**Former Uniform Act**").

The reform of the Former Uniform Act is one of the latest chapters in the history of the various OHADA uniform acts (the "**OHADA Uniform Acts**").[3] The OHADA Uniform Acts cover a wide range of areas of business law – from security to bankruptcy to general commercial law – and are aimed at promoting a harmonised legal system throughout the OHADA member states. In addition to the efforts to revise and update certain of the existing OHADA Uniform Acts, the Permanent Secretary of OHADA is also busy working on new uniform acts in relation to labour law, consumer contracts and general contract law.

The New Uniform Act implements certain fundamental changes in the landscape of security law in OHADA jurisdictions, including:

- amending the legal regime applicable to certain existing types of security (including notably certain perfection formalities);
- creating new types of security interests; and
- for the first time in these jurisdictions, instituting a legal regime for the taking of security by a security agent – a significant step forward in the context of multi-lender financings and syndications.

Key Issues

- The New Uniform Act institutes rules to appoint a security agent in multi-lender and syndicated financings.
- With a few exceptions, the security interests are now perfected by a filing at the RCCM and for mortgages in accordance with local laws.
- The New Uniform Act has abandoned in certain circumstances the traditional prohibition on "self-help" for enforcement of security. Security interests can guarantee future obligations and can be created over future assets under certain circumstances.
- The New Uniform Act creates several new types of security, including the assignment of receivables by way of security, cash collateral, and the pledge of intellectual property rights. It has also modernised several important aspects of the existing types of security.

If you would like to know more about the subjects covered in this publication or our services, please contact:

Anthony Giustini	**+33 144 05 59 26**
Delphine Siino Courtin	**+33 144 05 52 36**
Ross Howard	**+33 144 05 53 32**
Alhassane Barry	**+33 144 05 51 60**

To email one of the above, please use firstname.lastname@cliffordchance.com

www.cliffordchance.com

[1] Currently, the OHADA member states are Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Mali, Niger, Senegal and Togo. The Democratic Republic of Congo is expected to join soon and will become the 17th member state.

[2] The New Uniform Act provides that it will come into effect ninety days from its publication in the OHADA Official Journal. No national enacting legislation is necessary.

[3] The OHADA Uniform Acts are: Commercial Companies and Economic Interest Group dated 17 April 1997, Security dated 17 April 1997, Simplified Procedures for Debt Recovery and Enforcement Measures dated 10 April 1998, Collective Proceedings for Wiping Off Debts dated 10 April 1998, Arbitration dated 11 March 1999, Accounting dated 23 March 2000, Carriage of Goods by Road dated 22 March 2003, General Commercial Law dated 15 December 2010, and Cooperative Companies dated 15 December 2010.

Together with the New Uniform Act, the OHADA Council of Minister have also adopted on the same date the revised Uniform Act on General Commercial Law and the Uniform Act on Cooperative Companies.

We set out below an overview of some of the highlights of this new legislation and its impact on secured financings in OHADA jurisdictions.

The Security Agent

One major innovation in the New Uniform Act is the institution of a legal regime for the granting of security to a security agent. In multi-lender and syndicated financings, the ability to grant security in favour of a third party (such as a trustee under English law) greatly facilitates the creation, management, perfection and enforcement of security for the syndicate of lenders and their successors since it permits one party to receive and manage collateral and security rights for multiple lenders and permits the lenders to transfer and assign their rights under the loan without having to transfer the corresponding collateral and security rights (which, notwithstanding the transfer or assignment, remain in the hands of the security agent).

In jurisdictions that recognise the concept of trusts (such as England), lenders use trust arrangements in order to take security in favour of a security agent/trustee in its own name but acting in its capacity as trustee for the benefit of a pool of multiple lenders that may change over time. In certain other jurisdictions where the concept of trusts is not recognized (especially in certain civil law jurisdictions), the market has developed the practice of so-called "parallel debt" to achieve essentially the same result. In a parallel debt structure, the borrower assumes a payment obligation in favour of the security agent that is separate and independent from the borrower's payment obligations to the lenders but which exactly mirrors those latter obligations. The borrower then gives security not for its obligation to the lenders but instead for this parallel debt obligation, and thus, the lenders can change but the obligation secured by the collateral and the beneficiary remain the same (the parallel debt obligation owed by the borrower to the security agent/trustee).

Trusts arrangements and parallel debt structures have been used sparingly in the context of syndicated financings in OHADA jurisdictions since almost none of the OHADA member states recognises the concept of trusts, and local counsel were seldom entirely comfortable with the parallel debt structure. The result was many financings in which individual lenders took security and were required each to sign the security documents and, for certain security interests, be designated by name as beneficiaries under filings at the competent Trade and Personal Property Credit Register (the "**RCCM**"). This situation in turn meant that additional steps and formalities (some of which are cumbersome, such as the cancellation of the existing filing at the RCCM and new filing, amendments to the security documents, new registration of the amendments with the tax authorities, payment of additional costs and fees, etc.) had to be taken when lenders transferred loans and a new lender became a beneficiary of the security.

To address this difficulty (which we note also exists in many jurisdictions outside the OHADA members states), the New Uniform Act institutes rules for lenders to appoint a security agent and for that agent to take security on their behalf. Under the New Uniform Act, "*all security or other guarantees for the performance of an obligation can be granted, registered, filed, managed, and enforced by a national or foreign financial institution or credit institution acting in its own name and in its capacity as security agent for the benefit of creditors of the secured obligations that have appointed it*". Once appointed, the security agent can represent secured creditors for virtually all matters related to the secured obligations and can make the various required filings at the RCCM in the sole name of the security agent. When so acting and for such filings, the security agent must clearly indicate its capacity as security agent.

In some cases, the New Uniform Act provides that the creation or enforcement of the security leads to a transfer of ownership of collateral in favour of the secured party. In the case of a security agent, the new law provides that such collateral will constitute a dedicated estate (*patrimoine d'affectation*) of the security agent solely for the purpose of its mission as security agent, and that such property must be segregated from the agent's own assets. The segregated collateral is protected in case of bankruptcy of the security agent and more generally from foreclosure by creditors of the security agent (with a few relatively minor exceptions). Secured creditors have the right to replace the security agent if the latter does not satisfactorily perform its duties or is declared bankrupt. In case of replacement, all the rights and actions belonging to the former security agent are transferred by operation of law to the new security agent.

Many commentators will justly view the new security agent regime as comprehensive and innovative. That said, there are still several issues to be resolved, including defining the rights and obligations of security agents (presumably left to the parties to decide by contract), better understanding the nature of the security agent's role (is it akin to a trustee, an agent or is it *sui generis*?),

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011

determining how security agents will function in practice (how, for instance, will they account for assets held by them? what will the tax treatment be?) and how courts will view them (will lenders continue to have direct rights to security or rights of action?).

Surety-bonds and autonomous guarantees and counter-guarantees

The New Uniform Act, like the Former Uniform Act before it, provides a framework for personal guarantees, such as surety-bonds, and autonomous guarantees and counter-guarantees. In and of itself, this is an advantage over the laws of a number of jurisdictions where, until recently, the latter were often creatures of contract without a specific underlying legal regime.

Surety-bonds

The New Uniform Act has improved the regime for surety-bonds (essentially, guarantees of a third party's obligations akin to the French c*autionnement*) on several important points:

- It clarifies that a surety-bond can secure future obligations and that it can be a general surety-bond, automatically covering – unless provided otherwise – all principal, interest and incidental costs up to a maximum amount guaranteed.
- New rules have been introduced for the formal requirements for an obligation to be a surety-bond.
- The beneficiary of a surety-bond is obliged to provide information concerning the guaranteed obligations[4] only semi-annually, rather than quarterly as was formerly the case.

Autonomous guarantees and counter-guarantees

The regime applicable to autonomous guarantees and counter-guarantees (essentially, so-called "first demand guarantees" or "independent guarantees") ("**Guarantees**") under the New Uniform Act is inspired by the Uniform Customs and Practice for Documentary Credits (UCP 600) prepared and published by the International Chamber of Commerce (the "**ICC**"), the ICC Uniform Rules for Demand Guarantees (URDG 758), the UNCITRAL principles for the International Independent Guarantees and Stand-by Letters of Credit and the practices of international standby letters of credit. Unlike the surety-bond, these Guarantees create obligations that are autonomous and independent from the relationship between the instructing party (often a debtor) and the beneficiary of the Guarantee.

Here again, the New Uniform Act has clarified and simplified the regime on several important points:

- Mirroring URDG 758, the New Uniform Act defines Guarantees as "undertakings", while the Former Uniform Act defined them as "agreements". This distinction would presumably mean that a beneficiary does not need to sign a Guarantee for it to be valid.
- Also, the New Uniform Act clarifies the distinction between the rights of beneficiaries under Guarantees and their rights over the proceeds that may arise from Guarantees, with the former not being assignable while the latter are.
- Under the New Uniform Act, instructions in relation to Guarantees with a fixed term are now irrevocable, while instructions in relation to Guarantees with an indefinite term are revocable (formerly, the instructing party could revoke all Guarantees).
- Finally, where a written demand is made to the guarantor for payment and the supporting documents are provided to it, the New Uniform Act has followed URDG 758 by specifying that the guarantor has 5 business days to examine the demand, as opposed to the reasonable period of time available under the Former Uniform Act.

General Considerations on Security Interests

Before looking at issues related specifically to different types of security, we set forth below certain issues that arise under the new law with respect to security in general.

Securing future debts and security over future assets

The New Uniform Act clarifies a certain ambiguity that existed under the Former Uniform Act as to the scope of security interests by providing that they can guarantee future, conditional, unconditional, fixed and floating obligations. Also, since the grant of a pledge no longer requires possession of the collateral to pass to the beneficiary (as explained more fully below), it is now possible to take a pledge over future assets, as long as those assets are sufficiently identified. In this case, the right of the secured creditor will attach to the new assets immediately upon the pledgor becoming the owner of those assets (certain questions may remain about perfection in such case, including if formalities different from those originally undertaken are necessary to

[4] Such information includes the consideration for the obligations of the guaranteed obligor, their maturity, and their amount (principal, interest and otherwise).

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011

the future collateral). Under certain conditions, future buildings and fixed structures can also be subject to a mortgage, and a mortgage can also secure future debts.

Creation of security interests

All security – whether a mortgage or a pledge, whether over tangible or intangible assets, present or future – can now be created by a written document containing the required information, and failure to comply with this requirement will result in the security being void. Under the Former Uniform Act, specific formalities existed for the creation of pledges of receivables and share pledges in addition to a written document. Moreover, an important simplification of the new law is the removal of the need to indicate in the security agreement itself the conditions under which the secured obligations (and the related interest) would become due and payable (*conditions d'exigibilité de la dette principale et des intérêts*). Because the scope of this requirement was considered uncertain, it became customary under the Former Uniform Act to attach to security documents a summary of all the events of default and prepayments, etc. set forth in the loan agreement, which was often cumbersome and impractical.

Enforcement of security interests

In the event of non-payment by a pledgor, the New Uniform Act provides that a secured creditor can resort to forced sale at a public auction or can request the judicial attribution of the pledged assets up to the amount of the secured obligations, which are essentially the remedies available under various civil law systems. However, in a departure from (and some believe a welcome modernisation of) civil law practice, Article 104 of the New Uniform Act has abandoned in certain circumstances the Former Uniform Act's prohibition on "self-help" for enforcement. Such self-help is often found in the form of a clause that permits a secured creditor to appropriate to itself the pledged asset upon default of its debtor – a so-called "contractual attribution clause" or "*pacte commissoire*". Accordingly, if the property pledged is a sum of money or property whose value is the subject of an official quotation, the New Uniform Act provides that the "parties" can now freely agree that in the event of non-payment, the secured creditor would become the owner of that asset. Moreover, when the "debtor of the secured obligations" is a professional debtor as defined in the New Uniform Act (that is, a debtor whose debt arises out of the exercise of its business or is in direct relation with one of its business activities, even if it is not its principal activity), the "parties" can agree to a contractual attribution clause for all types of "tangible" assets (not just sums of money or an asset subject to an official quotation).

The reference in Article 104 to "tangible" assets", "parties" and the focus on the "debtor of the secured obligations" (as opposed to the pledgor) gives rise to certain questions:

Article 104 permits all tangible assets to be subject to a contractual attribution clause where the "debtor of the secured obligations" is a professional. We believe that such Article is seeking to limit recourse to contractual attribution clauses to the professional context, and thus to protect consumers. In doing so, however, the law seems to be assuming that the pledgor and the debtor of the secured obligations are one and the same person. This is not always the case since one person can provide a pledge for the debts of another. In such a situation, the pledgor is a third party and thus not the "debtor of the secured obligations", and it is not clear why the New Uniform Act would permit a non-professional pledgor to agree to the contractual attribution clause for any pledged tangible asset (belonging to it, and not to the "debtor of the secured obligations") on the basis that the "debtor of the secured obligations" is a professional debtor.

In addition, in situations where the pledgor is different from the "debtor of the secured obligations", which "parties" must agree to the contractual attribution clause – is it all three (pledgor, debtor and secured creditor) or only the secured creditor and the pledgor?

Another more general question about Article 104 is whether the parties to a pledge of receivables can include a contractual attribution clause and on what basis. Indeed, Article 104 refers, on the one hand, to a "pledged asset which is a sum of money or subject to an official quotation" (in this case, no restriction exists as to the "debtor of the secured obligations") and, on the other hand, to "other tangible assets" (in this case, the "debtor of the secured obligations" must be a professional debtor). If we consider that receivables are not tangible assets, then the question remains whether they can be considered a sum of money for the purposes of Article 104. To the extent that the creation of the cash collateral requires a transfer of ownership of the pledged funds to the secured creditor (see below for more details on the cash collateral), Article 104 is not applicable to the cash collateral. Therefore, we query whether the reference to "pledged asset which is a sum of money" might

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011

also extend to and be construed to include receivables?[5]

A contractual attribution clause can also be inserted in a mortgage if the mortgagor is a legal entity and the building is not used for habitation.

In the case of the enforcement under the contractual attribution clause, the value of the pledged or mortgaged asset is to be estimated by an expert, and if it exceeds the secured obligations, the excess must be paid to the pledgor. The contractual attribution clause must be "published" by a filing at the competent RCCM in order to be effective as against third parties.

Perfection of security interests

The New Uniform Act has opted for a system of perfection by filing. Accordingly, except for cash collateral and the pledge of securities accounts, all the security interests are now perfected as against third parties by a filing at the appropriate RCCM and for mortgages in accordance with local laws. The New Uniform Act sets out a general rule that the competent RCCM for the filing of all pledges is the RCCM of the place of incorporation of the pledgor. There are also specific rules – as exceptions to the general rule - for certain types of security interests (such as the pledge of receivables, the assignment of receivables, the pledge of shares and financial instruments, and the pledge of business as a going concern). The former law's cumbersome and expensive requirement to register pledges with the tax authorities has been abandoned (but local authorities will still be free to charge for filings at the RCCM), and the list of the parties who can carry out perfection formalities has been extended to cover not only the secured creditors, but also the security agent and the pledgor. Specific additional perfection formalities are required for certain pledges (such as pledges of receivables, share pledges, and the pledge of intellectual property rights) as outlined below. Perfection will preserve the rights of secured creditors for an agreed period, which cannot exceed 10 years (as opposed to 5 years under the Former Uniform Act). The general rule on perfection by filing at the RCCM appears to raise certain practical difficulties, for instance if the pledgor is not located in an OHADA country (as the new law offers no clear guidance as to where the filing should be made in this circumstance) or if the pledgor is an individual or government or other entity not listed in the RCCM.

Specific Key Issues on Security Interests

The New Uniform Act has modernised the existing types of security and has created new security interests.

Existing Security Interests

Pledge of tangible movable assets

The creation of pledges of tangible movable assets has been greatly simplified and now only requires a written contract containing certain mandatory information. The New Uniform Act has abandoned the requirement of an effective and continued dispossession (either physical or constructive) of collateral from the pledgor, since dispossession is no longer a condition of the validity of the pledge (*gage*). Under the New Uniform Act, the dispossession requirement is merely an alternative method for the perfection of the pledge of tangible assets. In addition, pledges can now be created over future assets, as long as they are sufficiently identifiable.

Pledge of receivables

The pledge of receivables also no longer requires dispossession. Again, it is simply created by a written contract containing certain mandatory information. The previous cumbersome obligation to deliver "title" to the pledged receivables (*titre de créances*) to the secured creditors and to notify the pledge to the pledged debtor by bailiff (*huissier*) has been abandoned. This will greatly simplify the creation of this security because in many cases the title to the pledged receivables (*titre de créances*) were either destroyed or lost, or the claim was simply not documented. Future and conditional receivables can also be pledged, as long as they are sufficiently identified and individualised. Under the New Uniform Act, by derogation to the general rule for perfection (which as noted above requires filing in the RCCM of the pledgor), a pledge of receivables is perfected by a double formality – it must be notified to the pledged debtor to be valid against it and the pledge must be filed at the RCCM of the domicile of the pledged debtor to be valid as against other third parties. While the abandonment of dispossession is welcome (greatly simplifying the formalities and increasing certainty), the choice of perfection by filing at the RCCM of the pledged debtor and notice may raise certain new practical difficulties: in cases where there are a large number of pledged debtors, it will require a filing at the RCCM of, and notice to, each pledged debtor; and, for creditors wishing to check the security given by a party to others, it would require the creditor to verify the filings in every RCCM of possible pledged debtors. Also, as noted above more

[5] We note that the contractual attribution clause is not required for the assignment of receivables by way of security (not to be confused with the pledge of receivables) because the assignment transfers ownership of the receivables to the beneficiary of the assignment (i.e., the secured creditor).

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011

generally, the case of pledged debtors located outside an OHADA country and those not listed in the RCCM appear to be open issues.

Pledge of shares and financial instruments

There have not been fundamental changes to this security. The New Uniform Act now allows the proceeds of shares or financial instruments to be included in the scope of the pledge. Under the New Uniform Act, by derogation to the general rule for perfection, pledges of shares and financial instruments are perfected as against third parties by a filing at the RCCM of the issuing company. Additional perfection formalities that were specific to the pledges of shares and financial instruments under the Former Uniform Act (such as the recording in the issuing company's share registry and the approval of the pledge by the appropriate corporate body) are unchanged, but the New Uniform Act now gives the secured creditor an option between a notification of the pledge to the issuing company by bailiff (*signification*) and a simple notification.

Pledge of securities account (*comptes de titres financiers*)

This pledge existed under the Former Uniform Act for listed companies, whose securities were dematerialised and represented by inscription in a securities account. The regime has been modernised and clarified by largely replicating the French law provisions on the subject. The pledge is created by the signature of a statement of pledge containing the required information. The scope of the securities account pledge includes the initial securities credited to the securities account, those that may be substituted in place of them or may supplement them and any cash proceeds (such as dividends and other cash distributions). This pledge is not filed at the RCCM, but is recorded in the securities account holder's registries. In practice, this security will concern few corporations because under the relevant OHADA law only listed companies can dematerialise their securities.

Pledge of business as a going concern (*fonds de commerce*)

While there have been no fundamental changes to this security, one improvement is that the mandatory information required to be included in the pledge agreement has now been limited to what is strictly required for the identification of the pledged assets (names of the parties, designation and address of the *fonds de commerce*, identification of the elements composing the *fonds de commerce*, and the elements that will permit the determination of the secured obligations). Under the New Uniform Act, by derogation to the general rule for perfection, the pledge of business as a going concern is perfected as against third parties by a filing at the RCCM of the owner of the *fonds de commerce* and at the RCCM of the various branches where the *fonds de commerce* is operated. As under the Former Uniform Act, intellectual property rights and professional equipment and vehicles can still be included in the scope of the pledge of business as a going concern, and such inclusion will require additional perfection formalities specific to them.

Pledge of inventory

Security over inventory can be subject to the general regime of the pledge of tangible assets, or creditors can turn to a specific regime for the pledge of inventory. There have been no major amendments to the specific regime. It should, however, be noted that the New Uniform Act expands the mandatory insurance requirements for pledged inventory to cover "partial or total deteriorations", in addition to "destruction" of the stocks.

Pledge of professional equipment and vehicles

The fundamental change here is the expansion of the parties that can be beneficiaries of this type of pledge. Under the Former Uniform Act, only a seller of equipment, a guarantor of the purchase price and/or a lender granting a loan used for the purchase of professional equipment and vehicles could benefit from this specific security interest over such assets (as opposed to any party that could benefit from a pledge of *fonds de commerce* when professional equipment and vehicles are included in it). Under the New Uniform Act, any party can now benefit from this pledge. This is a vast improvement. Due to the former limitations, professional equipment was generally included in the pledge of *fonds de commerce*. Where there was no *fonds de commerce* – such as the financing of new or future businesses – it was not possible for general creditors to benefit from security over the professional equipment (unless paid for out of the financing). By expanding the scope of potential beneficiaries of this pledge, the New Uniform Act has greatly facilitated the taking of security over professional equipment.

Mortgages

Mortgages have always been the least harmonised of the OHADA law security interests. Their creation and perfection formalities are still very much dependent on local laws and customs in each member state, but in general their creation requires a notarised act and they are perfected by a filing at the competent mortgage registry. That said, the New

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011

Uniform Act has modified and harmonised the regime on mortgages on at least one significant point. It is now possible to take a mortgage over future buildings and fixed structures under certain circumstances (including new fixed structures and buildings on land falling under public domain and national domain categories) (although one needs to see how this new feature will work when implemented in the context of the various national rules and requirements on mortgages).

Retention Rights (*Possessory Lien*)

Retention rights or possessory liens have not been fundamentally modified. It should, however, be noted that when the same tangible asset is subject to a pledge without dispossession and a retention right, the New Uniform Act resolves the conflict between them by giving priority to the beneficiary of the pledge if the pledge was filed at the RCCM before the beneficiary of the retention right came to possess the asset.

New Security Interests

The New Uniform Act of Security creates several new types of security.

Cash collateral

The new law creates a specific regime regulating the taking of cash collateral. For this type of security to be taken, cash collateral must be held in a blocked account opened with a credit institution licensed to hold deposits. The blocked account must be in the name of the secured creditor, who will become the owner of the funds deposited on the blocked account until the debt becomes due and payable. This security interest is not filed at the RCCM; rather, its perfection is achieved by a notification to the account bank. In case of non-payment of a due and payable secured amount, then, eight days after the pledgor is duly informed by the secured creditor, the secured creditor may simply collect the funds deposited in the blocked account up to the amount of the secured obligations. However, until the secured obligations become due and payable, the secured creditor cannot use the funds deposited in the blocked account. It should be noted that the New Uniform Act does not address the question of whether such segregated funds can be seized by creditors of the secured creditor or whether they fall into its estate in case of insolvency of the secured creditor.

Assignment by way of security

In addition to the specific regime for cash collateral, a second method of transfer of ownership by way of security is the assignment of receivables. Such assignment can cover present or future receivables (as long as they are sufficiently identified and individualised). The assignment is created by a written contract containing specific mandatory information. The New Uniform Act provides that "*a claim against a third party can be assigned by way of security for any credit extended by national or foreign legal entities, which carry out on a habitual basis and on their own account banking or credit activities*". Unlike the French law Dailly assignment – on which it is largely based – the New Uniform Act does not specify that the assignment must be "*in favour of*" the credit institution that has extended the credit nor that the assignment must be made "*by the beneficiary*" of the credit. Emphasis is rather on the nature of the secured obligations. As a result, unlike French law, this may mean that any third party (for example, a parent company) should be able to assign its receivables by way of security to guarantee the credit extended to the underlying debtor (for example, its subsidiary). However, we query whether this provision would allow that same parent company, when issuing a first demand guarantee for a subsidiary's obligations, to assign the parent's receivables to secure the parent's guaranteed obligations, which are autonomous and independent from the credit extended to the subsidiary. Similarly, confirmation will be required as to whether hedging providers can benefit from such an assignment because the secured obligations arise out of hedging arrangements. Are hedging arrangements "*credit extended*" as such term is used in this new provision? Finally, there will inevitably be debate about characterising potential secured parties as "*national or foreign legal entities, which carry out on a habitual basis and on their own account banking or credit activities*".

While this assignment can cover all types of receivables (which is convenient), by derogation to the general rule for perfection and in a manner similar to the pledge of receivables, it is perfected as against third parties by a filing at the RCCM of the domicile of the assigned debtor and against the assigned debtor by a simple notification to it (which is not so convenient, as noted above in relation to pledges of receivables). Also, if the assigned debtor accepts the assignment, the assigned debtor cannot raise against the beneficiary personal defences arising from the assigned debtor's relationship with the assignor (subject to fraud).

Pledge of bank accounts

Under the Former Uniform Act, there was no specific regime for the pledge of bank accounts. Following the traditional practice under French law, security over bank accounts was taken as a pledge of receivables where the pledged receivables were considered to be the credit balance standing on the account on the day of enforcement of the

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011

pledge. The New Uniform Act now creates a specific regime for pledges of bank accounts. The approach adopted is essentially the same as before, but the new law clarifies issues specific to pledges of bank accounts. For example, the new law clarifies the date on which the credit balance of the bank account crystalises for the purpose of the pledge and specifically permits multiple enforcements of the pledge if, on an enforcement date, the credit balance of the bank account is not sufficient to fully discharge the secured obligations. This pledge is perfected in the same manner as a pledge of receivables.

Although both the cash collateral and the pledge of bank account involve a bank account, there are clear differences between them, namely, with cash collateral, the ownership of the funds held in the blocked account is transferred to the secured creditor, while in the pledge of bank account the pledgor remains the sole owner of the funds held in the account until the enforcement of the pledge. Also, in cash collateral situations, neither party (other than the secured creditor if the secured debt is due and payable but not paid) can use the funds held in the blocked account, while with the pledge of bank account, the pledgor can freely use the account (until it is blocked).

Pledge of intellectual property rights

Under the Former Uniform Act, there was no specific regime for the pledge of intellectual property rights. Creditors could take security over such rights only within the scope of a pledge of a business as a going concern. Under the New Uniform Act, intellectual property rights can still be included in a pledge of *fonds de commerce*, but there is also now a specific security regime available. If the pledged intellectual property right is registered on one of the special registries, the publicity requirements set forth in the applicable regulation must be complied with in addition to the filing at the competent RCCM in order to perfect the pledge. Unless provided otherwise, the pledge of intellectual property rights does not extend to accessories and proceeds resulting from the exploitation of the pledged intellectual property rights.

Retention of title (*clause de réserve de propriété*)

Under the Former Uniform Act, there was no specific regime governing cases of sales where the seller retained title to the asset being sold until such time as the purchase price was paid. There was instead a regime in the Uniform Act on General Commercial Law for sales agreements. The New Uniform Act creates a specific regime akin to that existing under French law and applicable to all contracts, not only to sales contracts.

Conclusion

In line with the goals of the OHADA Uniform Acts, one of the main objectives of the New Uniform Act was to make OHADA jurisdictions more attractive environments for doing business, particularly for secured financings. On the whole, the New Uniform Act succeeds, offering more flexibility and a wider range of security options to creditors. In investing the considerable time and effort required to enact the New Uniform Act, the OHADA member states have sought to respond to criticisms of the Former Uniform Act by improving the efficiency of OHADA security interests and simplifying their creation, perfection and enforcement.

Needless to say, like any effort at significant law reform, the adoption of the New Uniform Act brings with it a degree of uncertainty in relation to new or revised provisions and a number of questions that will eventually need to be resolved by the establishment of common practices and/or decisions from national courts as well as those of the Common Court of Justice and Arbitration.

© Clifford Chance LLP, May 2011.
9 Place Vendôme, CS 50018, 75038 Paris Cedex 01, France

Clifford Chance LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC323571.

Registered office: 10 Upper Bank Street, London, E14 5JJ.

We use the word ‘partner’ to refer to a member of Clifford Chance LLP, or an employee or consultant with equivalent standing and qualifications.

This publication does not necessarily deal with every important topic nor cover every aspect of the topics with which it deals. It is not designed to provide legal or other advice.

If you do not wish to receive further information from Clifford Chance about events or legal developments which we believe may be of interest to you, please either send an email to nomorecontact@cliffordchance.com or contact our database administrator by post at Clifford Chance LLP, 10 Upper Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London E14 5JJ.

Abu Dhabi ▪ Amsterdam ▪ Bangkok ▪ Barcelona ▪ Beijing ▪ Brussels ▪ Bucharest ▪ Dubai ▪ Düsseldorf ▪ Frankfurt ▪ Hong Kong ▪ Istanbul ▪ Kyiv ▪ London ▪ Luxembourg ▪ Madrid Milan ▪ Moscow ▪ Munich ▪ New York ▪ Paris ▪ Perth ▪ Prague ▪ Riyadh (co-operation agreement) ▪ Rome ▪ São Paulo ▪ Shanghai ▪ Singapore ▪ Sydney ▪ Tokyo ▪ Warsaw ▪ Washington, D.C.
Clifford Chance has a co-operation agreement with Al-Jadaan & Partners Law Firm in Riyadh