

UNCITRAL Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation

Preface

The *Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation* was prepared by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL). The project arose from a proposal made to the Commission in 2005 that further work should be undertaken on coordination and cooperation in cross-border insolvency cases, particularly with regard to the use and negotiation of cross-border insolvency agreements. The topic was viewed as closely related and complementary to the promotion and use of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency and, in particular, implementation of its article 27, paragraph (d). In 2006, the Commission agreed that initial work to compile information on practical experience with negotiating and using cross-border insolvency agreements should be facilitated informally through consultation with judges and insolvency practitioners.

The first draft of the practice guide was developed through those consultations in 2006 and 2007 and, as requested by the Commission, presented to Working Group V (Insolvency Law) in November 2008 for discussion. That draft was also circulated to Governments for comment in late 2008.

A revised version of the practice guide, taking into account the comments provided by Governments and the Working Group, was presented to the Commission for finalization and adoption at its forty-second session, in 2009. The text was adopted by consensus on 1 July 2009 and, on 16 December 2009, the General Assembly adopted resolution 64/112, in which it expressed its appreciation to the Commission for completing and adopting the *Practice Guide* (see annex II).



Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
<i>Preface</i>		i
Introduction	1-17	1
A. Organization and scope of the <i>Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation</i>	1-5	1
B. Glossary	6-17	2
1. Notes on terminology	6-12	2
2. Terms and explanations	13	3
3. Reference material	14-17	5
I. Background	1-20	7
A. The legislative framework for cross-border insolvency	1-3	7
B. International initiatives	4-20	8
1. Model International Insolvency Cooperation Act	5	8
2. Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat	6-8	8
3. UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency	9-16	9
4. Regional arrangements	17-19	12
5. Guidelines Applicable to Court-to-Court Communications in Cross-Border Cases	20	12
II. Possible forms of cooperation under article 27 of the UNCITRAL Model Law ..	1-21	15
A. Article 27, paragraph (a): Appointment of a person or body to act at the direction of the court	2-3	15
B. Article 27, paragraph (b): Communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court	4-10	16
C. Article 27, paragraph (c): Coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor's assets and affairs	11	18
D. Article 27, paragraph (d): Approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings	12-13	19
E. Article 27, paragraph (e): Coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor	14-16	19
F. Article 27, paragraph (f): Other forms of cooperation	17-21	20
1. Questions of jurisdiction and allocation of disputes among cooperating courts for resolution	18-20	20
2. Coordination of the filing, determination and priority of claims	21	21
III. Cross-border insolvency agreements	1-200	23
A. Preliminary issues	1-38	23

1.	Contents.....	4-9	23
2.	Circumstances supporting use of a cross-border insolvency agreement	10	25
3.	Timing of negotiation.....	11-14	26
4.	Parties.....	15-18	27
5.	Capacity to enter into a cross-border insolvency agreement.....	19-23	28
6.	Format.....	24-26	30
7.	Common provisions.....	27-30	30
8.	Legal effect.....	31-33	32
9.	Safeguards.....	34-36	33
10.	Possible problems and means of resolution.....	37-38	33
B.	Comparison of cross-border insolvency agreements.....	39-200	34
1.	Recitals.....	40-51	34
2.	Terminology and rules of interpretation.....	52-55	40
3.	Courts.....	56-89	42
4.	Administration of the proceedings.....	90-105	54
5.	Allocation of responsibilities between the parties to the cross-border insolvency agreement.....	106-145	59
6.	Communication.....	146-181	75
7.	Effectiveness, amendment, revision and termination of cross-border insolvency agreements.....	182-190	87
8.	Costs and fees.....	191-194	90
9.	Safeguards.....	195-200	92
 Annexes			
I.	Case summaries.....		95
II.	Decision of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and General Assembly resolution 64/112.....		115

Introduction

A. Organization and scope of the *Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation*

1. The purpose of the *Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation* is to provide information for practitioners and judges on practical aspects of cooperation and communication in cross-border insolvency cases, specifically in cases involving insolvency proceedings in multiple States where the insolvent debtor has assets and cases where some of the debtor's creditors are not from the State in which the insolvency proceedings have commenced. Such cases might involve individual debtors, but typically they involve enterprise groups with offices, business activities and assets in multiple States. The information is based upon a description of collected experience and practice and focuses on the use and negotiation of cross-border insolvency agreements, providing an analysis of a number of those agreements, which range from written agreements approved by courts to oral arrangements between parties to insolvency proceedings entered into in cross-border insolvency cases over the past two decades. The *Practice Guide* is not intended to be prescriptive, but rather to illustrate how the resolution of issues and conflicts that might arise in cross-border insolvency cases could be facilitated by the use of such agreements, tailored to meet the specific needs of each case and the particular requirements of applicable law.

2. Chapter I of the *Practice Guide* discusses the increasing importance of coordination and cooperation in cross-border insolvency cases and provides an introduction to the various international texts relating to cross-border insolvency proceedings that have been developed in recent years. These texts address various aspects of cross-border insolvency, from elaborating a legislative framework to facilitate cooperation and coordination in cross-border insolvency proceedings to providing guidance on issues that could be included in cross-border insolvency agreements or adopted by courts to guide cross-border communication.

3. Chapter II amplifies article 27, in particular paragraph (d), of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency¹ (the UNCITRAL Model Law), discussing the various ways in which cooperation in cross-border cases might be achieved.

4. Chapter III examines in detail the use of one of the means of cooperation referred to in article 27, paragraph (d), of the UNCITRAL Model Law, namely cross-border insolvency agreements. The analysis in this chapter is based on practical experience with the negotiation and use of these agreements, in particular in the cases referred to in annex I. This chapter also includes a number of what are termed "sample clauses", which are based to varying degrees upon provisions found in the different insolvency agreements. These clauses are included to illustrate how different issues have been addressed or might be addressed, but are not intended to serve as model provisions for direct incorporation into an agreement (see also sect. 3 (c) ("Sample clauses"), paras. 16-17 below).

¹ *Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.05.V.10), annex III, part one; text also available from www.uncitral.org under "UNCITRAL Texts and Status".

5. Annex I includes summaries of the cases in which the cross-border insolvency agreements that form the basis of the *Practice Guide* were concluded. The summaries provide a basic overview of the contents of those agreements and, if available, of the reasons the agreements were negotiated. Detailed reasons for using an agreement are not generally included in the agreement, although there are some exceptions.²

B. Glossary

1. Notes on terminology

6. The following terms are intended to provide orientation to the reader of the *Practice Guide*. Since many terms have fundamentally different meanings in different jurisdictions, an explanation of the use of those terms in the *Practice Guide* may assist in ensuring that the concepts discussed are clear and widely understood. The *Practice Guide* uses terminology common to the UNCITRAL Model Law and the *UNCITRAL Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law*³ (the *Legislative Guide*), where relevant. For ease of reference, these terms are repeated below.

(a) References in the *Practice Guide* to “court”

7. The *Practice Guide* follows the *Legislative Guide*'s use of the word “court” and assumes that there is reliance on court supervision throughout the insolvency proceedings, which may include the power to commence insolvency proceedings, to appoint the insolvency representative, to supervise that representative's activities and to take decisions in the course of the proceedings. Although this reliance may be appropriate as a general principle, alternatives may be considered where, for example, the courts are unable to handle insolvency work (whether for reasons of lack of resources or lack of requisite experience) or supervision by some other authority is preferred (see the *Legislative Guide*, part one, chap. III (“Institutional framework”)).

8. For reasons of consistency, the *Practice Guide* uses the word “court” in the same way as article 2, paragraph (e), of the UNCITRAL Model Law to refer to a judicial or other authority competent to control or supervise insolvency proceedings.

(b) References in the *Practice Guide* to “cross-border insolvency agreement”

9. Cross-border insolvency agreements are most commonly referred to in some States as “protocols”, although a number of other titles have been used, including “insolvency administration contract”, “cooperation and compromise agreement” and “memorandum of understanding”. The *Practice Guide* attempts to compile practice with respect to as many forms of cross-border insolvency agreements as possible and, since the use of the term “protocol” does not necessarily reflect the diverse

² See, for example, agreements approved in the cases concerning Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. and Madoff Securities International Limited.

³ United Nations publication, Sales No. E.05.V.10; text also available from www.uncitral.org under “UNCITRAL Texts and Status”.

nature of the agreements being used in practice, the more general term “cross-border insolvency agreement”, or more simply “insolvency agreement”, is used herein.

(c) Rules of interpretation

10. Use of the singular also includes the plural; “include” and “including” are not intended to indicate an exhaustive list; “such as” and “for example” are to be interpreted in the same manner as “include” or “including”.

11. “Creditors” should be interpreted as including both the creditors in the forum State and foreign creditors, unless otherwise specified.

12. References to “person” should be interpreted as including both natural and legal persons, unless otherwise specified.

2. Terms and explanations

13. The following paragraphs explain the meaning and use of certain expressions that appear frequently in the *Practice Guide*. Many of these terms are common to the *Legislative Guide* and the UNCITRAL Model Law and their use in the *Practice Guide* is consistent with their use in those texts. They are included here for ease of reference:

(a) “Assets of the debtor”: property, rights and interests of the debtor, including rights and interests in property, whether or not in the possession of the debtor, tangible or intangible, movable or immovable, including the debtor’s interests in encumbered assets or in third-party-owned assets;

(b) “Avoidance provisions”: provisions of the insolvency law that permit transactions for the transfer of assets or the undertaking of obligations prior to insolvency proceedings to be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective and any assets transferred, or their value, to be recovered in the collective interest of creditors;

(c) “Centre of main interests”: the place where the debtor conducts the administration of its interests on a regular basis and that is therefore ascertainable by third parties;

(d) “Claim”: a right to payment from the estate of the debtor, whether arising from a debt, a contract or other type of legal obligation, whether liquidated or unliquidated, matured or unmatured, disputed or undisputed, secured or unsecured, fixed or contingent;

(e) “Commencement of proceedings”: the effective date of insolvency proceedings whether established by statute or a judicial decision;

(f) “Court”: a judicial or other authority competent to control or supervise insolvency proceedings;⁴

(g) “Creditor”: a natural or legal person that has a claim against the debtor that arose on or before the commencement of the insolvency proceedings;

⁴ See paras. 7-8 above.

(h) “Creditor committee”: a representative body of creditors appointed in accordance with the insolvency law, having consultative and other powers as specified in the insolvency law;

(i) “Cross-border insolvency agreement”: an oral or written agreement intended to facilitate the coordination of cross-border insolvency proceedings and cooperation between courts, between courts and insolvency representatives and between insolvency representatives, sometimes also involving other parties in interest;

(j) “Debtor in possession”: a debtor in reorganization proceedings, which retains full control over the business, with the consequence that the court does not appoint an insolvency representative;

(k) “Deferral”: when one court accepts the limitation of its responsibility with respect to certain issues, including for example the ability to hear certain matters and issue certain orders, in favour of another court;

(l) “Establishment”: any place of operations where the debtor carries out a non-transitory economic activity with human means and goods or services;

(m) “Insolvency”: when a debtor is generally unable to pay its debts as they mature or when its liabilities exceed the value of its assets;

(n) “Insolvency estate”: assets of the debtor that are subject to the insolvency proceedings;

(o) “Insolvency proceedings”: collective proceedings, subject to court supervision, either for reorganization or liquidation;

(p) “Insolvency representative”: a person or body, including one appointed on an interim basis, authorized in insolvency proceedings to administer the reorganization or the liquidation of the insolvency estate;

(q) “Main proceeding”: an insolvency proceeding taking place in the State where the debtor has the centre of its main interests;⁵

(r) “Non-main proceeding”: an insolvency proceeding, other than a main proceeding, taking place in a State where the debtor has an establishment;⁶

(s) “Ordinary course of business”: transactions consistent with both (i) the operation of the debtor’s business prior to insolvency proceedings and (ii) ordinary business terms;

(t) “Party in interest”: any party whose rights, obligations or interests are affected by insolvency proceedings or particular matters in the insolvency proceedings, including the debtor, the insolvency representative, a creditor, an equity holder, a creditor committee, a government authority or any other person so affected. It is not intended that persons with remote or diffuse interests affected by the insolvency proceedings would be considered to be a party in interest;

⁵ UNCITRAL Model Law, art. 2, para. (b), and art. 16, para. 3.

⁶ Ibid., art. 2, paras. (c) and (f). Non-main proceedings conducted in European Union member States under European Council (EC) Regulation No. 1346/2000 of 29 May 2000 on insolvency proceedings are referred to as “secondary proceedings”.

(u) “Priority”: the right of a claim to rank ahead of another claim where that right arises by operation of law;

(v) “Reorganization”: the process by which the financial well-being and viability of a debtor’s business can be restored and the business continue to operate, using various means, possibly including debt forgiveness, debt rescheduling, debt-equity conversions and sale of the business (or parts of it) as a going concern;

(w) “Reorganization plan”: a plan by which the financial well-being and viability of the debtor’s business can be restored;

(x) “Stay of proceedings”: a measure that prevents the commencement, or suspends the continuation, of judicial, administrative or other individual actions concerning the debtor’s assets, rights, obligations or liabilities, including actions to make security interests effective against third parties or to enforce a security interest; and prevents execution against the assets of the insolvency estate, the termination of a contract with the debtor and the transfer, encumbrance or other disposition of any assets or rights of the insolvency estate.

3. Reference material

(a) References to cases

14. References to specific cases are included throughout the *Practice Guide* and particularly in the footnotes. In general, those references are to cases cited and summarized in annex I, so only a short-form reference is included in the text of the *Practice Guide*, e.g. “GBFE” refers to the proceedings concerning Greater Beijing First Expressways Limited, “Systech” to the proceedings concerning Systech Retail Systems Corporation. References to page or paragraph numbers in association with those cases are references to the relevant portion⁷ of the publicly available⁸ English version of the agreement; many of these agreements are available in English only. Where an agreement is available in other languages, this is indicated in annex I.

(b) References to texts

15. The *Practice Guide* includes references, where relevant, to several international texts addressing various aspects of coordination of cross-border insolvency cases, including:

(a) “Concordat”: Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat adopted by the Council of the International Bar Association Section on Business Law (Paris, 17 September 1995) and by the Council of the International Bar Association (Madrid, 31 May 1996);

(b) “UNCITRAL Model Law”: UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency with Guide to Enactment (1997);

⁷ The agreements use different terms, including “section”, “paragraph”, “clause” and “article”.

For simplicity of reference, the present text uses “paragraph” to refer to any numbered part of an agreement and indicates the page where there are no relevant paragraph numbers.

⁸ At the date of publication of the *Practice Guide*, a few of the agreements cited were not publicly available; they are identified in annex I.

(c) “Court-to-Court Guidelines”: Guidelines Applicable to Court-to-Court Communications in Cross-Border Cases, published by the American Law Institute (16 May 2000) and adopted by the International Insolvency Institute (10 June 2001);

(d) “EC Regulation”: European Council (EC) Regulation No. 1346/2000 of 29 May 2000 on insolvency proceedings;

(e) “*Legislative Guide*”: UNCITRAL Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law (2004);

(f) “CoCo Guidelines”: European Communication and Cooperation Guidelines for Cross-Border Insolvency, prepared by INSOL Europe’s Academic Wing (2007).

(c) Sample clauses

16. The sample clauses included in the *Practice Guide* are merely illustrative, providing examples, based upon actual agreements, of how the provisions of a cross-border insolvency agreement addressing the particular issues discussed in chapter III might be drafted. The user is advised to read the sample clauses together with the discussion of the relevant issue in the preceding paragraphs. It should be noted that the sample clauses are not intended to be used as model clauses and they should not be regarded as necessarily comprehensive. Moreover, they should not be considered as forming the basis of what might be regarded as a model agreement. Some provisions might only be appropriate for a particular case, whereas others of a more general nature might be more widely and commonly used. Further, some sample clauses are only effective if approved by the responsible courts, for example when they allocate or touch upon responsibilities of the courts.

17. The *Practice Guide* therefore emphasizes the individual approach that has to be taken for each insolvency agreement, recognizing that an insolvency agreement has to be drafted for a specific case, taking into consideration the peculiarities of the case and the interests of the parties, as well as local conditions, including the applicable law.

I. Background

A. The legislative framework for cross-border insolvency

1. Although the number of cross-border insolvency cases has increased significantly since the 1990s, the adoption of legal regimes, either domestic or international, equipped to address cases of a cross-border nature has not kept pace. The lack of such regimes has often resulted in inadequate and uncoordinated approaches that have not only hampered the rescue of financially troubled businesses and the fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvency proceedings, but have also impeded the protection and maximization of the value of the assets of the insolvent debtor and are unpredictable in their application. Moreover, the disparities and, in some cases, conflicts between national laws have created unnecessary obstacles to the achievement of the basic economic and social goals of insolvency proceedings. There has often been a lack of transparency, with no clear rules on recognition of the rights and priorities of existing creditors, the treatment of foreign creditors and the law applicable to cross-border issues. While many of these inadequacies are also apparent in domestic insolvency regimes, their impact is potentially much greater in cross-border cases, particularly where reorganization is involved.

2. In addition to the inadequacy of existing laws, the absence of predictability as to how they will be applied and the potential cost and delay involved in application has added a further layer of uncertainty that can impact on capital flows and cross-border investment. Acceptance of different types of proceedings, understanding of key concepts and the treatment accorded to parties with an interest in insolvency proceedings differ. Reorganization or rescue procedures, for example, are more prevalent in some countries than others. The involvement of and treatment accorded to secured creditors in insolvency proceedings vary widely. Different countries also recognize different types of proceedings with different effects. An example in the context of reorganization proceedings is the case in which the law of one State envisages a debtor in possession continuing to exercise management functions, while under the law of another State in which contemporaneous insolvency proceedings are being conducted with respect to the same debtor, existing management will be displaced or the debtor's business liquidated. Many national insolvency laws have claimed, for their own insolvency proceedings, application of the principle of universality, with the objective of a unified proceeding where court orders would be effective with respect to assets located abroad. At the same time, those laws do not accord recognition to the universality claimed by foreign insolvency proceedings. In addition to differences between key concepts and treatment of participants, some of the effects of insolvency proceedings, such as the application of a stay or suspension of actions against the debtor or its assets, regarded as a key element of many laws, cannot be applied effectively across borders.

3. In addition to the lack of national law reform efforts, there has been a lack of multilateral treaty arrangements with global effect. A few treaties have been negotiated at a regional level, but those arrangements are generally only possible (and suitable) for countries of a particular region whose insolvency law regimes and general commercial laws are similar. Experience has shown that despite the

potential of international treaties to provide a vehicle for widespread harmonization, the effort required to negotiate such treaties is generally substantial and, as one commentator has noted, the greater the degree of practical utility that is pursued by means of a treaty, the greater the difficulty in bringing it to fruition and the greater the risk of ultimate failure. The search for comity in insolvency in Europe provides a good example. Beginning in 1960 the intention was to develop a bankruptcy convention that would parallel the 1968 Convention on Jurisdiction and the Enforcement of Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters. These efforts led to the 1990 European Convention on Certain International Aspects of Bankruptcy (the Istanbul Convention). Following only one ratification (Cyprus), the 1990 Convention was superseded by a draft European Union convention on insolvency proceedings. Although European Union member States came close to adopting that draft convention in November 1995, implementation ultimately proved impossible. The convention was revived in the form of a European Council regulation in May 1999, which was adopted by the Council on 29 May 2000 and came into effect on 31 May 2002 (see para. 19 below).

B. International initiatives

4. To address the lack of national law reform efforts, several international initiatives have been launched by certain non-governmental organizations over the last decade or so to provide a legal framework for harmonization of cross-border insolvency proceedings.

1. Model International Insolvency Cooperation Act

5. An early project launched by a non-governmental organization was the Model International Insolvency Cooperation Act (MIICA), developed under the auspices of Committee J of the Section on Business Law of the International Bar Association and approved by the Council of the Section on Business Law and the Council of the International Bar Association in 1989. The MIICA was a model statute, proposed for domestic adoption, which provided mechanisms by which a court could assist and act in aid of insolvency proceedings being conducted in other jurisdictions. Although failing to gain wide and active acceptance from Governments and legislators, the MIICA ensured that the model law concept came to be perceived as a viable way of solving the impasse caused by persistent failure to successfully conclude a global treaty in the area of insolvency. Experience with the MIICA also indicated the importance to the success of a project involving Governments in the negotiation process (a key element of the UNCITRAL process), particularly where the text being developed required action by Governments, whether legislative or otherwise, for its adoption.

2. Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat

6. Another initiative of Committee J was the development, in the early 1990s, of a Cross-Border Insolvency Concordat based on rules of private international law. The purpose of the Concordat was to suggest guidelines for cross-border insolvencies that participants or courts could adopt as practical solutions to a variety of issues. These include designation of the administrative forum, application of that forum's priority rules, rules for cases involving more than one administrative forum

and designation of applicable rules for avoidance of certain specified pre-insolvency transactions. The initial application of the Concordat, by some of the judges who had been instrumental in developing it, was in cases involving Canada and the United States of America. Cross-border insolvency agreements based on the Concordat model have also been entered into between the United States and each of the following: Israel, the Bahamas, the Cayman Islands, England, Bermuda and Switzerland.

7. This form of cooperation has emerged as a common practice, at least in certain States. The absence of formal treaties or national legislation to address the problems arising from international insolvencies has encouraged insolvency practitioners to develop, on a case-by-case basis, strategies and techniques for resolving the conflicts that arise when the courts of different States attempt to apply different laws and enforce different requirements on the same set of parties. The terms and duration of agreements vary, and amendment or modification in the course of the proceedings takes account of the changing dynamics of a multinational insolvency to facilitate solutions for unique problems that arise in the course of the proceedings. An early use of an insolvency agreement was in the 1992 insolvency proceedings concerning the Maxwell Communication Corporation. In those proceedings, the corporation was placed into administration in England and contemporaneously into Chapter 11 proceedings in New York, with administrators and an examiner appointed respectively.

8. An insolvency agreement may not be the appropriate solution for all cases, being case-specific as to its content and requiring time for its negotiation as well as a sufficient asset base to justify the costs associated with negotiation and cooperation between the courts and between the insolvency representatives in each jurisdiction. Nevertheless, the cases in which these agreements have been used provide examples of how cooperation and coordination between the judges, courts and the insolvency profession can improve the international regime for insolvency in the absence of comprehensive national, regional or international law reform solutions. The agreements developed have often provided innovative solutions to cross-border issues and have enabled courts to address the specific facts of individual cases. Although there are limitations on the extent to which they can be used to achieve more widespread harmonization of international insolvency law and practice, insolvency agreements are being increasingly used and information about them is being more and more widely disseminated.

3. UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency

9. The UNCITRAL Model Law was adopted by the Commission in 1997. As stated in its preamble, it focuses on the legislative framework needed to facilitate cooperation and coordination in cross-border insolvency cases, with a view to promoting the general objectives of:

- (a) Cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities of the enacting State and foreign States involved in cases of cross-border insolvency;
- (b) Greater legal certainty for trade and investment;
- (c) Fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvency proceedings that protects the interests of all creditors and other interested persons, including the debtor;

(d) Protection and maximization of the value of the debtor's assets;

(e) Facilitation of the rescue of financially troubled businesses, thereby protecting investment and preserving employment.

10. These objectives raise a number of issues that relate to the extent to which courts, in exercising their powers with respect to administration of the cases before them, are permitted or authorized to interact with or relate to foreign courts that might be administering a related case involving the same debtor. Are courts able, for example, to treat common stakeholders equitably, give foreign stakeholders access on the same basis as domestic stakeholders or permit another jurisdiction to take principal charge of administering reorganization? Experience has shown, for example, that some courts are often reluctant or unable to defer to a foreign court and may therefore prefer parallel insolvency proceedings or treat main and non-main proceedings, where provided for under the relevant insolvency regime, as if they were concurrent or parallel proceedings. Such a preference may be based upon applicable law or a desire to protect the interests of domestic creditors.

11. In its resolution 52/158 of 15 December 1997, recommending that States adopt the UNCITRAL Model Law, the General Assembly provided a compelling statement of the need for the text, its timeliness and its fundamental purpose. Specifically, the Assembly noted that increased cross-border trade and investment led to a greater incidence of cases where enterprises and individuals had assets in more than one State and there was often an urgent need for cross-border cooperation and coordination to facilitate the supervision and administration of the insolvent debtor's assets and affairs. Inadequate coordination and cooperation in those cases not only reduces the possibility of rescuing financially troubled but viable businesses, but also impedes a fair and efficient administration of cross-border insolvencies, making it more likely that the debtor's assets would be concealed or dissipated, and hinders reorganization or liquidation of debtor's assets and affairs that would be the most advantageous for the creditors and other interested persons, including the debtor and its employees.

12. The General Assembly went on to note that many States lacked a legislative framework that would make possible or facilitate effective cross-border coordination and cooperation. It made clear its conviction that fair and internationally harmonized legislation on cross-border insolvency that respected the national procedural and judicial systems and was acceptable to States with different legal, social and economic systems would not only contribute to the development of international trade and investment, but would also assist States in modernizing their legislation on cross-border insolvency.

13. An intergovernmental working group, including representatives of some 72 States, 7 intergovernmental organizations and 10 non-governmental organizations, negotiated the UNCITRAL Model Law between 1995 and 1997. As a model law, it requires enactment into national law to provide a unilateral legislative framework for cross-border insolvency proceedings. The UNCITRAL Model Law focuses upon what is required to facilitate the administration of cross-border insolvency cases and provide an interface between jurisdictions. As such, it respects the differences among national procedural laws and does not attempt a substantive unification of insolvency law (substantive insolvency law is addressed in the *Legislative Guide*).

14. The text of the UNCITRAL Model Law offers solutions that help in several modest but significant ways, including the following:

(a) Providing the person administering a foreign insolvency proceeding (“foreign representative”) with access to the courts of the enacting State, thereby permitting the foreign representative to seek a temporary “breathing space”, and allowing the courts in the enacting State to determine what coordination among the jurisdictions or other relief is warranted for optimal disposition of the insolvency proceedings;

(b) Determining when a foreign insolvency proceeding should be accorded “recognition” and what the consequences of recognition may be, including the relief available to assist the foreign proceeding;

(c) Establishing simplified procedures for recognition;

(d) Providing a transparent regime for the right of foreign creditors to commence, or participate in, an insolvency proceeding in the enacting State;

(e) Permitting courts and insolvency representatives in the enacting State to cooperate more effectively with foreign courts and foreign representatives involved in insolvency proceedings;

(f) Authorizing courts in the enacting State and persons administering insolvency proceedings in the enacting State to seek assistance abroad;

(g) Establishing rules for coordination where an insolvency proceeding in the enacting State is taking place concurrently with insolvency proceedings in foreign States.

15. The Guide to Enactment of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency⁹ emphasizes the centrality of cooperation to cross-border insolvency cases, in order to achieve efficient conduct of those proceedings and optimal results. A key element is cooperation between the courts involved in the various proceedings and between those courts and the insolvency representatives appointed in the different proceedings, as well as between the insolvency representatives (arts. 25-26 of the Model Law). An essential element of cooperation may be establishing communication among the administering authorities of the States involved. While the Model Law provides the authorization for cross-border cooperation and communication between judges, it does not specify how that cooperation and communication might be achieved, leaving it up to each jurisdiction to determine or apply its own rules. It notes, however, that the ability of courts, with the appropriate involvement of the parties, to communicate “directly” and to request information and assistance “directly” from foreign courts or foreign representatives is intended to avoid the use of time-consuming procedures traditionally in use, such as letters rogatory. As insolvency proceedings are inherently chaotic and value evaporates quickly with the passage of time, this ability is critical when courts consider that they should act with urgency.¹⁰

⁹ *Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law*, annex III, part two; text also available from www.uncitral.org under “UNCITRAL Texts and Status”.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, para. 179.

16. As at the end of 2009, legislation based upon the UNCITRAL Model Law had been enacted in Australia (2008); the British Virgin Islands, overseas territory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2005); Canada (2009); Colombia (2006); Eritrea (1998); Great Britain (2006); Japan (2000); Mauritius (2009); Mexico (2000); Montenegro (2002); New Zealand (2006); Poland (2003); the Republic of Korea (2006); Romania (2003); Serbia (2004); Slovenia (2008); South Africa (2000); and the United States (2005).¹¹

4. Regional arrangements

17. While a few treaties have been negotiated at a regional level, these arrangements are generally only possible (and suitable) for countries of a particular region whose insolvency law regimes and general commercial laws are similar. Of necessity, their application is limited to the regional group of contracting States.

18. Regional multilateral treaties on insolvency include, in Latin America, the Montevideo Treaties of 1889 and 1940 and, in the Nordic region, the Convention between Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden regarding Bankruptcy (concluded in 1933, amended in 1977 and 1982). While no doubt improving the situation among those contracting States, the increasing globalization of business and investment and the consequent spread of international insolvencies is likely to include non-participating States, underlining the limitations inherent in any regional treaty regime. Nevertheless, regional arrangements may prove to be a useful starting point for broader cooperation.

19. The EC Regulation (see Introduction, para. 15 above) regulates the complex problems of cross-border insolvency by creating a binding framework within which insolvency proceedings taking place in any member State of the European Union are recognized and enforced throughout the rest of the Union. The Regulation recognizes that the proper functioning of the internal European market requires the efficient and effective operation of cross-border insolvency proceedings. One impediment to that proper functioning, which the Regulation tries to address, is “forum shopping”, where parties transfer assets or judicial proceedings from one member State to another, seeking to obtain a more favourable legal position (recitals (2) and (4)). The Regulation imposes a mandatory regime for the exercise of jurisdiction to open insolvency proceedings and choice of law rules, which determine the law that will govern each relevant aspect of insolvency proceedings to which the Regulation applies and recognizes the importance of cooperation between the proceedings. Article 31 establishes the duty of insolvency representatives of different concurrent insolvency proceedings to cooperate and communicate information, but does not provide much guidance on the detail of that communication and cooperation. That is addressed by the CoCo Guidelines (see Introduction, para. 15 above), which constitute a set of standards for communication and cooperation by insolvency representatives in cross-border insolvency cases.

5. Guidelines Applicable to Court-to-Court Communications in Cross-Border Cases

20. In 2000, the American Law Institute developed the Court-to-Court Guidelines as part of its work on transnational insolvency in the countries of the North

¹¹ This information is regularly updated on the UNCITRAL website (www.uncitral.org) under “Status of Conventions”.

American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). A team of judges, lawyers and academics from the three NAFTA countries, Canada, Mexico and the United States, worked jointly on that project. The Court-to-Court Guidelines are intended to encourage and facilitate cooperation in international cases. They are not intended to alter or change the domestic rules or procedures that are applicable in any country, nor to affect or curtail the substantive rights of any party in proceedings before the courts. They have been approved by both the International Insolvency Institute and the Insolvency Institute of Canada and endorsed by various courts. Further, they have been used by courts in several cross-border insolvency cases, for example *PSINet* and *Matlack* (see annex I).

II. Possible forms of cooperation under article 27 of the UNCITRAL Model Law

Article 27. Forms of cooperation

Cooperation referred to in articles 25 and 26 may be implemented by any appropriate means, including:

- (a) Appointment of a person or body to act at the direction of the court;*
- (b) Communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court;*
- (c) Coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor's assets and affairs;*
- (d) Approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings;*
- (e) Coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor;*
- (f) [The enacting State may wish to list additional forms or examples of cooperation].*

1. A widespread limitation on cooperation and coordination between judges from different jurisdictions in cases of cross-border insolvency derives from the lack of a legislative framework, or from uncertainty regarding the scope of the existing legislative authorization, for pursuing cooperation with foreign courts. The UNCITRAL Model Law provides that legislative framework, authorizing cross-border cooperation and communication between courts. It does not, however, specify how that cooperation and communication might be achieved. To assist those States that might have a limited tradition of direct cross-border judicial cooperation and States where judicial discretion has traditionally been constrained, article 27 of the Model Law lists possible forms of cooperation that might be used to coordinate cross-border insolvency cases.

A. Article 27, paragraph (a): Appointment of a person or body to act at the direction of the court

2. Such a person or body may be appointed by a court to facilitate coordination of insolvency proceedings taking place in different jurisdictions concerning the same debtor. The person may have a variety of possible functions, including acting as a go-between for the courts involved, especially where issues of language are present; developing an insolvency agreement; and promoting consensual resolution of issues between the parties. Where the court appoints such a person, typically the court order will indicate the terms of the appointment and the powers of the appointee. The person may be required to report to the court or courts involved in the proceedings on a regular basis, as well as to the parties.

3. In the *Maxwell* case, for example, the United States court appointed an examiner with expanded powers under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code and directed it to work to facilitate coordination of the different proceedings. In the *Nakash* case, an examiner was also appointed by the United States court to,

inter alia, attempt to develop an insolvency agreement for harmonizing and coordinating the United States Chapter 11 proceedings with certain proceedings taking place in Israel and, ultimately, to facilitate a consensual resolution of the United States Chapter 11 case. In the *Matlack* case, the court order approving the insolvency agreement provided for an information officer to periodically or upon request deliver to the court reports summarizing the status of the foreign insolvency proceedings and such other information as the court might order.

B. Article 27, paragraph (b): Communication of information by any means considered appropriate by the court

4. An essential element of cooperation may be establishing communication between the administering authorities of the States involved. Articles 25 and 26 of the UNCITRAL Model Law authorize direct communication between courts, between courts and insolvency representatives and between insolvency representatives. Where the Model Law has been adopted, these provisions establish the necessary legislative authorization for that communication, but do not specify in any detail how that communication should take place beyond suggesting, in article 27, that it may be implemented by, for example, communicating information by any means considered appropriate by the court. The Model Law envisages that communication as authorized would be subject to any mandatory rules applicable in an enacting State, such as rules restricting the communication of information for reasons, inter alia, of protection of privacy or confidentiality.¹² The ability of courts to communicate “directly” and to request information and assistance “directly” from foreign courts or foreign representatives, avoiding the use of time-consuming procedures traditionally in use, such as letters rogatory, may be critical when courts consider that they should act with urgency.¹³ Where the Model Law has not been enacted, the legislative authorization for communication in cross-border proceedings might be lacking.

5. Establishing communication in cross-border insolvency cases may assist cross-border proceedings in many ways. It may, for example, assist parties in better understanding the implications or application of foreign law, particularly the differences or overlaps that may otherwise lead to litigation; facilitate resolution of issues through a negotiated result acceptable to all; and elicit more reliable responses from parties, avoiding inherent bias and adversarial distortion that may be apparent where parties represent their own particular concerns in their own jurisdictions. It may also serve international interests by facilitating better understanding that will assist in encouraging international business and preserving value that would otherwise be lost through fragmented judicial action. Some of the potential benefits may be hard to identify at the outset, but may become apparent once the parties have communicated. Cross-border communication may reveal, for example, some fact or procedure that will substantially inform the best resolution of the case and may, in the longer term, serve as an impetus to law reform.

6. Communication of information may take place by exchange of documents (e.g. copies of formal orders, judgements, opinions, reasons for decisions, transcripts of

¹² *Legislative Guide on Insolvency Law*, annex III, part two, para. 182.

¹³ *Ibid.*, para. 179.

proceedings, affidavits and other evidence) or orally. The means of communication may be by mail, fax, e-mail or other electronic means, or by telephone or videoconference. Copies of written communications may also be provided to the parties in accordance with applicable notice provisions. Communication may be effected directly between judges or between or through court officials (or a court-appointed intermediary, as noted in paras. 2-3 above) or insolvency representatives, subject to local rules. The development of new communication technologies supports various aspects of cooperation and coordination, with the potential to reduce delays and, as appropriate, facilitate face-to-face contact. As global litigation multiplies, these methods of direct communication are increasingly being used. Videoconferences have been used in preference to telephone conferences, as they provide reasonable control of the process and facilitate disciplined organization of the communication as the participants can hear and see each other.

7. Communication of information between judges or other interested parties raises a number of issues that need to be considered to ensure that all communication is open, effective and credible and that proper procedures are followed. At a general level, it might be appropriate to consider whether communication should be treated as a matter of course in cross-border proceedings or resorted to only where determined to be strictly necessary; whether it should cover only issues of procedure or may also deal with substantive matters; whether a judge may advocate that a particular course of action be taken; and, with respect to safeguards, such as those mentioned below (see chap. III, paras. 34-36 and 195-200), whether they should apply in all cases or whether there might be exceptions.

8. In any particular case it will be necessary to determine, as appropriate to a particular jurisdiction, the correct procedures to be followed, including the persons who are to be party to the communication and any limitations that will apply; whether the parties share the same intentions or understanding with respect to communication; any safeguards that will apply to protect the substantive and procedural rights of the parties; the language of the communication and any consequent need for translation of written documents or interpretation of oral communications; acceptable methods of communication; and the issues to be considered. Insolvency agreements generally seek to balance the interests of the different stakeholders and ensure that no one is prejudiced in any material way by the mechanisms to be included in the agreement. Safeguards might provide that parties are entitled to be notified of any proposed communication (e.g. all parties and their representatives or counsel), to object to the proposed communication and to be present when the communication takes place and actively participate, and that a record of the communication should be made, becoming part of the record of the proceedings and available to counsel, subject to any measure the courts may deem appropriate to protect confidentiality.

9. The different approaches taken to communication between the courts and parties serve to illustrate some of the problems that might be encountered. In addition to the absence of specific authorization, there is very often hesitance or reluctance on the part of courts of different jurisdictions to communicate directly with each other. That hesitance or reluctance may be based upon ethical considerations, legal culture, language or lack of familiarity with foreign laws and their application. Some States take a relatively liberal approach to communication

between judges, while in other States judges may not communicate directly with parties or insolvency representatives or, indeed, with other judges. In some States, ex parte communications with the judge are considered normal and necessary, while in other States such communications would not be acceptable.¹⁴ Within States, judges and lawyers may have quite different views about the propriety of contacts between judges without the knowledge or participation of the representative or counsel for the parties. Some judges, for example, accept that there is no difficulty with private contact among them, while some lawyers would strongly disagree with that practice. Courts typically focus on the matters before them and may be reluctant to provide assistance to related proceedings in other States, particularly when the proceedings for which they are responsible do not appear to involve an international element in the form of a foreign debtor, foreign creditors or the foreign operations of the debtor.

10. Courts may adopt guidelines, such as the Court-to-Court Guidelines, to coordinate their activities, foster efficiency and ensure that stakeholders in each State are treated consistently. Such guidelines typically are not intended to alter or change the domestic rules or procedures that are applicable in any country, and are not intended to affect or curtail the substantive rights of any party in proceedings before the courts. Rather, they are intended to promote transparent communication between courts, permitting courts of different jurisdictions to communicate effectively with one another, and may be adopted by courts for general use or incorporated into specific insolvency agreements.

C. Article 27, paragraph (c): Coordination of the administration and supervision of the debtor's assets and affairs

11. The conduct of cross-border insolvency proceedings will often require assets of the different insolvency estates to continue to be used, realized or disposed of in the course of the proceedings. Coordination of such use, realization and disposal will help to avoid disputes and ensure that the benefit of all parties in interest is the key focus, particularly in reorganization. Coordination may also be relevant to investigating the debtor's assets and considering possible avoidance proceedings. Some of the issues to be considered in facilitating coordination will include the location of the various assets; determination of the law governing those assets; identification of the parties responsible for determining how the assets can be used or disposed of (e.g. the insolvency representative, the courts or in some cases the debtor), including the approvals required; the extent to which responsibility for those assets can be shared among or allocated to different parties in different States; and how information can be shared to ensure coordination and cooperation.

¹⁴ For example, in the NAFTA countries, ex parte communications with the judge are accepted in Mexico, while in Canada and the United States they are not. See American Law Institute, *Transnational Insolvency: Cooperation Among the NAFTA Countries - Principles of Cooperation Among the NAFTA Countries* (Huntington, New York, Juris Publishing, 2003), comment to Procedural Principle 10, Topic IV.B., pp. 57-58.

D. Article 27, paragraph (d): Approval or implementation by courts of agreements concerning the coordination of proceedings

12. As noted above, the insolvency profession, faced with the daily necessity of dealing with insolvency cases and attempting to coordinate administration of cross-border insolvencies in the absence of widespread adoption of facilitating national or international laws, has developed cross-border insolvency agreements. These are designed to address the potential procedural and substantive conflicts arising in those cross-border cases, facilitating their resolution through cooperation between the courts, the debtor and other stakeholders across jurisdictional lines to work efficiently and increase realizations for stakeholders in potentially competing jurisdictions.

13. These agreements do not replace enactment of the UNCITRAL Model Law as a means of facilitating cross-border cooperation and coordination, but may be used in conjunction with enactment of the Model Law and, in fact, complement its enactment. They are discussed in detail in chapter III below.

E. Article 27, paragraph (e): Coordination of concurrent proceedings regarding the same debtor

14. When there are concurrent cross-border proceedings with respect to the same debtor, the UNCITRAL Model Law aims to foster decisions that would best achieve the objectives of those proceedings. Article 29 provides guidance to a court that is dealing with cases where the debtor is subject to both foreign and local proceedings, addressing ways in which those proceedings should be coordinated, particularly with respect to the provision of relief, to ensure that the different proceedings can move forward without being unnecessarily suspended by the operation of a stay. For example, investigation of the debtor's assets may involve assets located in a number of different jurisdictions and such investigation may be hampered by the operation of a stay in one or more of those jurisdictions. In order to proceed with the investigation, relief from the stay might be required. Similarly, proceedings commenced in one State might be assisted by the application of a stay in another State where no insolvency proceedings have commenced with respect to the debtor but where the debtor has assets. Recognition of the stay in that second State would assist in protecting the assets for the benefit of all creditors. In recognizing and implementing a stay ordered by another court, a court might consult with the issuing court regarding the interpretation and application of the stay, possible modification of, or relief from, the stay, and the enforcement of the stay.

15. Concurrent proceedings may also be coordinated by way of joint or coordinated hearings (see chap. III, paras. 154-159) and, in the case of reorganization, by coordinating the preparation and content of reorganization plans, particularly where the same or a similar plan is required in each State involved in the insolvency proceedings. Coordination may also be relevant to negotiation of the plan with creditors, procedures for approval of the plan and the role to be played by the courts, particularly with respect to approval of the plan and its implementation.

16. Chapter V of the UNCITRAL Model Law (arts. 28-32) addresses certain specific aspects of coordination of concurrent proceedings, namely commencement

of local proceedings after recognition of foreign main proceedings, coordination of relief, coordination of multiple proceedings, the application of a presumption of insolvency and rules of payment in concurrent proceedings.

F. Article 27, paragraph (f): Other forms of cooperation

17. Forms of cooperation not specifically mentioned in article 27 might include the following.

1. Questions of jurisdiction and allocation of disputes among cooperating courts for resolution

18. Reaching an appropriate level of cooperation may require courts in the States in which insolvency proceedings have commenced to coordinate their efforts and avoid the sorts of conflict that might arise from the traditional approaches of reciprocity and the first-to-judgement rule (which permits parallel litigation involving the same parties and issues to proceed in two countries, with the result governed by the first court to reach a decision). In some countries, the anti-suit injunction, restraining a party from commencing or continuing proceedings in another jurisdiction, may also create conflict¹⁵ and hamper the successful conduct of parallel insolvency proceedings. Litigation associated with such injunctions tends to be prolonged. Cooperation may involve, for example, identifying different matters to be brought before respective courts (which might be agreed at the level of the parties and not involve a decision by the courts); courts deferring to the jurisdiction or to decisions of other courts; and, to the extent permitted, allocating responsibility for various matters between the courts to facilitate coordination and avoid duplication of effort. Among some States, there is a trend of some courts in multinational cases attempting to determine the optimal forum for each case rather than relying on the traditional rules. This solution has been used most frequently in insolvency cases because of the universal jurisdiction characteristic of insolvency.

19. As noted above, determining the most appropriate forum may involve one court deferring to another (see chap. III, paras. 59-64 and 75-78). One court might defer to the jurisdiction of another court where, for example, a particular action may be possible in the second court but not in the first. In the *Maxwell* case, for example, where a creditor would have been subject to an avoidance action in the United States but not in England, the English court deferred to the jurisdiction of the United States court, with all parties agreeing that the use of the United States law in this case would be territorial. After considering the matter, however, the United States court concluded that the law of the jurisdiction having the greatest interest in the outcome of the controversy, in this case English law, should govern. The United States court acknowledged that, in an age of multinational corporations, it may be

¹⁵ In a case concerning parallel insolvency proceedings in the United States and Belgium, the United States appellate court adopted a restricted approach to enjoining foreign proceedings and acknowledged that the courts might enter an anti-suit injunction only on the rare occasions when needed “to protect jurisdiction or an important public policy.” The court quoted as an example a case where the foreign proceeding had only been initiated for the “sole purpose of terminating the United States claim and where the foreign court had enjoined parties from pursuing action in the United States”. See *Stonington Partners, Inc. v. Lernout & Hauspie Speech Products N.V.*, 310 F.3d 118, 127 (3d Cir. 2002).

that two or more countries have equal claim to be the home country of the debtor. Deferral might lead to a legal action commenced in one court being dismissed in order to allow the court in which a parallel action has been commenced to make a decision.¹⁶

20. Deferring to another court might not be possible in all cases, as courts are often obliged to exercise jurisdiction or exclusive control over certain matters. Some legal systems, in particular civil law jurisdictions, may also have procedural rules that limit their ability to defer to another court. However, the insolvency representative may have discretion to simply not pursue a given action in its home court, electing to let the representative of a related proceeding in another State pursue the action there.

2. Coordination of the filing, determination and priority of claims

21. Coordinating the procedures for verification and admission of claims may assist the administration of multiple cross-border insolvency proceedings involving large numbers of creditors in different States. Various measures could be adopted, for example determining a single jurisdiction for the submission, verification and admission of claims and allocating responsibility for that process to the court or the insolvency representative; coordinating that process where claims are to be submitted in more than one proceeding, including requiring insolvency representatives to share lists of creditors and claims admitted, and aligning submission deadlines and procedures; recognizing in other States the claims verified and admitted in a given State; establishing priorities of claims; and so forth. Coordination of treatment of claims is one of the issues commonly addressed in cross-border insolvency agreements (see chap. III, paras. 128-139).

¹⁶ See, for example, *Victrix Steamship Co., S.A. v. Salen Dry Cargo A.B.*, 825 F.2d 709 (2d Cir. 1987), in which a United States court approved dismissal of a claim against a debtor in a Swedish insolvency proceeding in deference to that proceeding; and *Cunard Steamship Co. v. Salen Reefer Serv. A. B.*, 773 F.2d 452 (2d Cir. 1985), which involved a similar dismissal of an arbitration in favour of an insolvency proceeding

III. Cross-border insolvency agreements

A. Preliminary issues

1. As noted above (see chap. II, paras. 12-13), an increasingly important tool for facilitating the management of multiple cross-border insolvencies is the “cross-border insolvency agreement”.
2. Some of the international projects targeting the facilitation of cross-border insolvency proceedings touch more or less explicitly on these agreements, referring in particular to cross-border “protocols” and, in some cases, recommending their use. Some projects, for example, have developed principles to assist with the negotiation of such agreements, including in particular, the Concordat. The CoCo Guidelines recommend the use of such agreements as the best means of achieving cooperation, while the Court-to-Court Guidelines make reference to the use of insolvency agreements in the context of joint hearings. As discussed below, some insolvency agreements incorporate the terms of these instruments by reference; others model specific provisions upon the drafting used in these texts.
3. Drawing upon practical experience, the following discussion examines the nature and use of cross-border insolvency agreements, outlines some of the conditions supporting their use and identifies the range of issues addressed in existing agreements, reflecting on the manner in which they have been treated in different cases.

1. Contents

4. Insolvency agreements are agreements entered into for the purpose of facilitating cross-border cooperation and coordination of multiple insolvency proceedings in different States concerning the same debtor. To quote the court in *MacFadyen*, such an agreement is a “proper and common-sense business arrangement to make, and one manifestly for the benefit of all parties interested”. Typically, they are designed to assist in the management of those proceedings and are intended to reflect the harmonization of procedural rather than substantive issues between the jurisdictions involved (although in limited circumstances, substantive issues may also be addressed). They vary in form (written or oral) and scope (generic to specific) and may be entered into by different parties. Simple generic agreements may emphasize the need for close cooperation between the parties, without addressing specific issues, while more detailed, specific agreements establish a framework of principles to govern multiple insolvency proceedings and may be approved by the courts involved. They may reflect agreement between the parties to take, or refrain from taking, certain steps or actions.
5. Though differing in form, these agreements tend to regulate a similar range of issues and are nearly always intended to be binding on the parties that enter into them. They are most commonly referred to as “protocols”, although a number of other titles have been used, including “insolvency administration contract”, “cooperation and compromise agreement” and “memorandum of understanding”.
6. These agreements have been successfully used in insolvency proceedings concerning both reorganization and liquidation and in a variety of situations, including cases involving multiple plenary proceedings; ancillary proceedings

commenced in different States affecting the same parties; main and non-main insolvency proceedings; insolvency proceedings in one State and non-insolvency proceedings with respect to the same debtor in another State; and insolvency proceedings with respect to enterprise groups. They have also been used in cases involving States with different legal traditions, that is, both common law and civil law.

7. In addition to promoting the efficient worldwide coordination and resolution of multiple proceedings against a debtor, cross-border insolvency agreements are also intended to protect the fundamental local rights of each of the parties involved in those proceedings. Their use has effectively reduced the cost of litigation¹⁷ and enabled parties to focus on the conduct of the insolvency proceedings, rather than on resolving conflict of laws and other similar disputes. As such, they are considered by many practitioners who have been involved with their use as the key to developing appropriate solutions for particular cases, without which a successful conclusion to the proceedings would have been very unlikely. Their increasing use suggests that in time they may become the norm in cases with a significant international element, although their use is not ubiquitous, currently being limited to a handful of States.

8. Typically, these agreements are tailored to address the specific issues of a case and the needs of the parties involved. They may be designed to facilitate the development of a framework of general principles to address basic administrative issues arising out of the cross-border and international nature of the insolvency proceedings, for example:

- (a) To promote certainty and efficiency with respect to management and administration of the proceedings;
- (b) To help clarify the expectations of parties;
- (c) To reduce disputes and promote their effective resolution where they do occur;
- (d) To assist in preventing jurisdictional conflict;¹⁸
- (e) To facilitate restructuring;
- (f) To assist in achieving cost savings by avoiding duplication of effort and competition for assets and avoiding unnecessary delay;
- (g) To promote mutual respect for the independence and integrity of the courts and avoid jurisdictional conflicts;
- (h) To promote international cooperation and understanding between judges presiding over the proceedings and between the insolvency representatives of those proceedings;
- (i) To contribute to the maximization of value of the estate.

¹⁷ In the *Everfresh* proceedings, for example, it has been estimated that enhancement of value through the insolvency agreement, which involved the creditors and restrained unsecured creditors from taking detrimental actions, was in the order of 40 per cent.

¹⁸ The insolvency agreement in the *Maxwell* proceedings, for example, resulted in the English and United States insolvency representatives performing in such a way that no conflict requiring judicial resolution arose.

9. Unfamiliarity with the use of such agreements has led to some misapprehension that they may be used to enable a party to circumvent or defer its legal obligations, duties or limitations or impose them on the parties in another State in a way not permitted under the national law of either party. However, an agreement is not a tool for circumventing legal obligations, but rather a tool for working out the best possible means of coordinating the proceedings in the States involved, within the limitations of the domestic legal regimes of those States. This principle applies to all parties, including the courts, which must abide by their national laws. The extent to which courts might interpret that law to facilitate cross-border cooperation is a different issue.

2. Circumstances supporting use of a cross-border insolvency agreement

10. Despite the case-specificity of insolvency agreements, the existence of certain circumstances in a particular case might be regarded as supporting the use of an agreement to facilitate cross-border cooperation and coordination. The circumstances noted below should not be regarded as an inclusive or determinative checklist, but rather as indicators that an agreement might be helpful; notwithstanding the existence of a number of these factors in a particular case, it might be decided that for other reasons an insolvency agreement is not required or desirable. Subject to consideration of what might be permitted under the law of each State, the circumstances supporting an agreement might include:

(a) Cross-border insolvency proceedings with a considerable number of international elements, such as significant assets located in multiple jurisdictions;

(b) A complex debtor structure (for example, an enterprise group with numerous subsidiaries) or complex intertwining of the operations of the debtor;¹⁹

(c) Different types of insolvency procedures in the States involved, for example reorganization with replacement of the management by insolvency representatives in one forum and the debtor in possession in another or a combination of liquidation, reorganization and other types of procedures;²⁰

(d) Sufficiency of assets to cover the costs of drafting the agreement;

(e) The availability of time for the negotiations. Insolvency agreements may not always be an option as they require time for negotiation. This might be problematic where urgent action is required;

(f) The similarity of substantive insolvency laws;

(g) Legal uncertainty regarding the resolution of choice of law or choice of forum questions;

¹⁹ The debtor structure might also include, for example, separate companies in different States that are owned by the same individual and closely intertwined, such as in the *Madoff* cross-border agreement, part C. The debtor structure may also refer to a globally operating enterprise group where all management decisions concerning the group members in one jurisdiction are taken in another jurisdiction, such as in *Smurfit-Stone* (see the motion of the debtors for an order approving the cross-border insolvency agreement in *Re Smurfit-Stone Container Corporation, et. al, Case No. 09-10235, United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, 20 February 2009*, para. 9).

²⁰ See, for example, *Lehman Brothers*.

- (h) The ordering of contradictory stays in the different proceedings;
- (i) The existence of a cash management system providing for the deposit of cash into a centralized account and the sharing of cash among members of an international group of companies;
- (j) The employment of the insolvency representatives appointed to the different insolvency proceedings by the same international company. This has occurred, for example, in cases involving the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China (Hong Kong SAR) and the British Virgin Islands and the Hong Kong SAR and Bermuda.²¹

3. Timing of negotiation

11. As the court in *Calpine* observed, the negotiation of an insolvency agreement is a matter of discussion, negotiation and cooperation between parties before it is presented to the courts for review and approval. That negotiation may take place at the beginning of a case or during the case as issues arise and more than one agreement may be negotiated to cover different issues. Although there are examples of agreements negotiated in the course of proceedings, for example in the *Maxwell* case, most of the agreements considered in the *Practice Guide* were negotiated prior to the commencement of proceedings. This approach may assist in preventing potential disputes from the outset.

12. The timing of negotiation, however, depends on how much time is available prior to the commencement of the proceedings or for the resolution of disputes in proceedings already commenced. For example, in the *Federal-Mogul* case, the parties had six months to negotiate the agreement, with the commencement of formal proceedings always available as an alternative. The time available for negotiation, reflected in the level of detail evident in the agreement, enabled the parties to resolve a number of complex and sensitive issues, such as the extent to which the insolvency representative could delegate its powers to another insolvency representative or party, including the debtor in possession in another jurisdiction. In the case of *Collins & Aikman*,²² an agreement could not be negotiated because the parties only had a few days prior to commencement of the proceedings. In the *Lehman Brothers* insolvency, involving some 75 separate and distinct bankruptcy proceedings in some 16 jurisdictions, preliminary discussions to explore the possibility of establishing a framework agreement for cooperation between the various debtor entities began in the weeks following the commencement of proceedings in the United States in September 2008. An initial draft agreement was circulated in February 2009 and, after further intense negotiations, the resulting

²¹ See, for example, *GBFE* and *Peregrine*.

²² The Collins & Aikman Group was a leading supplier of automotive components. In Europe alone, it had 24 companies spread over 10 countries with some 4,000 employees and 27 operational sites. In May 2005, voluntary petitions were filed in the United States for reorganization of the United States part of the group. In July 2005, the European sub-group of companies applied to the High Court in England for administration orders over all of the operating companies in Europe. The English insolvency representatives immediately recognized the close interrelationship between the European companies and developed a coordinated approach to the continuation of the businesses, though conclusion of a cross-border agreement was not possible due to time constraints. See *In the Matter of Collins & Aikman Europe, SA*, the High Court of England and Wales, Chancery Division in London, [2006] EWHC 1343 (Ch).

agreement, signed by a group of initial signatories, was submitted in May 2009 to the United States court for approval. It is anticipated that additional parties will join the agreement over time.²³

13. In other cases, proceedings such as non-main proceedings may be commenced on the application of the insolvency representative of the main proceeding with the sole purpose of assisting that main proceeding.²⁴ The insolvency representative of the main proceeding may have a clear idea of what cooperation and coordination is going to be required before applying for commencement of the non-main proceeding and thus negotiation of an insolvency agreement may be relatively quick and uncontroversial.

14. The time required for negotiation of an agreement varies from case to case and depends on a number of factors, such as the knowledge of the parties of the key features of the debtor and of any conflicts likely to be encountered in the course of the proceedings. In simple cases, obtaining this degree of knowledge and the ensuing negotiation may be possible within a few days, but typically the time frame would be longer.

4. Parties

15. Very often the negotiation of cross-border insolvency agreements is initiated by the parties to the proceedings, including the insolvency practitioners or insolvency representatives and, in some cases, the debtor (including a debtor in possession),²⁵ or at the suggestion and with the encouragement of the court; some courts have explicitly encouraged the parties to negotiate an agreement and seek the courts' approval.²⁶ The early involvement of the courts may, in some cases, be a key factor in the success of the agreement.

16. Typically, the parties that enter into an agreement vary depending upon the applicable law and what is permitted, for example, with respect to the powers of the insolvency representatives, the courts and other parties in interest. Frequently, they are entered into by the insolvency representatives, sometimes by the debtor (usually a debtor in possession), and may involve the creditor committee or, in one or two of the cases examined, individual creditors, such as major lenders (for further detail, see section B comparing the contents of different agreements). It is rarely the case that an agreement is entered into between the courts, although in some jurisdictions this might be possible. However, negotiations between parties in cross-border cases are frequently assisted by the courts and they may provide the impetus for reaching an agreement.

17. Some written arrangements are signed by the parties who conclude them; others are not. Although the signature reflects the agreement reached between the parties, in practice many agreements in writing are rendered effective by court approval constituting a court order. Some agreements address the issue of signature of counterpart copies, each of which should be deemed an original and equally

²³ See, for example, the debtor's motion for approval of an insolvency agreement, paras. 11-20 (available from www.lehman-docket.com); see also *Lehman Brothers*, para. 13.1.

²⁴ See, for example, *SENDO*, p. 2, and *EMTEC*, p. 2 (recital 4).

²⁵ The agreement in *Smurfit-Stone* explicitly states, in para. 4, that the debtors had drafted the agreement.

²⁶ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, p. 2 (recitals), and *Nakash*, p. 3 (recitals).

authentic, and the manner in which it can be signed, including by facsimile signature, which may be deemed to constitute an original.²⁷ Identification of the parties required to sign an agreement or be bound by it will be determined by the effect of the agreement, both substantively and procedurally. For that reason, and because of the practical considerations associated with negotiating an agreement between potentially large numbers of parties, creditors generally are not parties to an agreement, although there are examples involving a major creditor²⁸ or the creditor committee. As they are often unfamiliar with the insolvency law of other States, creditors can affect the success of global reorganization, and close cooperation with the creditor committee and creditors in general, as exemplified in the *Singer* case,²⁹ will be desirable.

18. Creditor support for an insolvency agreement is often achieved through provisions for notice and an opportunity for comment or objection with respect to the agreement. An agreement could provide that additional parties may join over time, but it is desirable that it not be varied by the addition of those parties and that they do not seek to vary what has previously been agreed. An agreement might also provide that parties could adhere to its terms and cooperate within the framework provided without necessarily becoming a party. Such an approach could accommodate parties that, under applicable law, may not be able to formally sign an agreement.³⁰

5. Capacity to enter into a cross-border insolvency agreement

19. For an insolvency agreement to be effective, the parties negotiating it should have the requisite authority or capacity to do so and to commit to what they agree. That capacity will depend on what those parties are permitted to do under applicable law, which may differ from State to State. In some States, for example, the insolvency representative's authority to negotiate and enter into an agreement will fall within its powers under the insolvency law; in other States, the insolvency representative may require the consent of creditors or authorization by the court.³¹

20. Where parties desire court approval of an agreement, certain jurisdictions may require the court to find appropriate statutory authorization for that approval, as it may not be covered by the court's "general equitable or inherent powers". Some commentators are sceptical of the feasibility of such agreements being approved by some courts because of the lack, in the absence of enactment of the UNCITRAL Model Law, of available judicial discretion. Other commentators express the view that certain types of agreements, such as those dealing only with administrative issues, could be entered into by insolvency representatives or even the courts themselves. The rationale is that these agreements would fall within the insolvency representative's statutory competence, being part of their legal responsibility to

²⁷ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 33, and *Federal-Mogul*, para. 12.3.

²⁸ See, for example, *Financial Asset Management*.

²⁹ *In re The Singer Company N.V.*, No. 99-10578 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y., filed 13 September 1999).

³⁰ See footnote 23.

³¹ See, for example, the decision authorizing the insolvency representatives in *Akai* to enter into and implement an insolvency agreement and the *ISA-Daisytek* agreement, which specifies that according to German law, the effectiveness of the agreement is subject to approval by the creditors (see para. 10.1). In the *Swissair* case (see para. 11.3), the insolvency agreement was to be confirmed by the English courts, but not by the Swiss courts.

protect and maximize the value of the estate, provided these responsibilities do not constitute any personal, legal obligations. Some commentators take the view that the insolvency representative's responsibility to the insolvency estate could constitute a duty to enter into such an agreement.

21. It has also been suggested that some judges could enter into an insolvency agreement with a foreign court on the basis of their statutory obligation to prevent actions detrimental to the estate. As noted above with respect to insolvency representatives, one issue to take into consideration is that judges must act on the basis of legal authority and acting outside that authority could make them personally liable. Although such a finding might be unlikely when the purpose of the agreement was to enhance the value of the estate within the terms of the applicable law, the existence of such requirements might help to explain a reluctance to formally approve insolvency agreements in some jurisdictions. Another reason may be a lack of familiarity with those agreements.

22. Practice has shown that insolvency agreements are possible between civil and common law jurisdictions. In the *Nakash* case, for example, the Israeli court found the requisite statutory authorization for such an agreement. In the *AIOC* case, an agreement was reached between the United States and the Swiss insolvency representatives, with the explicit endorsement of the responsible Swiss insolvency authority. The agreements in the *ISA-Daisytek*, *SENDO* and *Swissair* proceedings are further examples of agreements between civil and common law jurisdictions, involving respectively France, Germany and Switzerland, on one side, and the United Kingdom, on the other. There have also been agreements involving only civil law jurisdiction, for example in the *EMTEC* proceedings, involving France and Germany.

23. One factor key to the use of such agreements between civil and common law jurisdictions is the willingness of the courts and insolvency representatives to work to overcome potential jurisdictional obstacles. In the *Nakash* proceedings, for example, the United States court appointed an examiner to develop an insolvency agreement for harmonizing and coordinating the proceedings concerning the debtor before the courts of the United States and Israel.³² Afterwards, the Israeli court expressed the view that "it might be desirable to reach an agreement between the interested parties and the Courts in the United States and the State of Israel".³³ Many of the impediments that appeared to result from the differences between the insolvency laws of the forums involved were resolved by focusing on the goal common to both laws, that of maximizing value for the parties. Nevertheless, insolvency agreements occur in practice more frequently between common law jurisdictions, where courts have wider discretion than in jurisdictions in which statutory authorization to enter into such arrangements, such as provided by enactment of the UNCITRAL Model Law, is needed. However, commentators of

³² See *Nakash*, p. 3.

³³ *Ibid.* See further the case of *SunResorts Ltd.*, involving a United States and a Netherlands Antilles court, in which the latter court reacted positively to concerns expressed by the United States court and tightened custodial control to an unusual degree under Netherlands Antilles law. See *Petition of Husang and DePaus, trustees of SunResorts, Ltd. N.V.*, Case No. 97-42811 (BRL) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 1999) and *SunResorts Ltd. N.V.*, Court of First Instance, Netherlands Antilles, Seat St. Maarten, 1997. This positive reaction has been associated with the Netherlands Antilles court's knowledge of the UNCITRAL Model Law and the Concordat.

civil law countries are generally of the view that insolvency agreements will become more common in the future due to their successful use in cross-border insolvency proceedings.

6. Format

24. As noted above (see para. 4), there is no prescribed format for insolvency agreements. Both oral and written agreements have been used in practice, although oral agreements appear not to be the prevailing practice. This might be due to the fact that some laws include writing requirements for validity and enforceability, or because written agreements are more easily proved and enforced. Oral agreements may limit the parties to proceeding on a step-by-step basis, whereas the use of a written agreement will enable the development of a more detailed, general framework. Oral agreements generally rely for their observance and implementation on the trust and confidence of the parties and it may be difficult to bind parties to an oral agreement made in a cross-border context. The enforceability of written agreements depends on their legal nature. When approved by the courts, they would generally constitute an order of the court and be enforceable as such. If they are not approved by the courts, they have been considered to be contracts between the parties and should be enforceable as such.

25. A given case may be subject to a single insolvency agreement or a series of insolvency agreements addressing different issues that arise, as noted above, as the case progresses. In the *Maxwell* case, for example, an operating agreement was agreed at the start of the case to address issues of stabilization and asset preservation, with a second agreement negotiated at the end to address distribution to creditors and closure of the proceedings. Where an agreement is concluded by multiple parties, they may also be permitted to conclude additional agreements on a limited bilateral basis to address particular issues, with the proviso that all parties should be kept informed of any such additional agreements.³⁴

26. Reaching consensus on the content of an insolvency agreement may be the most important step in facilitating cooperation and coordination, as the process of negotiation often helps to manage the parties' expectations and facilitate the successful conclusion of the insolvency proceedings. Once negotiated, an agreement might simply form the backdrop for administration of the case and not be referred to again. It may also be possible to resolve matters in the agreement in such a way that the courts have minimal ongoing involvement, with the judges not required to communicate with each other on a continuing basis as the case progresses.³⁵

7. Common provisions

27. Cross-border insolvency agreements may include only general principles on how cooperation and coordination should be handled, or they may also address specific issues such as deferral, claims resolution procedures and procedures for communication between the courts, depending upon the needs of the particular case and the issues to be resolved. The issues discussed below in section B are illustrative of the issues that can be addressed in an agreement. Given the case-

³⁴ See *Lehman Brothers*, paras. 1.3 and 1.5.

³⁵ See, for example, *Maxwell*.

specific nature of many agreements, the issues discussed below do not necessarily all need to be addressed in every case.

28. A survey of the agreements entered into to date indicates that the issues typically addressed include some or all of the following:

- (a) Allocation of responsibility for various aspects of the conduct and administration of proceedings between the different courts involved and between insolvency representatives, including limitations on authority to act without the approval of the other courts or insolvency representatives;
- (b) Availability and coordination of relief;
- (c) Coordination of the recovery of assets for the benefit of creditors generally;
- (d) Submission and treatment of claims;
- (e) Use and disposal of assets;
- (f) Methods of communication, including language, frequency and means;
- (g) Provision of notice;
- (h) Coordination and harmonization of reorganization plans;
- (i) Issues related specifically to the agreement, including amendment and termination, interpretation, effectiveness and dispute resolution;
- (j) Administration of proceedings, in particular with respect to stays of proceedings or agreement between the parties not to take certain legal actions;
- (k) Choice of applicable law;
- (l) Allocation of responsibilities between the parties to the agreement;
- (m) Costs and fees;
- (n) Rights of appearance before the courts involved;
- (o) Safeguards.

29. Agreements may also address issues such as the composition of the board of directors; the actions the board may take and the procedures to be followed; shareholder/management and shareholder/board relations; and management of information flows.³⁶

30. The choice of issues to be addressed by an insolvency agreement may be influenced by the similarities or dissimilarities between the laws and procedures of the States involved in the particular cross-border case. Where the courts involved share the same legal tradition for example, the agreement may focus on providing more specific detail about substantive issues. Where legal traditions are different, the agreement may focus more on process and procedure, providing a framework for communication and cooperation. An agreement may require the laws of the relevant States to be analysed in order to determine whether and how a specific result can be achieved without causing insolvency representatives or other parties to breach their

³⁶ See, for example, *Olympia & York*.

duties under those laws. The issues to be addressed may also require allocation of responsibility for their resolution between different courts, depending upon which substantive law should apply to a particular issue. Such a determination of substantive law might depend upon which State has the greatest interest in the outcome of a particular issue and may involve one court deferring to the jurisdiction of another, provided such deference does not deprive local creditors of due process or other fundamental rights (see chap. II, paras. 18-20, and chap. III, paras. 75-78), or a particular action being pursued in one court as opposed to another. Agreements approved by the courts typically include provisions emphasizing the independence of the courts and the principle of comity and detailing the allocation of responsibilities between courts, in particular the right of parties in interest to appear and be heard in the respective proceedings.

8. Legal effect

31. Insolvency agreements may be intended to have binding effect on the parties³⁷ or may only establish a framework for cooperation that is not intended to be enforceable or to impose obligations on the parties.³⁸ They may also include a variety of different types of provisions, some of which may be intended to have legal effect and bind the parties and some of which may be simply statements of good faith or intent. Statements of good faith or intent, for example, may include provisions on the aim of the agreement, while provisions generally intended to have legal effect may include those on the responsibilities of the insolvency representatives, on costs or on the procedure required to render the insolvency agreement effective (e.g. through court approval).

32. To be effective, an insolvency agreement requires the consent of the parties to be covered by it. Some agreements include an express stipulation that it is binding on the parties to the agreement and their respective successors, assigns, representatives, heirs, executors and insolvency representatives.³⁹ Some agreements also expressly authorize the parties to take such actions and execute such documents as may be necessary and appropriate for them to be rendered effective and implemented or include a statement to the effect that the parties have agreed to take the appropriate actions to render them effective. In some jurisdictions, it may be sufficient for the insolvency representatives to enter into an agreement pursuant to their inherent powers, without the need for subsequent court approval. It should be noted that court approval for such an arrangement may not always exist under applicable law. Some jurisdictions, in particular civil law jurisdictions, might require the approval of the creditors for the agreement to be effective. The agreement in the *ISA-Daisytek* proceedings, for example, provided that its effectiveness was subject to the approval of the creditors pursuant to German law. The agreement further stipulated that the German insolvency representative would report the terms of the agreement to the responsible German court after the creditors' approval.

³⁷ See, for example, the *Madoff* cross-border agreement, para. 12.1.

³⁸ See, for example, *Lehman Brothers*, para. 1.2. Paragraph 1.1 states that the agreement is a statement of intentions and guidelines designed to minimize costs and maximize recoveries for all creditors.

³⁹ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 16, and *Financial Asset Management*, para. 28.

33. The agreement may require approval by each of the courts involved in the insolvency proceedings in accordance with the local law and practice of each State concerned. It is not uncommon for an agreement to include a provision that it should not have binding or enforceable legal effect until approved by the specified courts, with notice being given in proper form to the parties involved so as to minimize the likelihood of challenges. Once approved, an agreement would generally have the effect of a court order and bind the parties specified. One of the advantages of court approval is that it removes the possibility for dissenting creditors or parties to litigate matters in a way that might otherwise undermine the agreement.

9. Safeguards

34. The safeguards to be included in an insolvency agreement may be divided into those that should always be included and others that may be included as required.

35. Provisions that should be included might relate to ensuring that there is no derogation from court authority and public policy.

36. Provisions that may be included concern disclosure to interested parties, protection of rights of non-signatory third parties and the ability to revert to the court in cases of dispute. The parties entering into an agreement want to be able to rely on the capacity of their counterparts to enter into such an agreement, without undertaking costly and lengthy research of the applicable law in the other forum. Consequently, an agreement may include, as a safeguard, a provision warranting that the parties agreeing to it have the relevant capacity or, in cases where the insolvency representative needs court authorization to enter into the agreement, acknowledging this as a precondition for that representative's obligations under the agreement.⁴⁰ Similarly, agreements often explicitly provide that certain actions or divisions of power are permitted or limited to the extent provided by applicable law or that specified parties should respect and comply with the duties imposed upon them by applicable national laws.

10. Possible problems and means of resolution

37. Insolvency proceedings are ongoing proceedings and unforeseen events may occur, changing the course of the case. Accordingly, an insolvency agreement needs to be flexible, allowing revision to accommodate changing circumstances as a case progresses. In addition to revising existing agreements, parties may recognize the need for additional agreements to cover unforeseen issues that arise as the case progresses.

38. Conflicts may arise in the course of implementing the agreement. These can be manifold, relating to the terms of the agreements and their interpretation, the realization of its provisions and so forth. It is therefore important that the agreement include appropriate procedures for the resolution of disputes, preservation of what had been achieved at the time the conflict arose and prevention of further detriment. Those provisions may include specification of the courts competent to resolve certain issues or the use of other dispute resolution mechanisms.

⁴⁰ See, for example, *Financial Asset Management*, para. 24.

B. Comparison of cross-border insolvency agreements

39. The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the content and structure of a number of agreements used in recent cross-border insolvency cases. It identifies issues included in different agreements and discusses how they were treated. As noted above (see paras. 4 and 24-26), because of the case-specific nature of these agreements, there is no standard or single format for insolvency agreements that could be presented here as a template. Nevertheless, although some of the issues discussed below are included in only a few agreements, others are common to most of the agreements considered. The comparison of the contents of various agreements is intended to enhance the understanding of the use of these tools for cross-border cooperation, communication and coordination and to guide future drafters in designing agreements in specific cases, so that the negotiating time to develop an agreement might be considerably shortened. The foundation of the comparison is largely written agreements as they are the most widely and readily available, but where possible reference is also made to other forms of agreement.

1. Recitals

40. Recitals generally introduce the operative part of an agreement, giving details of the events leading up to the negotiation of the agreement, the reasons for the agreement, identifying the parties and so forth. While recitals differ from agreement to agreement, they typically address some or all of the following issues.

(a) Parties

41. Most agreements introduce the parties to the proceedings with varying levels of detail, including, for example, the name and nature of their business, the place of incorporation, the place of business and, where relevant, their position in relation to other members of an enterprise group.⁴¹ Some agreements do not refer to the parties to the agreement as such, but specify that the agreement should govern the conduct of all parties in interest in the insolvency proceeding, naming the debtor, the insolvency representatives and the creditor committee.⁴²

42. The issues covered by an insolvency agreement and the parties to the proceedings that will, accordingly, need to be bound by it will determine who should enter into the agreement. As a general rule, it can be said that the parties to the agreement are those whose obligations are concerned and whose consent is needed. Some agreements indicate the agreement of the insolvency representatives,⁴³ while others involve a wider range of parties in interest, including the creditor committee,⁴⁴ a secured lender of the debtor⁴⁵ and the debtor itself.⁴⁶ As noted above (see paras. 15-17), individual creditors typically are not parties to these

⁴¹ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, pp. 1-2, and *Quebecor*, paras. 1-4.

⁴² See, for example, *Laidlaw*, p. 1, and *Matlack*, p. 1.

⁴³ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. 1; *Inverworld*, p. 1; *Maxwell*, p. 1; and *Swissair*, p. 1. Where this occurs, the objection of the debtor to the insolvency agreement may not be a barrier; see, for example, the case of *Nakash*.

⁴⁴ See, for example, *Commodore*, p. 1.

⁴⁵ See, for example, *Everfresh*, pp. 3-4.

⁴⁶ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, p. 1.

agreements, although there are examples that involve a major creditor, such as the principal lender.

43. The case specificity of agreements can be seen from the *Commodore* agreement. In that case, the creditor committee applied for commencement of insolvency proceedings in the United States, in response to which the Bahamian insolvency representatives requested the court to abstain from hearing the case and to order relief ancillary to the foreign proceedings. Subsequently, the Bahamian insolvency representatives and the creditor committee entered into an agreement to resolve the contemplated litigation and establish a framework for the efficient and effective administration of the insolvency proceedings in the two jurisdictions.⁴⁷ While involvement of the creditor committee may strengthen the legitimacy of those agreements in which the creditor committee or creditors are directly involved, it will not be required in every case.

(b) Background/insolvency history

44. An introduction to the case, setting out the insolvency history of the case, might enhance the clarity and comprehensibility of the agreement. In many agreements, the introduction of the parties is followed by a summary of the different insolvency proceedings concerning the parties, either already commenced or imminent. Again, varying degrees of detail are included, some agreements specifying the dates and places of filing, court orders made, including on the recognition of other proceedings under the national law enacting the UNCITRAL Model Law,⁴⁸ and so forth.

45. In the context of multinational enterprises, there might be two different situations in which insolvency proceedings take place in different States: in one, the debtor is the same in both proceedings; in the other, the proceedings concern different members of the same enterprise group. In the latter situation, the debtors are separate and distinct in each proceeding. However, the cooperation between these proceedings might nevertheless be important because of the linkages between the group members, even though they are legally separate and distinct entities.⁴⁹ In particular, in reorganization cases, value might be enhanced through such cooperation. The agreement might explain these different situations and, in some cases, set out the specific need for the agreement.⁵⁰

(c) Scope

46. Insolvency agreements typically address the question of scope, although different approaches are taken. Some agreements commence with a general statement to the effect that the agreement should govern the conduct of all parties in interest in the insolvency proceedings. Others describe the scope more specifically. For example, the scope may be to establish a general framework of agreed

⁴⁷ See *Commodore*, pp. 1-3.

⁴⁸ See *Madoff* cross-border agreement, part A.

⁴⁹ An example is provided by the *Lehman Brothers* case; the background section at the beginning of the insolvency agreement explains the global nature of Lehman's business and the consequent need for the agreement.

⁵⁰ See *Madoff* cross-border agreement, part C, which refers to the nature of the businesses and the impact of the fraud committed by Mr. Madoff.

principles to address a range of different issues that may include the recovery and disposal or other realization of the debtor's assets, including sale to a specific person;⁵¹ the admission, verification and classification of claims, including priority; coordination of preparation, approval, confirmation and implementation of a reorganization plan or other similar arrangement; a litigation strategy with respect to any matter that could not be resolved through good faith efforts in the first instance; distribution of the proceeds; and general administrative matters. The scope provisions may also be directed to facilitating coordination by, for example, establishing coordinated procedures for addressing the matters listed above. The scope of an agreement often overlaps with its intent or purpose; by indicating what the agreement intends to regulate, it also defines its scope.

(d) Purpose

47. A provision on the parties' intent in drafting an agreement and, in particular, the objectives to be achieved can reflect the common understanding of the parties with respect to the agreement and provide reassurance as to that understanding to a court from which approval might be sought. It may also assist a court if questions of the interpretation of the agreement arise.

48. Many agreements share several general goals and objectives, which may include:⁵²

(a) Harmonization and coordination of activities before the courts in which the different insolvency proceedings are pending;

(b) Promotion of fair, transparent, orderly and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings for the benefit of all the debtors, their creditors and other interested parties, wherever located, to reduce cost and avoid duplication of effort;

(c) Protection of the rights and interests of all parties;

(d) Promotion of international cooperation and respect for judicial independence and comity;

(e) Implementation of a framework of general principles to address basic administrative issues arising out of the cross-border and international nature of the insolvency proceedings.

49. Other examples of goals include:

(a) Facilitating reorganization of the debtor's business as a global enterprise;

(b) Protecting the integrity of the process of administration;

(c) Consulting with and providing information to creditors concerning developments;

(d) Ensuring that appropriate matters are brought before the relevant courts and that those actions take place in a timely and efficient manner;

(e) Coordinating the activities between and among insolvency representatives, in order to minimize costs and avoid duplication of effort;

⁵¹ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, p. 2.

⁵² The CoCo Guidelines contain similar objectives and aims (Guidelines 1 and 2).

(f) Recording various mutual agreements, including with regard to coordination of relief, to respect the obligations imposed by the laws of the respective countries or to act in conformity with certain principles, such as mutual trust, adherence to the duty to communicate information and to cooperate;⁵³

(g) Preserving assets and ensuring fair distribution.

50. Some agreements also clarify what the agreement is not intended to achieve, i.e. to create a binding precedent or to establish an agreement that could be considered appropriate for all of the proceedings involved in a particular case, although acknowledging that it might be regarded as indicative of good practice.⁵⁴ Such a provision is responsive to the mistrust of parties with respect to the scope and admissibility of such agreements under national law and might, thus, facilitate parties reaching agreement.

(e) Language of the agreement and of communication

51. Since cross-border insolvency proceedings often involve States that do not share a common language, a provision on the language or languages to be used in the agreement and for communication between the parties could be included. Many of the agreements analysed in the *Practice Guide* were drafted in English or exist in two different language versions (e.g. English and French), without making any specific choice of language as such.⁵⁵ Where documents are to be filed in multiple proceedings in States that do not share a common language, translation may be required.⁵⁶

Sample clauses

Parties

This agreement is made and entered into between:

(1) The insolvency representative of State A [name and address], in its capacity as insolvency representative in the insolvency proceeding of the debtor in State A, appointed by decision of the court of State A dated [...], (the “State A Insolvency Representative”),⁵⁷

on the one hand

⁵³ These principles are also reflected in article 31 of the EC Regulation, which establishes the duty of the insolvency representative of the main and the non-main proceeding to cooperate and communicate information.

⁵⁴ See, for example, *SENDO*, p. 2.

⁵⁵ See, for example, *SENDO* and *Pioneer*; the CoCo Guidelines also address the question of language (Guidelines 10.1 and 10.2).

⁵⁶ See, for example, article 15.4 of the UNCITRAL Model Law.

⁵⁷ The parties may wish to further specify, if applicable by virtue of adoption of the UNCITRAL Model Law or the EC Regulation, which is the main and which is the non-main proceeding and who is the “Main Insolvency Representative” and the “Non-main Insolvency Representative”.

AND

(2) The insolvency representative of State B [name and address], in its capacity as insolvency representative in the insolvency proceeding of the debtor in State B, appointed by decision of the court of State B dated [...] (the “State B Insolvency Representative”),

on the other hand

Referred to as the “Insolvency Representatives”.

Background/insolvency history

Variant A

(1) X, a company [incorporated/with registered offices] in State A, is the ultimate parent company of an enterprise group that operates, through its various subsidiaries and affiliates, in States A, B, C and D.

(2) X and certain of its direct and indirect subsidiaries and affiliates in State A have each commenced insolvency proceedings by applying to the State A court under the insolvency law of State A and those cases are being procedurally coordinated.⁵⁸ The State A debtors are continuing in possession of their respective properties and are operating and managing their businesses, pursuant to the insolvency law of State A. A committee of unsecured creditors (the “creditor committee”) has been appointed in the State A proceedings.

(3) Y (an indirect subsidiary of X in State B) and certain of its direct and indirect subsidiaries and affiliates in State B have commenced insolvency proceedings by applying to the State B court under the insolvency law of State B. Orders have been granted under which (a) State B debtors are entitled to relief under the insolvency law of State B, and (b) Z was appointed as insolvency representative of the State B debtors, with the rights, powers, duties and limitations upon liabilities set forth in the insolvency law of State B and in the order of the State B court.

(4) The proceedings in States A and B are separate and distinct. Neither the State A debtors nor the State B debtors have sought recognition of their proceedings in the other jurisdiction. Neither the State A debtors nor the State B debtors are debtors in the other proceedings, although they have appeared before and submitted claims as creditors in the other proceedings.

Variant B

(1) X, a State A corporation, is the parent company of a business in State B that operates, through various State A and State B subsidiaries and affiliates, in States A and B. X and certain of its subsidiaries and affiliates (collectively, the “X companies”) are the largest independent provider of N services in the region, with approximately 90 per cent of the X companies’ revenue being generated in State A.

⁵⁸ “Procedural coordination” is the coordination of the administration of two or more insolvency proceedings in respect of enterprise group members. Each of those members, including its assets and liabilities, remains separate and distinct.

(2) The X companies develop, integrate and support systems for N services. The X companies provide N services to their clients using new software from leading computer manufacturers.

(3) The X companies have commenced insolvency proceedings under the insolvency law of State A in the State A court. The X companies continue to be in possession of their respective properties and to operate and manage their businesses, pursuant to the insolvency law of State A. A committee of unsecured creditors has not been appointed, but is expected to be appointed in the State A proceedings (the “creditor committee”).

(4) Certain of the X companies, including the parent company, X, have assets and carry on business in State B. X and five of its State B subsidiaries and affiliates (collectively, “the applicants”) have commenced proceedings under the insolvency law of State B in the State B court. Upon request of the applicants, the State B court ordered (a) that the State A proceedings are “foreign proceedings” for the purposes of the insolvency law of State B; and (b) a stay of actions against the applicants and their assets.

(5) The applicants are parties to the proceedings in States A and B.

Scope, purpose and goals

Variant A

While concurrent, parallel proceedings are pending in States A and B for the debtor, the implementation of basic administrative procedures is necessary to coordinate certain activities in the two proceedings, protect the rights of the parties and ensure the maintenance of the courts’ independent jurisdiction. A framework of general principles should be agreed upon to address:

- (a) Sale of the debtor’s assets;
- (b) The admissibility and priority of claims against the debtor;
- (c) Harmonization of the submission, approval and implementation of a reorganization plan under the insolvency laws of States A and B;
- (d) General administrative matters.

Variant B

The insolvency representatives of the debtor in States A and B have mutually decided to execute this agreement, with the purpose of establishing practical terms for the distribution of the assets among the company’s creditors. The objective of this agreement is to organize the cooperation between the insolvency representatives. It is intended in particular to organize the exchange of information between the insolvency representatives regarding the verification of claims and the distribution of assets.

Variant C

While the insolvency proceedings are pending in States A and B and elsewhere for the debtor, the implementation of basic administrative procedures is necessary to coordinate certain activities in the insolvency proceedings, protect the rights of parties and ensure maintenance of the court's independent jurisdiction and comity. Accordingly, this agreement has been developed to promote the following mutually desirable goals and objectives in the proceedings in States A and B and, to the extent necessary, in other proceedings:

- (a) To harmonize and coordinate activities in the insolvency proceedings;
- (b) To promote the orderly and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings to, among other things, maximize efficiency, reduce associated costs and avoid duplication of effort;
- (c) To maintain the independence and integrity of the courts of State A, State B and other States;
- (d) To promote international cooperation and respect for comity among the courts, the debtor, the creditor committee, the insolvency representatives and parties in interest in the insolvency proceedings;
- (e) To facilitate the fair, open and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings for the benefit of all of the creditors of the debtor and other parties in interest, wherever located;
- (f) To implement a framework of general principles to address basic administrative issues arising out of the cross-border and international nature of the insolvency proceedings.

Language

This agreement has been concluded in [...] and [...] (both texts are equally authentic). The language of communication between the parties shall be [...].

2. Terminology and rules of interpretation

(a) Terminology

52. Insolvency laws rely on terminology and concepts that may have fundamentally different meanings in different States. Even where parties speak the same language, a term may be interpreted differently in different legal systems. To ensure a common understanding, many agreements define certain terms used, although methods of definition vary. Some insolvency agreements include a comprehensive definition section,⁵⁹ while others adopt an ad hoc approach to terminology, providing short explanations throughout the text as required.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. 1.1, and *Swissair*, para. 1.

⁶⁰ See, for example, *Commodore* and *Everfresh*. The Concordat contains a glossary of terms that includes the following: administrative rules, common claim, composition, discharge, distribution, insolvency proceeding/insolvency forum, international law, limited proceeding, liquidation, main forum/proceeding, non-local creditors, official representative, plenary

53. Terms often explained include the following: applicable national law, competent national courts, insolvency professionals, insolvency representatives, involuntary proceedings, stays of proceedings, types of proceedings, the debtor and the parties.

(b) Rules of interpretation

54. General rules of interpretation are also often included to the effect, for example, that words importing the singular should be deemed to include the plural and vice versa; that headings are inserted for convenience only without any further meaning; that references to any party should, where relevant, be deemed to include, as appropriate, their respective successors or assigns; and that any use of the masculine gender should be deemed to include the feminine or neuter gender.⁶¹

55. Some insolvency agreements refer explicitly to the principles elaborated in the Concordat⁶² or to the Court-to-Court Guidelines,⁶³ incorporating them into the agreement to govern appropriate issues.

Sample clauses

Terminology

In this agreement, unless the context requires otherwise, the following expressions have the following meanings: [...]

Rules of interpretation

(a) Whenever the context requires, words importing the singular shall be deemed to include the plural and vice versa. Any use of the masculine gender shall be deemed to include the feminine or neuter gender;

(b) The index to and clause headings of this agreement are for convenience only and do not affect the construction of this agreement;

(c) References to clauses, paragraphs and recitals are to be construed as references to clauses, paragraphs and recitals of this agreement unless otherwise stated;

(d) References to any party shall, where relevant, be deemed to refer to or include, as appropriate, their respective successors or assigns;

(e) Except as otherwise expressly provided, references to this agreement or any other document include references to this agreement, its recitals and schedules or such other documents as may be varied, supplemented and/or replaced in any manner from time to time;

(f) In respect of any computation of periods of time from a specified date to a later specified date, the word “from” means “from and including” and each of the words “to” and “until” means “to but excluding”.

forum/proceeding, privileged claim, ranking rules, secured claim, voiding rules. The CoCo Guidelines include a definition of an insolvency representative (Guideline 4).

⁶¹ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. 1.8.

⁶² See, for example, *AIOC*, paras. II C and F, and *Everfresh*, p. 3.

⁶³ See, for example, *Systech*, para. 12 (c).

3. Courts⁶⁴

56. Judicial cooperation is increasingly viewed as essential to the efficient and effective conduct of cross-border insolvency cases, increasing the predictability of the process, because debtors and creditors do not have to anticipate judicial reactions to foreign proceedings, and enhancing the equitable treatment of all parties. Insolvency agreements have adopted a variety of approaches to facilitating coordination and cooperation between the courts of the different States to ensure that the proceedings are efficiently administered and disputes avoided.

(a) Comity and independence of courts

57. “Comity” in the legal sense is neither a matter of absolute obligation, on the one hand, nor of mere courtesy and good will, on the other, but is the recognition that one State accords within its territory to the legislative, executive or judicial acts of another State, having due regard both to international duty and convenience and to the rights of its own citizens or of other persons who are under the protection of its law.⁶⁵ Many insolvency agreements emphasize the importance of comity and the independence of the courts, specifying that this independence is not to be negatively affected or diminished by the approval and implementation of the agreement. They also emphasize that each court is entitled to exercise its independent jurisdiction and authority at all times with respect to matters presented to it and the conduct of the parties appearing before it.⁶⁶ The purpose of including such a provision is to provide an assurance that each party to the agreement is acting in accordance with (and therefore within the limits of) applicable law.

58. Agreements often address specifically what, in accordance with comity, the agreement should not be construed as doing, including:

- (a) Altering the independence, sovereignty or jurisdiction of the courts;
- (b) Requiring the debtors, the creditor committee or the insolvency representatives to breach any duties imposed on them by the national law under which they are constituted or appointed;
- (c) Authorizing any action that requires specific approval of one or both courts;

⁶⁴ See the glossary (see Introduction, sect. B) with respect to the explanation of “court” and the types of authority that might be involved in cooperation. Reference is made to judicial cooperation, but consistent with the use of the word “court”, it is intended to include cooperation between other authorities authorized to act.

⁶⁵ *Hilton v. Guyot*, 159 U.S. 113 (1895), a United States court decision dealing with the recognition of a French judgement and providing an early definition of comity. In some common law jurisdictions, the term “comity” has been interpreted as providing the basis for some courts to deny cooperation, on grounds that the foreign insolvency law is not sufficiently “like” the home country’s laws. See paragraph (a) of the preamble to the UNCITRAL Model Law, which states as an objective of the Model Law “cooperation between the courts and other competent authorities of this State and foreign States involved in cases of cross-border insolvency; see also article 7 of the Model Law, which allows a State to maintain provisions on assistance that are additional to those in the Model Law.

⁶⁶ See, for example, *Laidlaw*, para. 12.

(d) Precluding any creditor or other interested party from asserting its substantive rights under the applicable laws.⁶⁷

(b) Allocation of responsibilities between courts

59. Where insolvency proceedings with respect to the same debtor are commenced in a number of different jurisdictions, there will often be questions concerning the issues to be addressed by the different courts. In some cases, a single court will have the responsibility for determining or resolving certain matters. In other cases, it will not be so clear and several courts may be equally responsible or they may share responsibility or be jointly responsible for making certain determinations.⁶⁸ Notwithstanding the independence and sovereignty of each court, insolvency agreements often “allocate” responsibility for different matters between the competent courts to ensure efficient coordination of the proceedings and avoid overlap, disputes and duplication of effort. This may be achieved by the courts approving the agreement, or informally by the parties agreeing to pursue certain matters in certain courts. Responsibility may be allocated broadly, such as for use and disposal of the debtor’s assets in general, or more specifically, such as for the verification and admission of claims or approval of particular transactions with regard to the use and disposal of certain assets, including the pledging or charging of assets.⁶⁹

60. Even where certain matters are to be addressed by a specific court, the insolvency agreement may request that court, in addressing those matters, to seek and take into account the views of other courts and participants. In one particular case involving both main and non-main proceedings, the agreement requested the court dealing with assets in the context of non-main proceedings to take into account any proposals of the insolvency representatives in the main proceeding.⁷⁰ An agreement may also provide that the determination by only one court of any particular matter is desirable and should be achieved by cooperation between the courts.⁷¹

61. Some further examples illustrate how insolvency agreements may facilitate this coordination and cooperation between courts. In the *Inverworld* case, an agreement approved by the courts led to dismissal of the English insolvency proceeding, with certain conditions being imposed relating to the treatment of claimants in those proceedings and the allocation of functions between the two remaining courts. The United States court was to resolve the outstanding legal and factual issues relating to entitlements as among various classes of investors, while the Cayman Islands court was to oversee the administration of the distribution of

⁶⁷ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 1, and *Pioneer*, para. 8. The CoCo Guidelines include a similar statement (Guideline 3).

⁶⁸ The Concordat recommends that a single administrative forum should have primary responsibility for coordinating all insolvency proceedings relating to one debtor (Principle 1). Where there is one main forum, the Concordat recommends that administration and collection of assets should be coordinated by the main forum (Principle 2A); where there is no main forum, it addresses the responsibilities of each court regarding the decision on value and admissibility of claims (Principle 8) and the administration of assets (Principle 4).

⁶⁹ See, for example, *Maxwell*, para. 4 (a), and *Pioneer*, para. 10.

⁷⁰ See, for example, *SEND0*, p. 8.

⁷¹ See, for example, *Laidlaw*, para. 11 (a).

proceeds to claimants. Each court was to take the other court's actions as binding, thus avoiding parallel litigation. In the *Maxwell* case, an agreement approved by both the English and the United States courts allocated functions between the courts and provided for cooperative administration. Inter alia, the agreement granted power to the English insolvency representative to administer all assets and operations of the debtor group's business, incur expenses and so forth, subject to agreement by its United States counterpart as to specific questions and to approval by the United States court.

62. Some agreements specify the factors determining the competence of each court to act on certain matters. These factors may include: the location of the debtor, its assets or creditors; the application of conflict of laws rules; agreement as to the governing law; or other connecting factors. For example, responsibility for conducting the insolvency proceedings may be exercised by the court of the State in which they are commenced;⁷² responsibility for approving transactions may be allocated to the court of the State in which the assets that are the subject of the transaction are located;⁷³ responsibility for distributing the proceeds of assets and instructing the insolvency representatives regarding treatment of assets may be allocated to the court of the State in which the assets are located;⁷⁴ responsibility for dealing with claims against the debtor may be allocated to the court of the State of which the debtor is a national, in which the claimants reside, are domiciled or carry on business and have offices or in which the claims arise from the supply of goods and/or services to the debtor,⁷⁵ or according to the type of contract and the nationality of the contractual partner.⁷⁶

63. Some agreements provide that the courts should have joint responsibility for certain transactions, such as disposal of the debtor's assets or, more specifically, the sale of the debtor's assets, where those assets are located in both States⁷⁷ or in a third State.⁷⁸ Because of the nature of the business of the debtor and, in particular, the interconnectivity and interdependence of the lines of communications of its global business and Internet operations, one insolvency agreement adopted the approach of identifying those matters to be resolved with the assistance of the different courts. The courts could conduct joint hearings to determine and resolve these issues and were able to jointly determine additional issues that should be included as the insolvency proceedings progressed.⁷⁹ In the event that the courts could not agree, a fallback position was included, stipulating that certain specified matters not resolved by a joint hearing of both courts would be determined and resolved by one court only.

64. As a practical means of resolving issues raised by differences between legal systems, it may be possible for courts to make orders on a reciprocal basis, on the condition that appropriate orders be issued in the other jurisdiction. This approach was taken in the *360Networks* case, in which contractors had been reluctant to

⁷² See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 5.2, and *Financial Asset Management*, para. 9.

⁷³ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 6.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, para. 10.

⁷⁵ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 6.

⁷⁶ See, for example, *Livent*, paras. (v) and 11.

⁷⁷ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 6.

⁷⁸ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 7.

⁷⁹ See, for example, *PSINet*.

renegotiate contracts without a formal decision by the debtor that such contracts would not subsequently be terminated in the United States proceedings, permissible under United States law, thus detrimentally affecting their rights. Such arrangements might require court approval.

(i) *Treatment of claims*

65. Treatment of claims might include the verification, admission and classification of claims and the manner in which they are to be addressed in any reorganization plan. An insolvency agreement may provide that each individual claim should be dealt with by only one of the courts concerned, unless the claims have a substantial connection, under conflict of law rules, to another State, relate to a security or priority claimed pursuant to the laws of another State or it has been specifically agreed that the claim would be governed by the laws of another State.⁸⁰

66. Where a claim is submitted in one proceeding, some agreements provide that the creditor is deemed to have elected to have the verification and admissibility of that claim determined by the court administering that proceeding. If submitted in more than one proceeding, the insolvency agreement may nominate which court should be responsible for the verification and admission of those claims.⁸¹ Courts may also agree to develop rules on how certain aspects of the claims process, such as the proof of claims, will be treated.⁸² The parties to the proceedings may also adopt the approach of deferring those issues for future consideration and development of a claim resolution procedure to address claims generally or to address only certain types of claims (e.g. intercompany claims in an enterprise group context).⁸³

(ii) *Avoidance proceedings*

67. Some insolvency agreements include provisions on the responsibility for investigation and pursuit of assets allegedly belonging to the debtor's estate.⁸⁴ Allocation of responsibility for investigation and commencement of avoidance proceedings may depend upon the relevant provisions of applicable law, including conflict of laws provisions.

(iii) *Insolvency representatives*

68. Insolvency agreements often refer to the powers of each court with respect to the insolvency representative appointed in proceedings before it. Those powers may relate to appointment, conduct and compensation,⁸⁵ and, in some cases, to the insolvency representative appointed to other proceedings. For example, in one case involving the United States and the Netherlands where no written agreement was concluded, retention and compensation of professionals was undertaken in a coordinated manner. Retention and compensation of the Netherlands counsel for both the debtor and the unsecured creditors committee was approved by the United

⁸⁰ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 6.

⁸¹ See, for example, *Pioneer*, para. 10 (c) (iii).

⁸² See, for example, *Philip*, para. 12.

⁸³ See, for example, *Calpine*, para. 19, and *Quebecor*, para. 18.

⁸⁴ See, for example, *Nakash*, paras. 7-12.

⁸⁵ See, for example, *Laidlaw*, paras. 13-18, and *Mosaic*, paras. 13-18.

States court, while the Netherlands insolvency representative was involved in approving the compensation of the United States professionals.⁸⁶

(iv) *Resolution of disputes*

69. In order to ensure continuing cooperation between the proceedings and uphold the framework established by the insolvency agreement, provisions on resolution of disputes arising under the agreement may be included.⁸⁷ Two different kinds of disputes may be addressed. The first refers to disputes with respect to the intent, interpretation, implementation or enforcement of the agreement. Other disputes may relate to potential conflicts in the insolvency proceedings.

70. Agreements adopt different approaches to dispute resolution. One approach may be to require the parties to make all reasonable attempts to reach an agreement before referring the matter to a court. If agreement cannot be reached, the dispute might be referred to the court specified in the agreement as having responsibility for enforcing the terms of the agreement⁸⁸ or for resolving certain disputes, such as those relating to any act or decision of the insolvency representative.⁸⁹ Another approach may be to provide that a dispute relating to a matter arising with respect to the proceedings commenced in one State should be referred to the responsible court of that State or, where the dispute affects all proceedings covered by an agreement, the dispute should be resolved by the court best suited to do so.⁹⁰

71. Responsibility for resolution of disputes may also be shared by the courts and, where appropriate, resolved by way of joint or coordinated hearings. If, notwithstanding such a provision, the dispute were to be raised with only one of the courts, the insolvency agreement may further provide that the court could (a) render a binding decision after consultation with the other court; (b) defer to the other court by transferring the matter, in whole or in part, to the other court; or (c) seek a joint hearing of both courts.⁹¹

72. A further approach may be to appoint a third party to resolve disputes, whether generally or with respect to specific issues. The agreement can particularize the procedure to be followed, such as mediation or arbitration, and address issues such as commencement; opting-out; timetable; choice and appointment of the mediator; compensation; immunity; as well as the confidentiality of the process.⁹² An agreement may also provide for the submission of disputes concerning certain claims (e.g. warranty claims, intercompany claims) to a special tribunal or committee established for that purpose, or for the establishment of an arbitration panel to handle issues that could otherwise involve difficult and uncertain questions of conflict of laws or choice of forum.

⁸⁶ See *United Pan-Europe*.

⁸⁷ See, for example, *Systech*. The CoCo Guidelines advise courts to operate in a cooperative manner to resolve any dispute relating to the intent or application of the terms of any cooperation agreement or protocol (Guideline 16.2).

⁸⁸ See, for example, *ISA-Daisytek*, para. 11.1.

⁸⁹ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. 13.3.

⁹⁰ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 9 (b).

⁹¹ See, for example, *Financial Asset Management*, para. 26, and *Laidlaw*, para. 25.

⁹² See, for example, *Manhatinv*, paras. 16-21.

73. In addition to the details above, some agreements suggest that the courts might provide each other with advice or guidance and specify the procedure to be followed. To enhance transparency, the notice procedures of the agreement would generally apply and the debtor, the creditor committee or the insolvency representatives might make submissions to the appropriate court in response to, or in connection with, written advice or guidance received from the other court.⁹³

74. An insolvency agreement may also indicate the parties that may raise an issue with respect to the agreement, such as the insolvency representatives⁹⁴ or other parties in interest.

(c) Deferral

75. Deferral (see chap. II, paras. 18-20; chap. III, paras. 59-64) consists of one court accepting the limitation of its responsibility with respect to certain issues, including for example the ability to hear certain claims and issue certain orders, in favour of another court. Deferral might also involve one court waiting for another court to make a decision and then, after hearing submissions on the matter, following that decision by making an “independent” but similar decision. Where it is available, deferral may be used to avoid conflicting rulings between the jurisdictions involved. Deferral is a sensitive issue, touching on issues of sovereignty and independence. It can only occur where the courts involved agree and may often occur on a reciprocal basis, where the court in one jurisdiction agrees to defer on certain issues or to enforce the decision of another court involved in response to similar agreement by the other court. A factor often supporting deferral is the recognition by courts that the proceedings would otherwise not be able to move forward and there would be loss of value to the detriment of the creditors. Insolvency agreements making provision for deferral would generally only be effective if they were approved by the respective courts.

76. Deferring to another court might not be possible in all cases, as courts are often obligated to exercise jurisdiction or exclusive control over certain matters. Some legal systems also have procedural rules that limit the court’s ability to defer to another court. Recognizing that limitation, insolvency agreements often contain provisions acknowledging that courts will defer only to the extent that it is consistent with national law. In addition, an insolvency representative may have the discretion not to pursue a given action in its home court, allowing the representative of a related proceeding to pursue the action in the other State.

77. Agreements may address deferral with respect to very specific issues, identifying matters on which one court should defer to the decision of another, for example the resolution of disputes arising under the agreement, stays of proceedings or issues of foreign law.⁹⁵ They may also be general in scope, providing that one court should defer to the judgement of the other where appropriate or feasible.⁹⁶ In the *Inverworld* case noted above (para. 57), a consequence of the agreement reached was that one of the three courts involved deferred to the other courts by dismissing the proceedings before it with certain conditions being imposed relating to the

⁹³ See, for example, *Mosaic*, para. 27.

⁹⁴ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. 11, and *Peregrine*, para. 12.

⁹⁵ See, for example, *Olympia & York*, para. 6 (d).

⁹⁶ See, for example, *Loewen*, para. 11, and *360Network Group*, para. 12.

treatment of claimants and the allocation of functions between the two remaining courts.

78. Examples of deferral provisions are that it is in the interest of the debtors and their stakeholders for one of the courts to take charge of the principal administration of the reorganization;⁹⁷ that appeals against rejection of a claim should be heard by the court of the jurisdiction whose laws governed the claim⁹⁸ and that, if presented to a different court, would be referred to the competent court; and that in certain cases the approval of the court of the forum involved would be deemed to have been granted.⁹⁹

(d) Right to appear and be heard

(i) Who has the right

79. Article 9 of the UNCITRAL Model Law provides that a foreign representative is entitled to direct access to the courts of the recognizing State, thus freeing the insolvency representative from having to meet formal requirements, such as licences or consular action. Those requirements are typically lengthy and complicated, hindering the quick action that is often required in insolvency proceedings, whether domestic or cross-border. In States that have not adopted the Model Law, that right of direct access might be limited by formal requirements or by national law.

80. Agreements that address the issue of direct access do so to varying degrees and with respect to different parties in interest.¹⁰⁰ Some agreements address the issue explicitly, establishing the right to appear and be heard in each State involved in the agreement to the same extent as the counterparts domiciled in those States have those rights. Such access might be granted to the insolvency representatives or to other parties in interest, including the creditors, the debtor, the creditor committee and the post-commencement lenders. Where the question is one of access for creditors, many agreements confer the right to appear regardless of whether the party has submitted a claim in the particular proceedings. Another approach refers to the principles of the Concordat that give each party, creditor and the creditor committee the right, but not the obligation, to appear in proceedings in the different forums.¹⁰¹

81. A different approach notes the agreement of the insolvency representative of one State to their foreign counterparts having standing in the local insolvency proceedings or provides that the insolvency representatives of one State will support a request by the insolvency representative of another State to appear in local proceedings.¹⁰² The effect of agreements between the insolvency representatives on direct access to the court depends on the applicable law and might constitute no more than a statement of good faith or intent or an assurance that one insolvency representative would not oppose the appearance of the other in its forum. An agreement might also address what should be done where a party entitled to appear

⁹⁷ See, for example, *Pioneer*.

⁹⁸ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. 7.7.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, paras. 13.1-2.

¹⁰⁰ The Coco Guidelines recommend direct access for a foreign insolvency representative (Guideline 5).

¹⁰¹ See, for example, the Concordat, Principles 3A and 3C; see also *AIOC*, para. II. F.

¹⁰² See, for example, *Manhatinv*, paras. 22-23, and *Federal-Mogul*, para. 6.

is unable to do so. In one example, the insolvency representative was entitled to communicate its observations in writing to the court and the observations were to be transmitted to all parties in interest or made available in the court's public records.¹⁰³

82. Some agreements also provide details such as where to file a notice of appearance, providing the exact address of the court.¹⁰⁴

(ii) *Submission to jurisdiction*

83. Article 10 of the UNCITRAL Model Law constitutes a "safe conduct" rule aimed at ensuring that the court in a State enacting the Model Law would not assume jurisdiction over all the assets of the debtor or the foreign representative on the sole ground that the foreign representative had made an application for recognition of a foreign proceeding. Where the Model Law has not been enacted, an insolvency representative or other party appearing before the courts of another jurisdiction would be subject to the rules of that jurisdiction on this issue. An insolvency agreement that deals with the right to appear in the various States covered by it could address the question of submission to jurisdiction to the extent permitted by applicable national law in order to avoid potential conflict if the forum State had not enacted the Model Law. An agreement containing such a provision generally would need court approval to be effective.

84. Insolvency agreements differ in the manner in which they address this question. Some provide that an appearance before the court of a State or the making of an application in that State might subject a party in interest to the jurisdiction of that State only for the purpose of those proceedings.¹⁰⁵ Other agreements provide that a party would be subject to the jurisdiction of another State only when they have submitted a claim in proceedings commenced in that other State.¹⁰⁶ If a party has not previously appeared in, or does not wish to appear in, a foreign court, an agreement may provide that the party is entitled to file written evidentiary materials in support of a submission without being deemed to have appeared in the foreign court in which such material is filed, provided that court is not requested to order affirmative relief.

85. Some insolvency agreements provide that the insolvency representatives are exempt from submission to the foreign jurisdiction generally,¹⁰⁷ whereas others provide that the court will have jurisdiction over the insolvency representative but only with respect to the particular matters in which they appear before that court.¹⁰⁸ Such a provision can address the reluctance of an insolvency representative to subject itself to personal jurisdiction of a foreign State. Such reluctance might arise from unfamiliarity with the law of the foreign State or from disparities between the laws of the forum and the foreign State. An insolvency representative will seek to avoid doing anything in a foreign jurisdiction that

¹⁰³ See *Lehman Brothers*, para. 3.3.

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 4.

¹⁰⁵ See, for example, *Loewen*, para. 20, and *Matlack*, para. 16.

¹⁰⁶ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 17.

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, paras. 22-23. This approach is also adopted by the Court-to-Court Guidelines, which provide that the appearance of an insolvency representative in a foreign proceeding would not subject it to the jurisdiction of the foreign court (Guideline 13).

¹⁰⁸ See, for example, *360Networks*, paras. 20 (b), and *Livent*, para. (ii).

might render it in violation of its duties under national law or be in violation of the law of the foreign State because of an inability to take any action in the foreign State that might conflict with those duties.

86. Some agreements extend the immunity from submission to jurisdiction to the creditor committee, providing that an appearance in another forum should not constitute a basis for personal jurisdiction over the individual members of the committee.¹⁰⁹

87. As a safeguard, some agreements provide that no person will be subject to a forum's substantive rules unless, under the forum's conflict of laws rules, that person would be subject to those laws in a lawsuit on the same transaction in a non-insolvency proceeding.¹¹⁰

(e) Future proceedings

88. Insolvency agreements may address the issues likely to arise where additional insolvency proceedings are commenced with respect to the debtor (for example, in additional jurisdictions or, in the case of an enterprise group, with respect to an additional member of the group). An agreement may address the question of its relationship to potential, future insolvency proceedings that are not specifically covered by it, stipulating that if foreign proceedings are initiated, the procedures and policies of the agreement should extend to dealings related to those foreign proceedings. It may also include conditions for that extension, for example that all creditors of the foreign proceedings are treated equally irrespective of their place of domicile. An agreement may also address the situation in which one court later approves an additional agreement with a court of a different jurisdiction, requiring the court involved in only the initial agreement to honour the additional one to the extent permitted by its laws and consistent with the principles of comity and cooperation.¹¹¹

89. A more general provision may extend to any future proceedings the obligations applicable under insolvency law with respect to existing proceedings. One example provides that obligations with respect to sharing of information between proceedings with respect to submitted claims should extend to include sharing that information with any future proceedings.¹¹² The purpose of such a provision is to reinforce the obligation under existing law.

Sample clauses

Comity and independence of courts

(1) The approval and implementation of this agreement shall not diminish the independent jurisdiction of the courts of State A and State B. Approval and implementation of this agreement shall not be deemed to constitute an infringement of the sovereignty of State A or State B.

¹⁰⁹ See, for example, *Pioneer*, para. 16, and *Syntech*, para. 24; see also the Concordat, Principles 3A and 3C.

¹¹⁰ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 7.

¹¹¹ See, for example, *360Networks*, paras. 30-31.

¹¹² See, for example, *SEND0*, p. 4.

(2) In accordance with the principles of comity and independence established in paragraph 1 above, nothing in this agreement shall be construed to:

(a) Increase, decrease or otherwise modify the independence, sovereignty or jurisdiction of the court of State A or State B, including the ability of any such court to provide appropriate relief under applicable law;

(b) Require the court of State A or State B to take any action that is inconsistent with its obligations under the laws of State A or State B;

(c) Require the debtor, the creditor committee or the insolvency representatives to take any action or refrain from taking any action that would result in a breach of any duty imposed on them by any applicable law;

(d) Authorize any action that requires the specific approval of one or both of the courts under the insolvency laws of State A or State B after appropriate notice and a hearing (except to the extent that such action is specifically described in this agreement).

(3) The debtor, the creditor committee, the insolvency representatives and the latter's respective employees, members, agents and professionals shall respect and comply with the duties imposed upon them by the laws of State A and State B and other applicable laws, regulations or orders of courts of competent jurisdiction.

Allocation of responsibilities between courts

The court of State A shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the conduct and hearing of the State A proceeding. The court of State B shall have exclusive jurisdiction over the conduct and hearing of the State B proceeding.

Treatment of claims

To coordinate the [reorganization] [liquidation] of the debtors' business and avoid any unnecessary duplication of effort and expense or inconsistent rulings by the courts, the following principles are applicable in connection with establishing the validity, amount and treatment of any claims against the debtors:

(a) All claims against the State A debtor, including claims arising under guaranties granted by the State A debtor, shall be determined by the State A court in the State A proceeding;

(b) All claims against the State B debtor shall be determined in accordance with the following principles:

(i) Any person submitting a claim against the State B debtor in the State A proceeding shall be deemed to have elected to have the validity, amount and treatment of that claim determined by the State A court;

(ii) Any person submitting a claim against the State B debtor in the State B proceeding shall be deemed to have elected to have the validity, amount and treatment of that claim determined by the State B court;

(iii) Any person submitting a claim against the State B debtor in both proceedings shall be deemed to have elected to have the validity, amount and treatment of that claim determined by the State A court.

Insolvency representatives

(1) The State A insolvency representative and professionals appointed in the State A proceeding shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the State A court with respect to all matters, including:

- (a) Tenure in office;
- (b) Compensation;
- (c) Liability, if any, to any person or entity, including the debtor and any third parties, in connection with the insolvency proceeding;
- (d) The hearing and determination of any matters relating to those matters arising in the State A proceeding.

(2) The State A insolvency representative and appointed professionals shall not be required to seek approval of their retention in the State B court. Additionally, the State A insolvency representative and professionals:

- (a) Shall be compensated for their services solely in accordance with the insolvency law of State A and other applicable State A law or orders of the State A court;
- (b) Shall not be required to seek approval of their compensation in the State B court.

(3) The State B insolvency representative and appointed professionals shall not be required to seek approval of their retention in the State A court. Additionally, the State B insolvency representative and professionals:

- (a) Shall be compensated for their services solely in accordance with the insolvency law of State B and other applicable State B law or orders of the State B court;
- (b) Shall not be required to seek approval of their compensation in the State A court.

Resolution of disputes

Variant A

Disputes relating to the terms, intent or application of this agreement shall be addressed by the parties to either the State A court or the State B court, or to both courts, upon notice in accordance with paragraph [...] of this agreement. Where an issue is addressed to only one court, that court, in rendering a determination in any such dispute:

- (a) May consult with the other court;
- (b) May, at its discretion:
 - (i) Render a binding decision after such consultation;
 - (ii) Defer to the determination of the other court by transferring the matter, in whole or in part, to the other court; or

(iii) Seek a joint hearing of both courts.

In making a determination, each court shall have regard to the independence, comity or inherent jurisdiction of the other court.

Variant B

This agreement is governed exclusively by State A law. Any dispute concerning the validity, interpretation, performance or non-performance of this agreement will be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the State A court.

Variant C

Disputes relating to the terms, intent or application of this agreement may be addressed by parties in interest to the courts of both State A and State B upon notice.

Deferral

To harmonize and coordinate the administration of the insolvency proceedings, the courts of State A and State B each shall use their best efforts to coordinate activities with, and defer to the judgement of, the other court, where appropriate and feasible. If possible, any particular matter should be determined by one court, but in all events in a manner to avoid conflict between the courts.

Right to appear and be heard

(1) The debtor, its creditors and other parties in interest in the insolvency proceedings, including the creditor committee and the insolvency representatives, shall have the right and standing to:

(a) Appear and be heard in insolvency proceedings before either the State A or State B court to the same extent as creditors and other parties in interest domiciled in the forum State, subject to any local rules or regulations generally applicable to all parties appearing in the forum:

(b) File notices of appearance or other applications or documents with the State A or State B court, provided however that any appearance or filing may subject a creditor or a party in interest to the jurisdiction of the court in which the appearance or filing occurs.

(2) Appearance by the creditor committee in the State B proceeding shall not form the basis for personal jurisdiction in State B over the members of the creditor committee. In accordance with the policies set forth in paragraph [...] of this agreement,

(a) The State B court shall have jurisdiction over the State A insolvency representative solely with respect to the particular matters on which the State A insolvency representative appears before the State B court;

(b) The State A court shall have jurisdiction over the State B insolvency representative solely with respect to the particular matters on which the State B insolvency representative appears before the State A court.

Future proceedings

(1) Where a foreign proceeding is initiated, all persons affected by this agreement shall, to the greatest extent possible and provided that all creditors in the foreign proceeding are treated equally irrespective of their place of domicile, implement the procedures contemplated by this agreement in any foreign proceeding and be governed by the purpose and policies of this agreement in dealings related to the foreign proceeding.

(2) If the State A court enters an order approving an agreement with the court of a jurisdiction other than State B, the State B court shall honour that agreement to the extent permitted by the laws of State B and consistent with the principles of comity and cooperation.

(3) If the State B court enters an order approving an agreement with the court of a jurisdiction other than State A, the State A court shall honour that agreement to the extent permitted by the laws of State A and consistent with the principles of comity and cooperation.

4. Administration of the proceedings

90. The manner in which some procedural issues that arise in cross-border insolvency proceedings, including priority of proceedings, stays of proceedings and applicable law, are handled in practice may be a determining factor for the success of those proceedings. For example, if a stay concerning the insolvency proceeding in one State is not upheld and respected in other States in which, for example, the debtor has assets, it can lead to a “race to the courthouse”, damaging the value of the insolvency estate and the creditors’ interests. These issues therefore lend themselves to being considered and addressed in an insolvency agreement.

(a) Priority of proceedings

91. As noted above (see chap. I, para. 10), experience has shown that courts are often reluctant or unable to defer to a foreign court and may therefore prefer to treat proceedings as if they were concurrent or parallel proceedings, irrespective of whether they may be main or non-main proceedings. Such a preference may be based upon applicable law or a desire to protect the interests of domestic creditors. To provide certainty, avoid potential conflict and simplify issues of coordination, an agreement can allocate responsibility for different matters between the courts or determine the priority between different proceedings. For example, the parties may agree which proceeding is to be the primary proceeding and therefore has precedence over the other proceedings.¹¹³

92. Sometimes, the insolvency representatives appointed in one State may request commencement of insolvency proceedings in a foreign State in order to avoid jurisdictional conflicts and any risk of the debtor’s assets being dissipated to the detriment of creditors.¹¹⁴ Since it may not be possible for the insolvency representative requesting commencement of those proceedings to be appointed in

¹¹³ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. 3.1, and *Peregrine*, para. 2.

¹¹⁴ See, for example, *GBFE*, para. E; *Peregrine*, para. H; and *SEND0*, p. 2.

the other State, it may be important for agreement to be reached with the locally appointed insolvency representative in order to facilitate coordination and avoid frustrating the purpose of the proceedings. In the *SENDO* case, for example, the insolvency representatives concluded an agreement for the purpose of defining a practical means of functioning that would allow for the efficient coordination of the two insolvency proceedings, as they recognized that the existing legal framework, i.e. the EC Regulation, established only very general operating principles.¹¹⁵

(b) Stays of proceedings

93. The *Legislative Guide* notes (part two, chap. II, para. 25) that an essential objective of an effective insolvency law is protecting the value of the insolvency estate against diminution by the actions of the various parties to insolvency proceedings and facilitating administration of those proceedings in a fair and orderly manner. A stay or suspension of proceedings is one of the means by which those objectives are achieved. Cross-border insolvencies involving multiple proceedings often raise difficult questions concerning the stay, particularly with respect to implementing or respecting stays issued by foreign courts in foreign proceedings or issuing parallel stays in support of those foreign proceedings. National legislation may impose limitations on recognizing or respecting a stay issued by a foreign court or may not permit the court to grant a stay of proceedings based on the presumed validity of the commencement of insolvency proceedings abroad. Moreover, the scope of a stay ordered in foreign proceedings may not find a direct parallel in a State in which its recognition is sought. The respect accorded to a stay ordered by a foreign court may be dependent upon political and economic considerations, as well as upon familiarity with the State ordering the stay or tangible business contacts with that State. Even where national law provides for the universal effect of an automatic stay, a foreign court might be inclined to protect the interests of its local creditors and disregard the foreign stay, even where that worked against maximizing the potential recovery for all creditors.

94. The UNCITRAL Model Law provides for an automatic stay on recognition of foreign proceedings and deals with a number of issues concerning coordination of relief between main and non-main proceedings.¹¹⁶ In States enacting the Model Law, the position with regard to the stay should be relatively clear and transparent.¹¹⁷ However, in other States or in States where recognition of foreign proceedings will not be sought, the issue may be addressed in an insolvency agreement. Since recognition of a foreign stay of proceedings cannot be imposed on a court simply by agreement between the parties, the courts would generally need to approve an agreement including such provisions.

95. Insolvency agreements adopt different approaches to the question of stays. Some provide for joint recognition of stays of proceedings, stipulating that the court of one State should extend and enforce the stay imposed in the other State involved in the agreement in its own territory and vice versa. A proviso might be that enforcement of the stay should take place only to the extent necessary and

¹¹⁵ See, for example, *SENDO*, p. 2.

¹¹⁶ UNCITRAL Model Law, arts. 20, 21, 28 and 29.

¹¹⁷ Not all States enacting legislation based upon the UNCITRAL Model Law have adopted the automatic stay.

appropriate or to the same extent that it is applicable in the State in which it is ordered. In recognizing and implementing a stay applicable in another State, the agreement might provide for the court to consult with the issuing court regarding interpretation and application of the stay, including its possible modification, relief from the stay and issues of enforcement.

96. Other agreements do not provide for automatic recognition in relevant courts of a stay of proceedings issued by one court involved in the agreement, but permit recognition and assistance to be sought from those relevant courts, where that assistance might include giving effect to the stay or providing an equivalent remedy or relief.¹¹⁸

97. In addition to a court-ordered stay of proceedings, parties may agree to suspend any proceedings commenced by them against the debtor for a specific period of time, in order to allow the optimal approach to coordination of the different proceedings to be found. Such an agreement may be coordinated through creditor committees or involve the agreement of creditors (especially where those creditors have applied for commencement of the insolvency proceedings) and might be included in a written agreement,¹¹⁹ but would also be feasible outside a written agreement. In a case concerning main and non-main proceedings, the insolvency representative of the main proceeding agreed not to apply, for a certain period of time, for a stay in the non-main proceeding, notwithstanding its right to do so under applicable law, in order to achieve the best means of recovery of the assets of the debtor.¹²⁰

98. The issue of relief from the stay has also been addressed in insolvency agreements. One agreement, for example, provided a safeguard that permitted the parties to seek relief after entry into force of the agreement in the event of an emergency. Another agreement facilitated coordination by granting the foreign insolvency representative relief from the automatic stay for a specific period of time to investigate assets allegedly belonging to the debtor's estate in the forum State. In a case where the cross-border insolvency proceedings were to be administered jointly and a workplan to be agreed upon, the court-approved insolvency agreement granted the insolvency representatives relief from any stay or similar order so that the agreed workplan could be implemented.

99. In situations involving assets or persons in a third State, an insolvency agreement may provide that each court involved could grant emergency relief upon application by the insolvency representative. In one agreement including such a provision, it was also specified that since that relief could be granted by the court of one forum, the insolvency representative should attempt to obtain the ex post facto approval of the other courts as soon as possible.¹²¹

(c) Applicable law

100. Where insolvency proceedings involve parties or assets located in different States, complex questions may arise with respect to the law that will apply to the

¹¹⁸ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 7.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 27.

¹²⁰ See, for example, *SENDO*, p. 7.

¹²¹ See, for example, *Nakash*, para. 6.

validity and effectiveness of rights in, or claims relating to, those assets; to the treatment of those assets; and to the rights and claims of those parties not located in the State in which the insolvency proceedings have commenced. In the case of such insolvency proceedings, the forum State will generally apply its private international law rules (or conflict of laws rules) to determine which law is applicable to the validity and effectiveness of a right or claim and to its treatment in the insolvency proceedings. While insolvency proceedings may typically be governed by the law of the State in which the proceedings are commenced (the *lex fori concursus*), many States have adopted exceptions to the application of that law, which vary in number, scope and policy justification. The diversity in the number and scope of such exceptions may create uncertainty and unpredictability for parties involved in cross-border insolvency proceedings. By specifically addressing the issue of applicable law, an insolvency law can assist in providing certainty with respect to the effects of insolvency proceedings on the rights and claims of parties affected by those proceedings.

101. However, formally articulated conflict of laws rules specific to solving cross-border insolvency issues do not exist in most States. An example serves to illustrate the difficulties. In the *Toga Manufacturing* case,¹²² the court in the United States did not grant an injunction to the applying Canadian debtor on the basis that a United States creditor's claim, which would be a priority claim under United States law, would be treated in the Canadian proceeding as an ordinary unsecured claim.

102. In the absence of clear rules under applicable law, an agreement can seek to avoid potential conflict by specifying the law applicable to specific issues. Many agreements address applicable law issues with respect to questions such as the treatment of claims; right to set-off and security; application of avoidance provisions; use and disposal of assets; and distribution of proceeds from the sale of the debtor's assets.¹²³ Different approaches are taken to determining the law applicable to those issues. One approach is to apply the law of the forum, unless considerations of comity require application of another law. Another approach is to indicate that issues should be decided by the forum court using an analysis based upon the conflict of laws rules applicable in that forum or in accordance with the law governing the underlying obligation. In the case of avoidance provisions for example, the insolvency agreement may specify the law of the State in whose territory the entities to which transfers of assets were made are situated or the law as determined by the rules of the jurisdiction to which the creditors are subject.¹²⁴

103. A proviso might be that if the law governing the underlying obligation is either unclear or the law of a State not involved in the insolvency agreement, the conflict of laws rules of one of the relevant States should be applied to determine which of the courts should be responsible for that matter. A further approach specifies that the conflict of laws rules of a third State should apply if application of the laws of the States involved leads to conflicting results.¹²⁵

¹²² *In re Toga Manufacturing Ltd.*, 28 B.R. 165 (E.D.Mich. 1983).

¹²³ The Concordat refers the decision on value and admissibility of claims as well as the determination of certain creditor's rights to each forum for the claims filed before it, using an analysis based upon conflicts of laws rules (Principle 8A).

¹²⁴ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 8.01, and *Everfresh*, para. 12.

¹²⁵ See, for example, *Peregrine*, para. 9.

104. Parties may also agree on how to approach certain issues that would be treated differently under the laws of the different States. In one case involving the Netherlands and the United States, which was coordinated without a written insolvency agreement, the parties agreed that one burdensome contract governed by the law of a third State would be rejected in accordance with United States law. The parties further agreed that the effects of such rejection would be arbitrated in the Netherlands, applying the third State's law.¹²⁶ With respect to treatment of claims, the parties further agreed not to apply the law of the United States and thus not to subordinate certain claims to the level of equity interests, because that would have resulted in inconsistency with the insolvency law of the Netherlands.¹²⁷

105. As already noted (see para. 25 above), several agreements may be concluded between the parties in the course of the insolvency proceedings. Where that occurs, a preliminary agreement may record that the parties will attempt to negotiate a subsequent agreement addressing, for example, the treatment of claims that would specify the law applicable to claims submitted by each debtor and their respective creditors in the other proceedings.¹²⁸

Sample clauses

Priority of proceedings

Subject to the terms of this agreement, the State A proceeding shall be the primary proceeding. However, as a practical matter, given that the business activities of the company are and always have been focused in State B, substantially all of the liquidation of the company shall be carried out in and from State B.

Stays of proceedings

Variant A

(1) The State A court recognizes the validity of the stay of proceedings and actions applicable against the State B debtor and its property under the insolvency law of State B. In implementing the terms of this paragraph, the State A court may consult with the State B court regarding (a) the interpretation and application of the State B stay and any orders of the State B court modifying or granting relief from the State B stay, and (b) the enforcement of the State B stay in State A.

(2) The State B court recognizes the validity of the stay of proceedings and actions applicable against the State A debtor and its property under the insolvency law of State A. In implementing the terms of this paragraph, the State B court may consult with the State A court regarding (a) the interpretation and application of the State A stay and any orders of the State A court modifying or granting relief from the State A stay, and (b) the enforcement of the State A stay in State B.

¹²⁶ See *United Pan-Europe*.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.* The law not to be applied was section 510 (b) of the United States Bankruptcy Code.

¹²⁸ See, for example, *Calpine*, para. 19, and *Quebecor*, para. 18.

(3) Nothing in this agreement shall affect or limit the debtors' or other parties' rights to assert the applicability or non-applicability of the State A or the State B stay to any particular proceeding, property, asset, activity or other matter, wherever pending or located.

(4) Nothing in this agreement shall affect or limit the ability of either court to direct (a) that any stay of proceedings affecting the parties before it shall not apply to any application by those parties to the other court, or (b) that relief be granted to permit those parties to apply to the other court on such terms and conditions as the court considers appropriate.

Variant B

To promote the orderly and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings and the protection of the debtor's estates for the benefit of creditors and other stakeholders, the parties shall:

(a) If so requested by the State A insolvency representative, request the State B court, to the extent permitted under State B law, to recognize and/or provide judicial assistance to the State A proceeding and extend and give effect to the State A stay in State B or provide equivalent remedies and relief;

(b) If so requested by the State B insolvency representative, request the State A court, to the extent permitted under State A law, to recognize and/or provide judicial assistance to the State B proceeding and extend and give effect to the State B stay in State A or provide equivalent remedies and relief.

Applicable law

(1) The adjudicating forum shall decide the value, admissibility and priority of claims submitted using an analysis based upon the conflict of laws rules applicable in that forum.

(2) The insolvency law of State A shall be the substantive law governing all transfers made [to] [from] entities located in State A.

(3) The insolvency law of State B shall be the substantive law governing all transfers made [to] [from] entities located in State B.

5. Allocation of responsibilities between the parties to the cross-border insolvency agreement

106. Cooperation is most needed in areas where potential conflict can be expected. Agreements on the responsibilities of each party, or at least cooperation in these areas, constitute one way to avoid those conflicts. Consequently, agreements often allocate responsibility between the parties to the proceedings for a range of matters, including supervision of the debtor; reorganization plans; treatment of assets; power to commence legal actions; treatment of claims, including claims verification and creditor notification; and post-commencement finance. In order to maintain flexibility, the insolvency agreement can also stipulate that the courts might jointly determine that other cross-border matters arising in the insolvency proceedings should be dealt with under, and in accordance with, the principles of the

agreement.¹²⁹ However, as soon as an agreement touches upon involvement of a court, responsibility of a court or action to be taken by a court, court approval of such arrangement would be required for the agreement to be effective.

107. In some States, an insolvency representative may be able to allocate responsibility for certain actions to a foreign insolvency representative where it is practical to do so and to satisfy its own obligation by overseeing and reviewing what the other insolvency representative does. Insolvency representatives may also be able to provide certain undertakings in order to coordinate their activities with courts or other parties. For example, in a case in which no written agreement was concluded, the insolvency representative provided to the court of the other State a letter confirming that it would not consent to the disposition of any estate assets or funds until approved by that court, to the extent required.¹³⁰

(a) General means of cooperation

108. Some agreements do not address the allocation of responsibilities between the various parties and the courts in detail, but include a broad statement concerning cooperation between the parties that is in the nature of a statement of good faith or intent, leaving flexibility to the parties to determine the manner in which cooperation will be achieved.¹³¹

109. Examples include provisions to the effect that: the parties, which may include some or all of the debtor, the creditor committee and the insolvency representatives depending upon the circumstances of the case, will take all reasonable steps to cooperate with each other in connection with actions taken in the courts of the States involved, and to coordinate the administration of the proceedings for the benefit of the respective insolvency estates and parties in interest;¹³² to the extent possible, all actions taken in the different insolvency proceedings should be consistent; and the administration of the proceedings should be organized to ensure efficiency and reduce costs, focusing upon coordination of the activities of the insolvency representatives, the matters to be addressed by the courts and relevant procedural issues.

110. More detailed provisions specify the means of achieving cooperation, such as sharing the administration of the proceedings, where the insolvency representatives reach agreement on how to coordinate their activities with each other, subject to their respective obligations and responsibilities under applicable law. These provisions might include agreement that each insolvency representative should control the administration of the subsidiaries of the debtor in its State and seek the assistance of the other insolvency representative where needed; an insolvency

¹²⁹ See, for example, *SEMCanada Crude Company*, para. 8.

¹³⁰ See *United Pan-Europe*.

¹³¹ See, for example, *Philip*, paras. 11-13, and *Systech*, paras. 11-13.

¹³² See, for example, *Loewen*, para. 3.1, and *Laidlaw*, para. 10. The Concordat takes a similar approach, stipulating that for cases with more than one plenary forum, but no main forum, each forum should coordinate with each other, subject in appropriate cases to a governance protocol (Principle 4A). The CoCo Guidelines recommend the cooperation of the insolvency representatives and sets out details for this cooperation (Guidelines 12.1-12.4), including the court appointment of the main insolvency representative or its agent as a co-insolvency representative in non-main proceedings to ensure coordination between different proceedings under the court's supervision (Guideline 16.3).

representative may act without the prior consent of the other representative and without giving prior notice on any matter that does not require notice to be given to parties in interest under the law governing those insolvency proceedings; or an insolvency representative should attempt, in good faith, to obtain the consent of the other insolvency representative prior to taking certain actions, including seeking or consenting to the substantive consolidation of the debtor with any other entity or any other action that would have an adverse impact on the debtor or, in a group context, any member of the group.¹³³

111. The provisions may also specify the procedure to be followed to achieve this cooperation, including, for example, holding an initial meeting at which the insolvency representatives should discuss all actions already taken concerning the debtor's assets and develop a workplan, followed by meetings on a regular basis. Further details could include the particulars of those meetings, including a timetable and how they should take place (e.g. in person or via telephone).¹³⁴ Other elements of cooperation could include using documents prepared in one proceeding for similar purposes in other proceedings¹³⁵ or the insolvency representatives participating as management exercising the rights, powers and duties of a debtor in possession in the insolvency proceedings in the other forum.¹³⁶

(b) Supervision of the debtor

112. An agreement can establish the extent to which the debtor will be responsible for supervision of its business, addressing what the management can or cannot do without prior consultation with, or the consent of, the insolvency representatives. Prior consent may be required, for example, for the use and disposal of assets, while prior consultation may be required with respect to commencement of legal proceedings; recruitment or dismissal of employees, other than in the ordinary course of business; and consultation with any trade unions, except in the ordinary course of business.¹³⁷

(c) Reorganization plans

113. Where reorganization proceedings are commenced against a debtor in a number of different States or against several members of an enterprise group in different States, a question arises as to whether it will be possible to reorganize the debtors in a coordinated manner, perhaps through similar plans that will deliver savings across the various insolvency proceedings, ensure a coordinated approach to the resolution of the debtors' financial difficulties and maximize value for creditors. Some insolvency laws permit the development of such plans, while under others it will only be possible where the different proceedings can be coordinated. Accordingly, this issue is commonly addressed in insolvency agreements, many of which provide that substantially similar reorganization plans should be submitted to

¹³³ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. III. B.

¹³⁴ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, paras. 1-6.

¹³⁵ See, for example, *GBFE*, paras.10.1-10.2.

¹³⁶ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. F.

¹³⁷ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 3.4 (b) (ii).

each responsible court.¹³⁸ The development of similar reorganization plans in different forums may also be achieved, in the absence of a written agreement, by the parties working together to ensure that the plans and the approval process are in accordance with both legal systems.

114. The joint development of reorganization plans is an appropriate means for addressing concerns of creditors and the courts, where they have a role to play in approval and implementation of the plans and can be coordinated through an insolvency agreement. Even though the plans might be similar or at least consistent with each other, the creditors' right to disagree with or object to the plans submitted in other proceedings should be preserved.¹³⁹ An insolvency agreement might cover preparation of the plan or plans; classification and treatment of creditors;¹⁴⁰ procedures for approval, including solicitation and voting; and the role to be played by the courts (where applicable), particularly with respect to confirmation (if required by the insolvency law) of a plan approved by creditors and its implementation.¹⁴¹ An agreement might also provide that the plans, once approved by creditors and, where required, confirmed by the respective courts, should be binding upon claimants in relevant States, regardless of whether those claimants had submitted claims in proceedings in those States or otherwise submitted to the jurisdiction of those States.¹⁴²

115. Where the insolvency agreement does not establish those procedures, it may nevertheless provide that they should be established, in accordance with applicable law, by the debtor in consultation with the insolvency representatives or by order of the relevant courts. An agreement that provides generally for coordination but does not specifically address reorganization plans might also facilitate coordination of such plans. In the *360Networks* case for example, the agreement itself did not address the reorganization plan, but in the course of reorganization the parties agreed to draft two substantially similar plans and make each dependent on the approval of the other. In the *Masonite* case, the insolvency agreement, developed to coordinate activities in the Canadian and the United States proceedings, led to the approval of a single plan by both jurisdictions and the completion of the total reorganization of the *Masonite* companies within only 85 days following commencement of the proceedings.¹⁴³

116. One particular concern when negotiating similar reorganization plans relates to the equal treatment of creditors in each jurisdiction and the need to ensure that some do not receive less favourable treatment than others. For example, in the *Felixstowe Dock and Railway Co.* case,¹⁴⁴ the United States debtor sought the cooperation of

¹³⁸ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 8. The CoCo Guidelines also emphasize the cooperation of the insolvency representatives in any manner consistent with the objective of reorganization or the sale of the business as a going concern wherever possible (Guideline 14.1).

¹³⁹ See *Lehman Brothers*, para. 10.1.

¹⁴⁰ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 13.

¹⁴¹ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 4.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, para. 5.

¹⁴³ A Canadian court order recognized and implemented the United States order approving a process for reorganization and confirming the plan; see *Masonite and Masonite International Inc. (Re)*, [2009] O.J. No. 3264, Court No. 09-8075-00, para. 27.

¹⁴⁴ *Felixstowe Dock and Railway Co. v. U.S. Lines Inc.*, 1987 Q. B. 360 (Queen's Bench Division, Commercial Court 1987) (England).

the English courts to lift injunctions applying to the debtor's assets in England to prevent their realization or removal. Although the United States court assured the English court that if the injunctions were lifted, prosecution of the English claims in the English courts would not give rise to actions for contempt in the United States court, the English court declined to lift the injunctions. That decision was based on the English court's concern that English creditors would receive less favourable treatment under a United States reorganization plan.

117. Different approaches may be taken to preparation and submission of a reorganization plan. Responsibility could be given to the debtor or debtors respectively, where the insolvency law provides for the debtor to remain in possession and continue operating the business¹⁴⁵ or to the insolvency representatives, possibly in cooperation with the debtor.¹⁴⁶ Where the plan is to be developed together with the insolvency representative, different approaches may be adopted to coordinate the process in different States. The management of the debtor's business in one State, for example, may be best positioned to develop a reorganization plan for all of the debtor's businesses in consultation with all of the insolvency representatives;¹⁴⁷ or the plan may be prepared by the debtor together with the insolvency representative of only one forum,¹⁴⁸ but with the involvement of other insolvency representatives, especially if the insolvency law requires the insolvency representative to participate in the negotiation of, or to consent to, the reorganization plan.

(d) Treatment of assets

118. Fundamental to insolvency proceedings is the need to identify, collect, preserve and dispose of the debtor's assets.¹⁴⁹ Under some insolvency laws, the legal title over the assets is transferred to a designated official (generally the insolvency representative). Under others, the debtor continues to be the legal owner, but its powers to administer and dispose of those assets are limited. Identification of the assets and their treatment in insolvency affects the scope and conduct of the proceedings and can have a significant bearing on the likely success of those proceedings.

(i) Investigation of assets

119. Investigation of the debtor's assets is often crucial to the successful conduct of insolvency proceedings and a coordinated approach might avoid duplication of effort and save costs. Investigations may be coordinated by allocating responsibility for their conduct to, for example, the insolvency representative of one State or by coordinating the activities of the insolvency representatives in other ways, such as by establishing provisions for notice and reporting. Responsibility might be allocated generally for all assets or might be agreed on a case-by-case basis.¹⁵⁰ Where responsibility is allocated to one insolvency representative, it might be

¹⁴⁵ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 5.

¹⁴⁶ See, for example, *Maxwell*, para. 3 (iii).

¹⁴⁷ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 3.2 (a).

¹⁴⁸ See, for example, *Maxwell*, para. 3 (iii).

¹⁴⁹ *Legislative Guide*, part two, chap. II, paras. 1-24.

¹⁵⁰ See, for example, the *Madoff* cross-border agreement, para. 6.2, where allocation of responsibility is included for identification of assets.

desirable for that representative to inform its counterpart in the other State about the investigation¹⁵¹ and periodically consult with respect to progress and results, as well as proposed actions. The insolvency representative might also provide the counterpart with drafts of any requests proposed to be made to the court. Where an investigation has commenced at the time of entering into the insolvency agreement, responsibility may continue to reside with that investigating insolvency representative.¹⁵² Another approach requires the insolvency representatives to meet to discuss all actions taken before the meeting and to develop a workplan to coordinate and govern subsequent actions, for example identification, location, recovery, preservation and protection of the debtor's assets.¹⁵³

(ii) *Use and disposal of assets*

120. The conduct of insolvency proceedings will often require assets of the debtor to continue to be used or disposed of (including by way of encumbrance) in order to enable the goal of the particular proceedings to be realized. Where the insolvency of the debtor involves proceedings in different States, coordination of the use and disposal of the debtor's assets may be required to ensure maximization of the value of assets for the benefit of all creditors. Similarly, coordination may be required with respect to preservation of assets. In an enterprise group context for example, group members may have an interest in the assets of other group members. Where the value or recovery of those assets is at risk, interested group members may seek to coordinate the manner in which those assets are treated, including by providing funding to preserve and maximize the value or assist the recovery of the assets.¹⁵⁴

121. Agreements can be used to facilitate this coordination by establishing requirements for approval, allocating responsibility between the different parties in interest¹⁵⁵ and specifying details concerning the procedures for use or disposal. Although the extent to which responsibility can be allocated between the different courts and insolvency representatives will depend upon the requirements of applicable law, practice suggests that different approaches are possible.¹⁵⁶

a. *Supervision by the courts*

122. Some agreements allocate responsibility for supervising use and disposal of assets between the courts, whether to the court of the State in which the assets are located or which has jurisdiction over the assets;¹⁵⁷ to the court of the State in which the debtor is located; or jointly to the courts competent for the different

¹⁵¹ See, for example, *Maxwell*, para. 4, and *Nakash*, para. 18.

¹⁵² See, for example, *GFBE*, para. 4.1 (c), and *Nakash*, para. 7.

¹⁵³ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 2, and the *Madoff* cross-border agreement, para. 6.2.

¹⁵⁴ See, for example, *Lehman Brothers*, para. 7.4.

¹⁵⁵ See, for example, *Swissair*, paras. 4-5.

¹⁵⁶ In cases with more than one plenary forum but no main forum, the Concordat refers the assets within each jurisdiction to that forum (Principle 4B). Where proceedings involve a main and non-main proceeding, the CoCo Guidelines recommend that every insolvency representative should seek to sell the assets [in its jurisdiction] in cooperation with the other insolvency representatives so as to maximize the value of the assets as a whole (Guideline 13.1). Further, any national court, where required to act, should approve those sales or disposals that would produce such value (Guideline 13.2).

¹⁵⁷ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 6; see also *Lehman Brothers*, para. 7.1.

insolvency proceedings.¹⁵⁸ In some agreements, use of the location criteria is relevant only to specific kinds of asset, such as immovables.¹⁵⁹ Another approach, which may be appropriate in certain cases, such as where there is a high level of managerial and operational interdependence among enterprise group members, is to make sales of certain assets subject to the joint approval of the courts involved, regardless of the location of those assets,¹⁶⁰ although it would be desirable to ensure that such a provision did not cause unnecessary delay and reduction of value. To facilitate that joint approval and the allocation of proceeds between the different debtors, some agreements permit joint hearings to be conducted.¹⁶¹

123. The requirement for court approval may be limited to assets that exceed a specified value or to certain types of transaction, distinguishing for example between disposals in the ordinary course of business and disposals outside the ordinary course, with approval required only for transactions in the latter category. An agreement may also specify that approval is not required for certain types of transaction e.g. depositing funds in bank accounts. Though some agreements envisage approval being sought for each and every transaction,¹⁶² an agreement can also provide that the responsible courts should make general orders to cover all disposals of assets, enabling the insolvency representatives to take action without seeking approval in each instance.¹⁶³

b. Supervision by insolvency representatives

124. Another approach explicitly authorizes the insolvency representatives to use or dispose of the debtor's assets without court approval where permitted by applicable law, reducing the time needed for those actions. This authorization could include requesting the debtor to dispose of certain assets. In some situations, it might be appropriate to require the insolvency representative to seek the prior consent of its foreign counterpart for disposal of assets, including the disposal of shares or interests. To avoid an impasse, any requirement to seek consent might be limited to making a "good faith attempt" or to consultation. Where the debtor is permitted to manage the assets, for example, as a debtor in possession, approval of the insolvency representatives may be required for sale or disposal outside the ordinary course of business, but not otherwise.¹⁶⁴ Even where court approval is not required for each sale or disposal of assets, the courts may nevertheless oversee the use and disposal of assets by requiring the insolvency representatives to provide regular reports on their work.¹⁶⁵

125. Other details which an insolvency agreement may address regarding the use and disposal of assets might include the manner of the disposal; the setting of a foreign exchange rate for transactions that require the computation of an amount in different currencies;¹⁶⁶ the manner or place of payment of the proceeds;¹⁶⁷ and the

¹⁵⁸ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 2.

¹⁵⁹ See, for example, *PSINet*, para. 10 (ii).

¹⁶⁰ See, for example, *Tee-Comm.*, para. 6.

¹⁶¹ See, for example, *Livent*, para. (vi), and *PSINet*, para. 13.

¹⁶² See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 3.

¹⁶³ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 6.

¹⁶⁴ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 3.4 (a) (i).

¹⁶⁵ See, for example, *Inverworld*, paras. 6 and 11.

¹⁶⁶ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. G.

use of the proceeds from sales, such as to fund working capital;¹⁶⁸ cover court-approved expenses¹⁶⁹ and plan funding;¹⁷⁰ or distribute to creditors.

(e) Allocation of responsibility for commencing proceedings

126. During insolvency proceedings, it might become necessary to commence various types of proceeding concerning the debtor or third parties. These may include insolvency or other similar proceedings with respect, for example, to subsidiaries of the debtor (wherever situated) not already subject to insolvency proceedings, or parallel proceedings, for example, on the basis of presence of substantial assets, substantial business or place of incorporation¹⁷¹ or actions concerning third parties, such as avoidance of certain transactions or with respect to submission and verification of claims. To avoid possible conflict, an insolvency agreement may allocate responsibility for commencing such actions between the different representatives, subject to certain requirements, such as the written consent of the other insolvency representative.¹⁷²

127. Allocation of responsibility in this manner may be important to satisfy the requirements of national law as many laws, in specifying the persons who may request the commencement of insolvency proceedings, do not include foreign insolvency representatives or address the question of their standing to make such a request. Article 11 of the UNCITRAL Model Law is designed to ensure that a foreign representative, following recognition of main or non-main proceedings, has the standing to request commencement of an insolvency proceeding in the recognizing State, provided the conditions for commencement are otherwise met; the Model Law does not modify the conditions under local law for commencement of those proceedings. Similarly, article 23 provides the standing, following recognition of a foreign proceeding, for a foreign representative to initiate avoidance actions as available in the recognizing State. Where the Model Law has not been enacted however, or there is doubt as to the standing of a foreign representative to commence such proceedings, allocating that responsibility in an insolvency agreement to another insolvency representative may facilitate commencement of those proceedings. An agreement may also cover related procedural issues, such as deadlines for filing of documents and reports and provision of notice, in accordance with applicable law.

(f) Treatment of claims

128. Claims by creditors operate at several levels in insolvency proceedings, determining which creditors may vote in the proceedings, how they may vote and how much they would receive in a distribution. Accordingly, the procedure for submission of claims and their verification and admission is a key part of the insolvency proceedings. Where insolvency proceedings cross borders, procedural matters with respect to coordination of claims processing, such as place and time (including deadlines) of submission, responsibility and procedure for verification

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., para. II. H.

¹⁶⁸ See, for example, *Livent*, para. 13.

¹⁶⁹ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 19.

¹⁷⁰ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 10.

¹⁷¹ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. L.

¹⁷² See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 5.

and admission, handling of objections, provision of notice of claims submitted and cross-recognition of admission can be clarified and coordinated in an insolvency agreement. The treatment of intercompany claims in an enterprise group context might also be the subject of an agreement and include, for example, the establishment of a mechanism, such as a committee, to resolve differences with respect to those claims.¹⁷³ Such an agreement may or may not require approval by the court, depending upon the role played by the court in the claims admission and verification process under the applicable insolvency law. Details of the claims procedure to be followed may be negotiated at the commencement of the proceedings or any agreement concluded at that time might provide that certain claims would be addressed in a subsequent insolvency agreement to specify the timing, process, jurisdiction and law applicable to the resolution of claims.¹⁷⁴

129. While agreements in writing typically address coordination of the treatment of claims, coordination may in some circumstances be achieved without such agreement. In one case involving the United States and the Netherlands, for example, the United States debtor in possession and the Netherlands insolvency professionals worked together to coordinate various processes without a written agreement, ensuring compliance with the laws of both States involved.¹⁷⁵

130. Agreements may also address issues of priority and subordination. For example, in the *United Pan-Europe* case, the parties agreed not to subordinate certain claims to the level of equity interests, which was permitted under the law of one of the States involved, because to do so would have been inconsistent with the law of the other State.

(i) *Submission of claims*

131. Agreements can establish the proceedings in which claims should be submitted, and address the issue of claims submitted in more than one proceeding to establish where they should be verified and admitted. Claims submitted in one proceeding could be treated as if they had been properly submitted in the other proceeding in which they would then be verified and admitted or rejected. A claim submitted in one proceeding may be deemed to have been submitted in both proceedings, with the place of last submission being responsible for verification and admission or rejection. An agreement may also clarify that submitting a claim is a prerequisite for participating in a distribution or voting upon any proposal or reorganization plan.¹⁷⁶

(ii) *Claim verification and admission*

132. Verification and admission of claims may be conducted in a variety of ways by different parties, involving the courts, the insolvency representatives and in some cases the debtor. As noted above, insolvency agreements may address the procedure for verification and admission of claims and the allocation of responsibility between

¹⁷³ See *Lehman Brothers*, para. 9.3, and the *Madoff* cross-border agreement, para. 7.1.

¹⁷⁴ See, for example, *Calpine*, para. 19, and *Quebecor*, para. 18.

¹⁷⁵ See *United Pan-Europe*.

¹⁷⁶ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 4.

the courts or insolvency representatives.¹⁷⁷ For example, the agreement may provide that the parties should work together to agree on the procedure in a future agreement¹⁷⁸ or that claims should be adjudicated in accordance with applicable law.

133. Where the court is involved in the process, parties may agree that the court of one forum will verify and admit all claims¹⁷⁹ or that each court responsible for the different insolvency proceedings will verify and admit claims properly submitted in those proceedings.¹⁸⁰ Where claims are to be adjudicated by one court, it may be the court of the State in which the debtor is located or the court in which the claim is submitted, unless principles of comity require otherwise or another court is a more appropriate forum in view of all the circumstances.¹⁸¹

134. Where the insolvency agreement provides for claims to be verified and admitted in one State, it might require recognition of those claims by the other courts involved in the proceedings and acceptance of that process by the debtor. Similarly, where claims are to be adjudicated in several courts, an agreement can stipulate that each court should consider the claims against the debtor submitted in its proceeding and its decision on those claims should be applied and recognized by the other courts, to the extent allowed under applicable law.¹⁸² Where action is required to be taken to ensure recognition, the agreement may allocate responsibility for taking the necessary steps to, for example, the debtor or the insolvency representative.¹⁸³ Requiring insolvency representatives to periodically exchange a register of the claims submitted in each proceeding may facilitate coordination of claims processing.¹⁸⁴ Where creditors are required under applicable law to attend in person to verify their claims, an agreement might address the obstacle caused by the costs of travel for foreign creditors, which could prevent smaller claim-holders from pursuing their rights.

135. An insolvency agreement may provide that the adjudicating forum will decide the value, admissibility and priority of the claims, using an analysis based upon the conflict of laws rules applicable in that forum or in accordance with the law governing the underlying claim,¹⁸⁵ or that a special committee may be established for that purpose.¹⁸⁶ The agreement may also address the question of objections to claims, for example by permitting objections to be made in each proceeding.¹⁸⁷

136. As an alternative to adjudication by the courts, an insolvency agreement may provide for claims to be verified and admitted by the insolvency representative, and specify the details of the procedure. One agreement, for example, provided that the insolvency representatives of multiple proceedings in different European Union

¹⁷⁷ The Concordat, for example, stipulates principles for the filing of claims for cases with a main forum and for cases with more than one plenary forum but no main forum (Principles 2 and 4).

¹⁷⁸ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 4.

¹⁷⁹ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 4.

¹⁸⁰ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. G.

¹⁸¹ See, for example, *PSINet*, para. 10.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, para. 11.

¹⁸³ See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 4.

¹⁸⁴ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. C.

¹⁸⁵ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 8, and *ABTC*, para. 4.

¹⁸⁶ See *Lehman Brothers*, para. 9.4.

¹⁸⁷ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 8.

States should each verify the amount and form of the claims submitted in their proceedings. It further provided that the insolvency representative of the non-main proceedings should provide the insolvency representative of the main proceeding with a list of the claims in the non-main proceedings. The verification was to be undertaken independently in conformity with national law in accordance with the provisions of the EC Regulation.¹⁸⁸

137. Responsibility for treatment of specific claims, such as unsecured claims, may in some cases be referred to specified parties, for example the debtor in possession, subject to consultation with the insolvency representatives.¹⁸⁹

138. An insolvency agreement may also address treatment of claims in reorganization proceedings, prior to approval and implementation of the plan. One agreement, for example, referred primary responsibility during that time to the insolvency representatives in consultation with the debtor for agreement on the validity or amount of claims and their payment or other settlement.¹⁹⁰

139. Another issue that an insolvency agreement may address is the manner in which, and the court to which, appeals concerning rejection of claims should be made. To facilitate coordination and enhance transparency and predictability, an agreement may also include certain standard forms relating to verification and admission of claims, such as the proof of claim and the notice of rejection of the claim.¹⁹¹

(iii) *Distribution*

140. Where creditors are able to submit claims in multiple proceedings, it is desirable that the proceedings be coordinated to avoid a situation in which one creditor might be treated more favourably than other creditors of the same class by obtaining payment of the same claim in more than one proceeding. Article 32 of the UNCITRAL Model Law includes a rule to address that situation (incorporating the so-called “hotchpot rule”).

141. Some insolvency agreements include a general provision on distribution, such as that all of the debtor’s assets should be realized for the benefit of all secured, priority and non-insider unsecured creditors, with the net proceeds of sale to be distributed in accordance with priorities established under the laws of one forum. Other agreements specifically address the issue of double payment. One approach is to include a general provision that a creditor should not be paid twice where, in parallel proceedings, it submits a claim in both proceedings. Other insolvency agreements are more specific, detailing how this should be avoided, including by the insolvency representatives exchanging relevant information, such as draft distribution schedules and, if distributions have occurred, lists of the recipient creditors.¹⁹² It may also be avoided by providing that the creditor should receive a distribution from the debtor’s assets as if it had submitted a single claim in either

¹⁸⁸ See, for example, *SENDO*, p. 5.

¹⁸⁹ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 11.

¹⁹⁰ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 3.6 (a).

¹⁹¹ See, for example, *GBFE*, pp. 25-32.

¹⁹² See, for example, *SENDO*, p. 9.

proceeding, but limited to a rateable recovery from the debtor's assets not greater than would be permitted under both laws.¹⁹³

142. An insolvency agreement may also address the means of distribution, for example the currency in which claims should be paid;¹⁹⁴ who will pay the dividends, for example each insolvency representative may be responsible for making distributions in the proceedings in which it was appointed;¹⁹⁵ and the creditors to which the distribution will be paid.

(g) Post-commencement finance

143. The continued operation of the debtor's business after the commencement of insolvency proceedings is critical to reorganization, and to a lesser extent liquidation, where the business is to be sold as a going concern. To maintain its business activities, the debtor must have access to funds to enable it to continue to pay for crucial supplies of goods and services. When the debtor has no available liquid assets to meet its immediate cash flow needs, it will have to seek finance from third parties.¹⁹⁶ Since many insolvency laws either restrict or do not address the provision of new money in insolvency proceedings or the priority for its repayment, the uncertainty created by these different approaches in a cross-border insolvency situation makes post-commencement finance an issue that might be addressed in an insolvency agreement.

144. Many insolvency agreements, however, do not address the provision of post-commencement finance. Sometimes, the court order approving the insolvency agreement contains provisions on post-commencement finance. That order might, for example, authorize the applicants to pursue all avenues of refinancing and approve and recognize the finance approved in proceedings in other jurisdictions.¹⁹⁷ One agreement included a provision that the insolvency representative with responsibility for operation of the business on an ongoing basis required the consent of its counterpart and approval of the court of the other forum to obtain financing, regardless of whether that consent was required under the applicable law.¹⁹⁸ That mechanism was adopted to ensure that the parallel insolvency proceedings achieved the goal of maximizing the value of the estate and preserving the interests of each of the insolvency regimes involved. An insolvency agreement may also address issues of jurisdiction providing, for example, that any post-commencement finance lender should only be subject to the jurisdiction in which the post-commencement finance was provided.¹⁹⁹

145. Similarly, an insolvency agreement can explicitly permit the insolvency representative to borrow funds or encumber assets and impose conditions such as

¹⁹³ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. D.

¹⁹⁴ See, for example, *Peregrine*, para. 11 B, and *GBFE*, para. 8.2.

¹⁹⁵ See, for example, *GBFE*, paras. 4.2 (c) and 5.3 (e).

¹⁹⁶ *Legislative Guide*, part two, II, paras. 94-107 and recommendations 63-68. The CoCo Guidelines recommend the insolvency representatives' cooperation with regard to obtaining any necessary post-commencement financing, including through granting of priority or a security interest to reorganization lenders as might be appropriate and in so far as permitted under any applicable law (Guideline 14.2).

¹⁹⁷ See, for example, *Systech*, paras. 19 (f) and 22.

¹⁹⁸ See, for example, *Maxwell*, paras. 2 (iii)-(v).

¹⁹⁹ See, for example, *Mosaic*, para. 16.

the consent of the creditor committee,²⁰⁰ or permit the use of the proceeds of certain transactions other than the sale of substantially all of the assets to fund, for example, working capital²⁰¹ or to invest, leaving the manner of investment to the insolvency representative's reasonable judgement.²⁰²

Sample clauses

General means of cooperation

To assist in the efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings, the debtor, the creditor committee and the insolvency representatives shall:

- (a) Cooperate with each other in connection with actions taken in the courts of States A and B;
- (b) Take any other appropriate steps to coordinate the administration of the proceedings in States A and B for the benefit of the debtor's respective estates and parties in interest.

Supervision of the debtor

- (1) (a) Without the prior consent of the State A insolvency representative, the debtor shall not:
 - (i) Subject any asset to any new mortgage, charge or security interest;
 - (ii) Except as provided in any reorganization plan to which effect is given under State A law, agree to the validity or amount of, pay or settle the claims of any pre-commencement creditor of the debtor out of the debtor's assets;
 - (iii) Undertake intragroup sales or purchases other than in the ordinary course of business and in compliance with the debtor's present transfer pricing policies;
- (b) Without prior consultation with the State A insolvency representative, the debtor shall not:
 - (i) File in the State A court or circulate to the creditors, or any class of them, any reorganization plan for approval;
 - (ii) Consult with any trade unions, except in the ordinary course of business;
 - (iii) Recruit or dismiss any employees other than in the ordinary course of business, and the debtor shall, in respect of any recruitment or dismissal of employees, comply at all times with applicable employment law.
- (2) The debtor shall not, without the prior consent of the insolvency representatives of States A and B, acquire, sell or dispose of any asset outside the ordinary course of business.

²⁰⁰ See, for example, *Commodore*.

²⁰¹ See, for example, *Livent*, para. 13.

²⁰² See, for example, *GBFE*, paras. 6.2 and 6.3 (b).

Reorganization plans

(1) To the extent permitted by the laws of the respective States and to the extent practicable, the insolvency representatives of States A and B shall submit substantially similar reorganization plans in States A and B in accordance with the respective insolvency laws of States A and B. The insolvency representatives of States A and B shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate all procedures in connection with those reorganization plans, including solicitation procedures regarding voting on the reorganization plan, treatment of creditors and classification of claims. To the extent not provided in this agreement, those procedures will be established either by applicable law or further orders of the courts of States A and B.

(2) The insolvency representatives of States A and B shall take any action necessary to coordinate the contemporaneous submission of reorganization plans in States A and B.

Treatment of assets: supervision by the courts

(1) Transactions relating to State A assets will be subject to the approval of the State A court. Transactions relating to State B assets will be subject to the approval of the State B court. Any transactions involving assets located in both States A and B will be subject to the joint jurisdiction of the courts.

(2) The parties agree that the State A insolvency representative shall pursue all necessary causes of action in other States. The parties agree that insolvency proceedings shall be initiated by the State A insolvency representative if necessary, but only upon the agreement of both insolvency representatives.

Investigation of assets**Variant A**

(1) The debtor's assets shall be investigated wherever located. The State A insolvency representative has already commenced such an investigation and, in the interests of continuity, efficiency and expense, shall continue with its investigation in accordance with this agreement. The State B insolvency representative, the debtor or any other party in interest shall have the right at any time to request either court to permit or order the State B insolvency representative to conduct an independent investigation.

(2) In conducting the investigation, the State A insolvency representative shall, at all times, notify the State B insolvency representative of any actions that it intends to pursue and consult in good faith with the State B insolvency representative as to the reasons for and propriety of pursuing those actions. Unless not reasonably practical in the circumstances, the State A insolvency representative shall provide the State B insolvency representative with a draft of each application it proposes to make to either court in pursuit of those actions. The State A insolvency representative shall not be required to obtain the consent of the State B insolvency representative with respect to such actions; however, to the extent the State B insolvency representative disagrees with any of the proposed actions:

(a) The State A insolvency representative shall be required to inform the court in which it is seeking to pursue such actions of the State B insolvency representative's disagreement,

(b) The State B insolvency representative shall have a reasonable opportunity to appear and be heard in, and to seek relief from, the relevant court.

(3) The State A insolvency representative shall at all times keep the State B insolvency representative informed as to the course and conduct of the investigation into the debtor's assets and periodically consult as to progress. Unless otherwise requested by the State B insolvency representative or directed by either court, the State A insolvency representative shall promptly share with the State B insolvency representative all documents and other information obtained in connection with its investigation into the debtor's assets.

Variant B

Subject to this agreement and any prior orders of the appropriate courts, the insolvency representatives are authorized to coordinate with each other:

(a) The identification, preservation, collection and realization of the assets of the debtor, including evaluation of proceedings for recovery of avoidable transfers and damages;

(b) The investigation and analysis necessary to establish the financial position of the debtor.

Variant C

Investigations with respect to the assets of the debtor situated in States A and B shall be conducted respectively by the State A and State B insolvency representatives in accordance with applicable law.

Variant D

(1) The State A insolvency representative may, without the prior consent of the State B insolvency representative and without giving prior notice to it, carry out investigations into the assets of the debtor situated in State A provided that the State A insolvency representative shall report on the details of such matters to the State B insolvency representative at weekly or such other intervals as may be agreed between them.

(2) The State B insolvency representative may, without the prior consent of the State A insolvency representative and without giving prior notice to it, carry out investigations into the assets of the debtor situated in State B provided that the State B insolvency representative shall report on the details of such matters to the State A insolvency representative at weekly or such other intervals as may be agreed between them.

Allocation of responsibility for commencing proceedings

The State A insolvency representative shall attempt in good faith to obtain the consent of the State B insolvency representative prior to:

- (a) Commencing or consenting to insolvency proceedings (whether in State A, State B or elsewhere) with respect to the State A debtor;
- (b) Causing the State A debtor or its subsidiary to commence legal proceedings.

Submission of claims; and claim verification and admission

See sample clause above on *Allocation of responsibility between courts: treatment of claims*.

Distribution

Variant A

In order to avoid the risk, arising from the plurality of insolvency proceedings, of paying a creditor an amount that is greater than should be received, each insolvency representative is required to send to the other insolvency representative:

- (a) A draft distribution plan specifying the payment of dividends to be made. The insolvency representatives to whom this draft is sent shall respond and provide comments on the draft within [...] days from the date of receipt of the draft. Failure to respond within this time period shall be treated as acceptance of the draft plan;
- (b) After any payment of dividends, a list providing the names and addresses of the creditors who have been paid, the amount paid and nature of the claim.

Variant B

- (1) Without prejudice to secured claims or rights in rem, a creditor that has received part payment in respect of its claim in the State A proceeding pursuant to State A laws relating to insolvency may not receive a payment for the same claim in the State B proceeding under State B laws regarding the debtor, so long as the payment to the other creditors of the same class is proportionately less than the payment the creditor has already received.²⁰³

Post-commencement finance

The State A insolvency representative shall attempt, in good faith, to obtain prior approval of the State B insolvency representative before borrowing funds or pledging or charging any assets of the debtor.

²⁰³ This sample clause is based on article 32 of the UNCITRAL Model Law, which incorporates the hotchpot rule that assures fairness of distribution when a creditor has a valid claim in both proceedings.

6. Communication

146. As noted above (see chap. II, paras. 4-5), communication between the parties in cross-border insolvency proceedings is often viewed as an essential means of addressing the uncertainty that may be encountered in those cases where the parties are not necessarily familiar with the laws of other States and their application. Accordingly, the most common goal of insolvency agreements is to establish procedures for communication between the parties. Where the provisions of chapter IV of the UNCITRAL Model Law (arts. 25-27) have been enacted into national law, they will provide the legislative framework for communication between the courts, between insolvency representatives and between the courts and insolvency representatives. An insolvency agreement might provide further detail as to the types of information to be exchanged; means of exchanging information; method and frequency of communication; provision of notice; and confidentiality. Where the Model Law has not been adopted, an agreement might both establish the framework and provide the necessary practical detail. Formalizing the procedures for communication in an agreement will assist the overall coordination of the proceedings, promote the confidence of the parties, avoid disputes and increase transparency.²⁰⁴

147. A communication agreement might be used to address the issues noted above, as required in each particular case and as permitted by local procedural requirements. While many such agreements have been endorsed by the courts, that endorsement may only be required where the communication agreement covers aspects of communication between the courts; an agreement addressing communication between, for example, the insolvency representatives and the creditors may be implemented without such approval. Such an agreement might be one of a series of agreements entered into in the course of proceedings to address different issues and may be used as an initial step to facilitate resolution of those other issues. Where videoconference facilities are available, the ability of the parties to see and hear each other might further assist mutual understanding.

(a) Communication between courts

(i) Direct communication

148. As noted above (see chap. II, sect. B), communication between relevant courts is very often essential because of the important supervisory role of courts in insolvency proceedings and may assist in preventing a “duelling” of insolvency proceedings, undue delays and costs, unduly cumbersome and lengthy hearings, inconsistent treatment of similarly situated creditors and the loss of valuable assets. In addition, direct communication might facilitate the resolution of problems created when different laws accord different treatment to the same types of claim. In the *Stonington Partners* case for example, involving parallel insolvency proceedings

²⁰⁴ The CoCo Guidelines recommend that courts communicate with each other for the purpose of coordinating and harmonizing the different insolvency proceedings (Guideline 2), including the communication between courts and foreign insolvency representatives (Guideline 4); and that courts should cooperate with each other directly, through insolvency representatives or through any person or body appointed to act at the direction of the court (Guideline 16.4). Other recommendations address the time, method and means of communication (Guidelines 6 and 7); see also the Court-to-Court Guidelines.

in the United States and Belgium, an issue concerned the ranking of a securities fraud claim that would effectively have been denied any share under United States law, but could have been allowed under Belgian law and would have ranked equally with all other unsecured claims if proved. The United States appellate court recommended that an actual dialogue should occur or be attempted.²⁰⁵

149. Where permitted under applicable law, the ability of the courts to communicate with each other provides a safeguard, facilitating direct knowledge of the administration of the other proceeding. In a case concerning litigation against the debtor in the United States and insolvency proceedings in the Netherlands Antilles, a telephone call from the judge in the court of the Netherlands Antilles to the court in the United States corrected erroneous information communicated by the parties. In the same case, direct communication between the courts resulted in an order by the United States court, with the concurrence of the court of the Netherlands Antilles, directing mediation and the appointment of a mediator with the consent of the parties.²⁰⁶ In a further example, concerning a case between the United States and Canada, the Canadian court needed information from the United States court on whether the criteria for independence were fulfilled by the “foreign representative”, so that the Canadian court could recognize the foreign representative and make certain orders in Canada.²⁰⁷ A slightly different example that proved to be very useful was a case involving the United States and Germany, in which the German insolvency representative was able to participate and testify by telephone in a hearing conducted in the United States.²⁰⁸

150. In the *Cenargo* case,²⁰⁹ which involved insolvency proceedings in the United States and the United Kingdom, direct communication between the judges was arranged via a telephone conference in which the various parties’ counsel participated after the English judge was contacted by the United States judge seeking direct dialogue to resolve problems caused by competing orders. In the course of the conference, the English judge mentioned that English law did not permit him to speak to another judge officially on any matter without the consent and the participation of the parties. The parties were given the opportunity to comment at the end of the conference and a transcript was circulated upon the request of the English judge. The various safeguards that might apply to direct communication are discussed in chapter II (see chap. II, para. 8) and below (see paras. 195-200).

²⁰⁵ See footnote 15. Such dialogue did not take place in the case, though the parties discussed coordination during several case conferences resulting in the preparation of a letter by the debtor’s counsel intended for signature by the United States judge and directed to the Belgian court with the purpose of opening the lines of communication between the courts. This letter might have paved the way for a cross-border agreement between the two proceedings. However, the debtor withdrew its request to enjoin Stonington from pursuing its claims in the Belgian case, thus rendering the issue of communication moot; see *Lernout & Hauspie Speech Products, N.V.*, 301 B.R. 651, 659 (Bankr. D. Del. 2003).

²⁰⁶ See footnote 33.

²⁰⁷ See *ABTC*.

²⁰⁸ This happened in the “Dana” case, *In re Petition of Dr. Eberhard Braun, in his Capacity as Insolvency Administrator for Fairchild Dornier GmbH*, United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of Texas, San Antonio Division, Case No. 02-52351, (16 July 2004).

²⁰⁹ *In re Cenargo Int’l, PLC*, 294 B.R. 571 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2003).

151. Provisions on court-to-court communication included in insolvency agreements may include different levels of detail. They may provide, for example, that the courts of the different forums may communicate with one another generally or with respect to any matter relating to the insolvency proceedings²¹⁰ or in order to coordinate their efforts and avoid potentially conflicting rulings.²¹¹ They may also specify particular issues on which courts may communicate and, in some cases, seek guidance and advice from other courts, for example on the application of the law of the other forum to certain issues, such as the interpretation, application and enforcement of the stay ordered by that court (see para. 95 above).²¹²

152. Where courts are unable to communicate directly, communication may nevertheless be facilitated through the insolvency representatives or through an intermediary or by way of letter or other written communication. As noted above, direct communication across borders is subject to the provisions of national law and practice, which might not always facilitate that communication (see chap. II, para. 9). Article 31 of the EC Regulation provides for communication between insolvency representatives, but is silent on communication between courts. Some European Union member States have elaborated that provision. One law, for example, authorizes the judge or insolvency representative to provide the foreign insolvency representative with all information deemed necessary for the foreign proceeding and requires domestic courts or insolvency representatives to give the foreign insolvency representative the opportunity to make proposals with respect to the treatment of assets in the domestic proceedings.²¹³

153. The *Maxwell*, *Nakash* and *Matlack* cases provide examples of the use of an intermediary through whom the judges could communicate (see chap. II, para. 3). An agreement may specify the type of information to be exchanged and the manner of its exchange (see chap. II, para. 6). Communication may also be facilitated by incorporating guidelines, such as the Court-to-Court Guidelines, into the agreement (see chap. II, para. 10)²¹⁴ and may be made subject to general provisions of an agreement relating to dispute resolution.²¹⁵ An insolvency agreement may also specify that the insolvency representatives and debtors should provide to either court, upon request, copies of any orders, decisions or similar papers issued by the other court.²¹⁶

(ii) *Joint or coordinated hearings*

154. One means of facilitating coordination of multiple proceedings is to hold joint or coordinated hearings or conferences, where appropriate, to resolve issues that have arisen. Joint hearings or conferences have the advantage of enabling the courts to deal with the complex issues of different insolvency proceedings directly and in a timely manner, with parties in the various proceedings having the opportunity for

²¹⁰ See, for example, *Financial Asset Management*, para. 13; *Laidlaw*, para. 11 (b); *Pioneer*, para. 12 (b); and *Systech*, para. 12 (b).

²¹¹ See, for example, *Nakash*, para. 4.

²¹² See, for example, *Calpine*, paras. 28-29, and *Eddie Bauer*, para. 12.

²¹³ See § 239 I and II of the Austrian Bankruptcy Act (Konkursordnung).

²¹⁴ See, for example, *Matlack*, para. 11 and Schedule 1 to the insolvency agreement; and *Progressive Moulded*, before para. 1 and Schedule A to the insolvency agreement.

²¹⁵ See, for example, *Calpine*, para. 27.

²¹⁶ See, for example, *AbitiBowater*, para. 23.

direct contact and the ability to ask questions and seek clarification of counsel in the other jurisdiction.

155. Some agreements leave it to the courts to determine when joint or coordinated hearings or conferences should be conducted, providing, for example, that they may be conducted with respect to any matter relating to the administration, determination or disposition of any aspect of the proceedings, where the courts consider it to be necessary or advisable or to facilitate coordination with the proper and efficient conduct of the insolvency proceedings.²¹⁷ A more limited example permits such hearings with regard to specific issues, such as disposal of assets.

156. Some agreements set out procedures to be followed for such hearings and in some cases also for conferences. Some agreements adopt procedures similar to Guideline 9 of the Court-to-Court Guidelines; other agreements incorporate those Guidelines by reference.

157. Those procedures may address:²¹⁸

(a) The establishment of a telephone or video link to enable the courts to simultaneously hear or see the proceedings in the other court;²¹⁹

(b) Limitation of submissions or applications by any party to the court in which the party is appearing, unless specifically given leave by the other court. Some agreements add that after the scheduling of the hearing, courtesy copies of such submissions or applications should be provided to the other court and that any application seeking relief from both courts must be filed with both courts;²²⁰

(c) The judges of the different forums who will hear such applications are entitled to communicate with each other in advance of the hearing, with or without counsel being present, to establish guidelines for the orderly submission of documents and the rendering of decisions by the courts and to deal with any related procedural or other matters;²²¹

(d) The judges of the different forums, having heard an application, are entitled to communicate with each other after the hearing, without counsel present, for the purpose of determining whether consistent rulings can be made by both courts and the terms upon which such rulings shall be made, as well as to address any other procedural or non-substantive matter.

158. A different approach to these hearings provides that the judges of the different forums might appear and sit jointly in either court as agreed between them, provided that where they do creditors and other parties in interest may appear and be heard in person or at the courtroom of the judge who has travelled to appear in the other courtroom.²²²

159. In cases where the insolvency agreement included relevant provisions either on joint jurisdiction or explicitly allowing for joint or coordinated hearings, these hearings have been successfully arranged and have included holding a telephone

²¹⁷ See, for example, *360Networks*, para. 12, and *Quebecor*, para. 10 (d).

²¹⁸ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 5, and *Inverworld*, para. 26.

²¹⁹ See, for example, *Livent*, para. vi (a).

²²⁰ See, for example, *Mosaic*, para. 11 (c).

²²¹ See, for example, *PSINet*, para. 13 (iv).

²²² See, for example, *Livent*, para. (vi) (a).

conference to develop a coordinated schedule for the case and coordinated video hearings to discuss a proposed sale of assets in the different jurisdictions.²²³

(b) Communication between the parties

160. In addition to communication between courts, communication between insolvency representatives and between the insolvency representatives and other parties may be important to the coordination of insolvency proceedings, facilitating exchange of information and coordination of the activities to be undertaken by the insolvency representatives in pursuance of their obligations. Practice indicates that exchange of information has taken place on the basis of both written and oral agreements,²²⁴ and in some cases is the subject of a specific communication or information-sharing agreement, additional to an insolvency agreement of more general application.²²⁵

161. Where information is to be shared, the insolvency agreement may specify the types of information to be covered and the parties with whom that information may be shared. It may, for example, distinguish between the treatment of information that is publicly available and information that is not; identify specific categories of information that may be transmitted and the manner in which it might be shared;²²⁶ and specify the purposes for which information may be used, including any limitations that apply to that use, such as confidentiality requirements (see paras. 178-181 below).

(i) Information-sharing between insolvency representatives

162. Exchange of information may be specifically addressed or it may be pursued under a more general obligation to cooperate in an insolvency agreement.²²⁷ An agreement may specify a procedure such as that communication should take place on a regular basis, for example, through the provision of monthly operating reports prepared by each insolvency representative and transmitted to the other²²⁸ or through quarterly consultation meetings or conferences.²²⁹ The agreement may specify how those meetings should be conducted (whether by phone or in person) and the procedures to be followed.²³⁰ Such specific procedures may also include jointly developing a workplan to coordinate and govern the material steps to be taken by the insolvency representatives,²³¹ keeping each other regularly informed about their activities and material developments with respect to the debtor, as well

²²³ See, for example, *Everfresh and Systech*.

²²⁴ See, for example, *United Pan-Europe*.

²²⁵ See, for example, the *Madoff* information agreement. The cross-border agreement contains general provisions addressing communication and information-sharing between the insolvency representatives; the information agreement deals specifically with information-sharing between agents of the insolvency representatives and of the trustee appointed under the United States Securities Investor Protection Act. The information agreement is to be interpreted consistently with the cross-border agreement.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, paras. 4.4-4.7.

²²⁷ Compare *360Networks*, para. 11, and *Loewen*, para. 10, with *Manhatinv*, paras. 2-12 (in particular, paras. 9-12).

²²⁸ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. K.

²²⁹ See, for example, *Peregrine*, para. 17.

²³⁰ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, paras. 2-12.

²³¹ *Ibid.*

as providing notice of any application to the court²³² and, in some cases, drafts of those applications or copies of any documents filed in the proceeding²³³ or other significant documents or information.²³⁴ Provision of information may be assisted by requiring the insolvency representatives to keep clear records of the administration of the estate, including of significant management decisions,²³⁵ books and records that would account for disposal of the assets and monthly reports of the fees and expenses of the administration.²³⁶

163. Insolvency representatives may agree to make themselves available for consultation with their foreign counterparts upon request²³⁷ or to consult each other on specific matters, such as the preparation and negotiation of reorganization plans to be submitted in the different States.²³⁸ One agreement dealing with main and non-main proceedings in European Union member States referred to Article 31 of the EC Regulation and required each insolvency representative, prior to any disposal of assets, to prepare and provide to the other a list of the assets located in the territory of the non-main proceeding.²³⁹ It also required the insolvency representative of the main proceeding to make a proposal to the insolvency representative of the non-main proceeding for the global transfer of all assets. The insolvency representative of the non-main proceeding was to provide a copy of the proposal and its response to that proposal to the court administering the non-main insolvency proceeding. The insolvency representatives were also required to share a draft distribution plan and a list of creditors that had received distributions.²⁴⁰

(ii) *Sharing information with other parties*

164. In addition to the sharing of information between insolvency representatives, an insolvency agreement may address the sharing of that information with other parties, such as the courts involved and the creditors or creditor committee and, where there is more than one creditor committee, between those committees.²⁴¹ Such provisions may be useful to provide a degree of certainty and avoid potential conflict. The agreement may require, for example, that information shared by the insolvency representatives, such as monthly reports on their activities, could also be provided to the creditors, the creditor committee or the courts.²⁴² Additional information may be exchanged on request, either by an insolvency representative or by a creditor committee.

165. With a view to enhancing the transparency of the proceedings, some agreements provide that information publicly available in one forum should be

²³² See, for example, *Nakash*, para. 9.

²³³ See, for example, *Peregrine*, para. 14.

²³⁴ See, for example, *Swissair*, para. 8.1.2.

²³⁵ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 4.1.

²³⁶ See, for example, *Inverworld*, paras. 10 and 23.

²³⁷ See, for example, *Peregrine*, para. 16.

²³⁸ See, for example, *Maxwell*, paras. G.1 (iii), G.3 (iii) and, in particular, G.6.

²³⁹ See, for example, *SENDO*, pp. 7-8.

²⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

²⁴¹ This may occur where there are different committees for different classes of creditors or, where the agreement covers members of an enterprise group, the committees of different group members in different States. See, for example, *Lehman Brothers*, para. 6.1.

²⁴² See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 23, and *Commodore*, para. K.

made available in all forums²⁴³ or that all claimants in the proceedings should have similar access to disclosed information, including information as to the financial condition, status and activities of the debtor, the nature and effect of any reorganization plan and the status of proceedings in each jurisdiction.²⁴⁴ Sharing of information may also be enhanced by measures such as a court holding monthly status conferences.²⁴⁵

166. An insolvency agreement may also cover communication between the management of the debtor and the insolvency representatives. It may provide, for example, that the insolvency representatives and the management of the debtor entities should regularly consult on strategic matters, specifying the kind of information that management should provide to the insolvency representatives or providing the insolvency representatives with access to all books and other records requested. Relevant information might include minutes of board meetings of the debtor; periodical account information; periodical reports on the status of other legal proceedings involving the debtor; and copies of all tax returns.²⁴⁶

(iii) *Notice*

a. When notice is required

167. Provision of notice to interested parties is an essential element of the efficient administration of global insolvency proceedings and a reliable mechanism for the dissemination of basic information. Notice may be required to be given, under applicable law, to a number of different parties and stakeholders in those insolvency proceedings. While an insolvency agreement cannot circumvent the requirements of applicable law, it can extend those requirements (e.g. by providing notice more widely or including more comprehensive information), clarify the manner in which the provisions will operate across the different proceedings and supplement them, if necessary, to take account of the relationship between the different proceedings. Details that might be included in such agreements may include the party to give notice; to whom notice should be given; when notice is required; and the content of that notice.

168. Notice provisions in an insolvency agreement may be very general, relying upon procedures applicable under the relevant insolvency laws. Without specifying the exact circumstances warranting the provision of notice, one approach may be to indicate that where notice is required, it should be provided in writing, in accordance with the applicable law.²⁴⁷ Another approach might be to provide that all parties should receive notice of all proceedings in accordance with the practices of the respective courts.²⁴⁸

169. Agreements may also limit the requirements for provision of notice, excluding matters of a purely formal and non-substantive nature, or limit notice to cases where

²⁴³ See, for example, *Calpine*, para. 16, and *Masonite*, para. 13.

²⁴⁴ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 13.

²⁴⁵ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 25.

²⁴⁶ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, paras. 4.2-4.5; see also the *Legislative Guide* on obligations of the debtor (part two, chap. III, paras. 22-33 and recommendation 110).

²⁴⁷ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. E.

²⁴⁸ See, for example, *Livent*, para. (ii), and *Solv-Ex*, para. 2.

joint or coordinated hearings are held.²⁴⁹ Failure to provide notice as required may also be addressed, excusing a party from providing advance notice in a timely manner if circumstances reasonably prevented it from doing so,²⁵⁰ with the proviso that notice and an opportunity for a hearing should be given as soon as practicable after the preventing event.

170. Matters requiring notice to be given might include:

(a) An application by an insolvency representative to commence proceedings with respect to a member of the debtor's group²⁵¹ or any other application, request or document filed in one or all of the insolvency proceedings;

(b) Related hearings or other proceedings mandated by applicable law in connection with the insolvency proceedings;²⁵²

(c) An application for approval of remuneration and expenses of the insolvency representatives and professionals;²⁵³

(d) Issues concerning treatment of claims and reorganization plans;

(e) Court orders or reasons and opinions issued in the proceedings;²⁵⁴

(f) An action relating to investigation of assets in other forums;²⁵⁵

(g) The seeking of emergency relief;²⁵⁶

(h) A transaction, or an application for approval of a transaction involving the assets of the estate, including the use, sale, lease, deposit of funds or any other disposal;²⁵⁷

(i) Post-commencement finance.²⁵⁸

b. Parties required to give notice

171. Some agreements specify the persons required to provide notice, for example the insolvency representatives of the different proceedings, the debtor or the party otherwise responsible for effecting notice in the State where certain documents are filed or the proceedings are to be conducted.²⁵⁹

c. Recipients of notice

172. Different approaches are taken to specifying the persons to be notified of different aspects of cross-border insolvency proceedings. Some agreements specify

²⁴⁹ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 10, and *PSINet*, para. 28.

²⁵⁰ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. E.

²⁵¹ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. L, and *Maxwell*, paras. 2 (i) and 3 (vi), including for example a subsidiary or an intermediate holding company situated between the debtor and its affiliate or subsidiary companies.

²⁵² See, for example, *ABTC*, para. 3.

²⁵³ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, paras. 8 (a) (ii) and (b) (ii).

²⁵⁴ See, for example, *Loewen*, para. 21.

²⁵⁵ See, for example, *Nakash*, para. 9.

²⁵⁶ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 26.

²⁵⁷ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 3.

²⁵⁸ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. M (1)-(4).

²⁵⁹ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 14, and *Mosaic*, para. 19.

that notice requirements apply only to parties to the agreement, others require notice to be given generally to a number of recipients, including the debtor, creditor committee, creditors, the insolvency representatives and sometimes to other persons appointed or designated by the courts or entitled to receive notice according to the practice of the State where the documents are filed or the proceedings occur. Notice may be limited, with respect to creditors, to the creditor committee or to a certain number of the largest creditors, for example the 20 largest creditors. Recipients may also be determined by reference to a list maintained in one proceeding or they may include all parties that are entitled to notice in accordance with any order issued in either proceeding. Some agreements specify contact details, including fax numbers or the full addresses of the parties entitled to receive notice. Others not only list the parties entitled to receive notice, but also emphasize the obligations of those parties to give notice in accordance with the practices of the respective courts.²⁶⁰

173. Another example requires the insolvency representative of the main proceeding to give notice to all creditors based in other forums by regular mail in the form of individual notices setting forth the required formalities and penalties provided by the law applicable in the main proceeding. Notice may also be required to be given to creditors whose claims are to be dealt with by a court other than the one to which their claim was submitted.²⁶¹

174. Where the insolvency representative is required to obtain court approval in order to investigate or pursue assets of the debtor in a particular State, an insolvency agreement may require notice to be given to other courts involved in the proceedings.²⁶² Some agreements provide that where a request for an order contrary to the provisions of the agreement is made, all parties should be notified.²⁶³

d. Method of giving notice

175. Some insolvency agreements do not specify how the notice should be given, other than requiring that it should be in accordance with the practices of the respective courts or in writing.²⁶⁴ Other agreements list different methods from which the parties can choose, including courier, fax, e-mail or other electronic forms of communication²⁶⁵ or overnight mail, overnight delivery service²⁶⁶ or even delivery by hand.²⁶⁷ An agreement may also regulate the publication of notice, stipulating the time at which and the medium (e.g. newspaper) in which the debtor should publish the notice and the language of the notice to be given, in order to ensure that creditors, wherever situated, and other parties in interest will be able to

²⁶⁰ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. E, and *Laidlaw*, para. F.

²⁶¹ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, paras. 6 (c) and (d).

²⁶² See, for example, *Nakash*, para. 5.

²⁶³ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 18, and *Solv-Ex*, para. 15. The CoCo Guidelines provide, inter alia, that notice of any court hearing or any order should be given to the insolvency representatives where relevant to that insolvency representative (Guidelines 17.1-3).

²⁶⁴ See, for example, *AIOC*, para. II. E.

²⁶⁵ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 10.1.

²⁶⁶ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 3.

²⁶⁷ See, for example, *Olympia & York*, para. 4 (c), and *Swissair*, para. 10.2.

understand it, satisfying requirements for effectiveness and sufficiency. Another possible and evolving means of notice is the use of a website.²⁶⁸

176. An agreement may address the effectiveness of service of notice and the impact of changes of the address for service. One example provided that notice would be effective notwithstanding a change of address, where the change of address was not notified within certain time limits determined by reference to the giving of notice. In case of personal delivery for example, notification of the change had to be received before the time of delivery; in case of communication by fax, at the time of transmission (with automatic confirmation of receipt). In addition to these types of detail, an agreement can indicate the evidence required to prove service.

e. Notice concerning operation and implementation of the insolvency agreement

177. Some insolvency agreements include notice provisions with respect to operation or implementation of the agreement, requiring that notice be given for any supplementation, modification, termination or replacement of the agreement in accordance with the notice procedure described in it.²⁶⁹ Where disputes relating to the agreement arise, the agreement might require notice to be provided to specified parties.²⁷⁰

(c) Confidentiality of communication

178. Much of the information relating to the debtor and its affairs that needs to be considered and shared in insolvency proceedings may be commercially sensitive, confidential or subject to obligations owed to third persons (such as trade secrets, research and development information and customer information). Accordingly, its use needs to be carefully considered and disclosure appropriately restricted to avoid third parties being placed in a position where they can take unfair advantage of it. Confidentiality of information, especially in a cross-border case where requirements for protection of confidentiality may vary from State to State, may be an issue that could be addressed in an insolvency agreement.²⁷¹ Many practitioners require persons seeking access to communications to execute confidentiality agreements, the details of which, including the manner in which they are to be enforced, might be set out in an agreement.

²⁶⁸ See the website maintained in the *Lehman Brothers* insolvency proceedings (www.lehman.com), which provides links to the Chapter 11 proceedings and includes key documents (including master service lists), case information, key parties, estate information etc.

²⁶⁹ See, for example, *Loewen*, para. 26, and *Mosaic*, para. 25.

²⁷⁰ See, for example, *PSINet*, para. 31, and *Systech*, paras. 27-28.

²⁷¹ Principle 3D of the Concordat also addresses the issue of confidentiality. The CoCo Guidelines recommend that, to the fullest extent permissible under applicable law, any relevant information not available publicly should be shared by an insolvency representative subject to appropriate confidentiality arrangements to the extent that this is commercially and practically sensible (Guideline 7.5); and that the duty to provide information, within the meaning of the Guidelines, includes the duty to provide copies of documents at reasonable cost on request (Guideline 7.6). They further address communication between insolvency representatives (Guideline 6.1 and Guideline 7.1), including between insolvency representatives of a main and a non-main proceeding (Guideline 8).

179. Not all insolvency agreements provide for confidentiality of communication.²⁷² Those that do adopt various approaches, including providing generally that the information exchanged should be kept confidential or that non-public information may be made available subject to appropriate protections. These might include that confidentiality arrangements are made;²⁷³ the insolvency representatives have entered into a written agreement with the objective of protecting and preserving all privileges;²⁷⁴ the (written) consent of the concerned party has been obtained; or disclosure is required by applicable law²⁷⁵ or a court order.²⁷⁶ Where information is exchanged, an agreement may provide that such exchange does not constitute a waiver of any applicable privileges, including attorney-client or work product privileges.²⁷⁷

180. In addition to the sharing of information, confidentiality requirements may apply to the dispute resolution process concerning any conflicts under or regarding the agreement and any material produced in that process. Divulgence of information by any participants in that process may be limited or the agreement may provide that divulgence of such information cannot be compelled by, for example, the insolvency representative.²⁷⁸

181. Confidentiality agreements might also affect the creditor committee. One agreement provided that the creditor committee would be bound by the by-laws adopted in one jurisdiction, to relieve it from executing the confidentiality agreements otherwise required in the other proceeding.²⁷⁹

Sample clauses

Communication between courts

The courts of States A and B may communicate with one another with respect to any matter relating to the State A and State B proceedings. In addition, the courts may conduct joint or coordinated hearings with respect to any matter relating to the conduct, administration, determination or disposition of any aspect of those proceedings, provided both courts consider such hearings to be necessary or advisable and, in particular, to facilitate or coordinate the proper and efficient conduct of the proceedings. With respect to any such hearings, unless otherwise ordered, the following procedures will be followed:

(a) A telephone and/or video link shall be established to enable both courts to simultaneously hear the proceedings in the other court;

(b) The judges may appear and sit jointly in either court as agreed between them, provided that creditors and parties in interest may appear and be heard in person or at the courtroom of the judge who has travelled to appear in the other courtroom;

²⁷² *Maxwell* and *SENDO* do not.

²⁷³ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 5, and *Livent*, para. (v).

²⁷⁴ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 11.

²⁷⁵ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, paras. 4.6 (c) and 4.7 (a).

²⁷⁶ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 12.

²⁷⁷ See, for example, *Commodore*, para. M (6), and *Manhatinv*, para. 10.

²⁷⁸ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 18.

²⁷⁹ See, for example, *Quebecor*, para. 17.

(c) Any party intending to rely on any written evidentiary materials in support of a submission to either court in connection with any such hearing shall file those materials, which shall be consistent with the procedural and evidentiary rules and requirements of each court, in advance of the hearing. If a party has not previously appeared in or does not wish to submit to the jurisdiction of either court, it shall be entitled to file such materials without, by the act of filing, being deemed to have submitted to the jurisdiction of the court in which such material is filed, provided it does not request in those materials or submissions any affirmative relief from the court to which it does not wish to submit;

(d) Submissions or applications by any party shall be made initially only to the court in which such party is appearing and seeking relief. Where a joint or coordinated hearing is scheduled, the party making such applications or submissions shall file courtesy copies with the other court. Applications seeking relief from both courts must be filed with both courts;

(e) The judges who will hear any such application shall be entitled to communicate with each other, with or without counsel present, to establish guidelines for the orderly submission of documents and other materials and the rendering of decisions of the courts and to deal with any related procedural or administrative matters;

(f) The judges shall be entitled to communicate with each other after any such hearing, without counsel present, for the purposes of (i) determining whether consistent rulings can be made by both courts, (ii) coordinating the terms of the courts' respective rulings and (iii) addressing any other procedural or administrative matter.

Communication between the parties: information-sharing between insolvency representatives

(1) In addition to other provisions of this agreement addressing information-sharing, the insolvency representatives of States A and B agree to share all information that may lawfully be shared regarding the debtor, its present and former officers, directors and employees and its assets and liabilities, which each has or may have in its possession or under its control. The insolvency representatives may, but are not obliged to, share privileged information with each other. Each of the insolvency representatives shall keep the other fully apprised of its activities and material developments in matters concerning the debtor known to them.

(2) The entry of an order approving this agreement shall constitute the recognition by each relevant court, insolvency representative, the professionals retained by them, their employees and [...] that they are subject to, and do not waive any attorney-client, work product, legal, professional or any other privileges recognized under any applicable law.

Communication between the parties: sharing information with other parties

Information publicly available in either forum shall be made publicly available in the other. To the extent permitted, non-public information shall be made available to official representatives of the debtor, including the creditor committee and any other official committee appointed in proceedings with respect to the debtor, and parties in interest, including providers of post-commencement finance, subject to appropriate confidentiality agreements.

Notice

(1) Notice of any application or document filed in one or both of the insolvency proceedings and notice of any related hearing or other proceeding mandated by applicable law in connection with the insolvency proceedings or this agreement shall be given by appropriate means (including, where circumstances warrant, by courier, fax or other electronic form of communication) to the following parties:

(a) All creditors and other parties in interest in accordance with the practice of the jurisdiction where the document is filed or the proceedings are to occur;

(b) To the extent the parties referred to in subparagraph (a) are not entitled to receive such notice, to counsel, the creditor committee, the insolvency representatives and such other parties as may be designated by either of the courts from time to time.

(2) Notice in accordance with this paragraph shall be given by the party otherwise responsible for effecting notice in the jurisdiction where the document is filed or the proceedings are to occur. In addition, the debtor shall provide to the court of State A or B, upon request, copies of all orders or similar papers issued by the other court in the insolvency proceeding.

Confidentiality of communication

The insolvency representatives of States A and B agree that they shall not provide any non-public information received from each other regarding any present or former officer, director or employee of the debtor to any third party, unless the provision of that information is:

(a) Agreed to by the party to whom the information relates or the other insolvency representative, as applicable;

(b) Required by applicable law; or

(c) Required by order of any relevant court.

7. Effectiveness, amendment, revision and termination of cross-border insolvency agreements

(a) Effectiveness and conditions precedent to effectiveness

182. Parties negotiating an insolvency agreement want the result to be effective. For this reason, some agreements set out the procedure by which they are to become

effective; most of the agreements analysed in the *Practice Guide* involved approval of the courts of the different forums.²⁸⁰ The approval may be that of a specific court or of all courts involved in the proceedings and an additional provision may make it clear that the agreement will have no binding or enforceable legal effect until that approval is obtained. In approving an insolvency agreement, a court may also specify that it will only be binding upon the parties when approval of the other courts has been obtained.²⁸¹ Some agreements include additional requirements, such as that the decision to approve by one court should be transmitted to all creditors that have submitted claims in the insolvency proceedings before that court²⁸² or to the parties that have signed the agreement.²⁸³

183. An alternative approach, required under some national laws, is approval by a creditor committee, with copies of the insolvency agreement and approval to be provided to the court in order for the agreement to become effective.²⁸⁴ Agreements not approved by the courts may be enforceable under contract law.

184. In practice, the courts involved in approval of insolvency agreements to date have been willing to do so, on the basis that the agreements represent the consensus reached by the relevant parties, including the insolvency representatives that are often appointed by the courts. Courts have tended to trust the professional judgement of insolvency representatives who, as experienced insolvency practitioners, have drafted the agreement as a pragmatic solution to harmonize and coordinate concurrent insolvency proceedings.²⁸⁵

185. In deciding on the approval of an insolvency agreement, courts have looked to factors such as whether a conflict with any principle of comity was at stake and whether the principle of equal treatment of creditors was observed.²⁸⁶ Courts have ensured they do not approve an agreement that would authorize something contrary to the law or ultra vires. In a case concerning concurrent insolvency proceedings, one court had before it a reorganization plan drafted by the insolvency representatives of the other jurisdiction. The court only approved the plan with modifications, on the basis that it could not approve a reorganization plan that authorized something contrary to the law or ultra vires, as the plan would have amounted to a waiver of any liability for the directors of any company in the debtor group for any breach of duty to its respective company.²⁸⁷ To facilitate approval and avoid challenges, the process of approval may permit creditors to raise objections to the content or drafting of the agreement, which would be considered by the court in deciding upon approval.

²⁸⁰ See, for example, *MacFadyen*, para. 9, and *Pope & Talbot*, para. 25.

²⁸¹ See, for example, *Solv-Ex*, para. 15, and *Systech*, para. 25. The order approving the insolvency agreement might also provide that that approval is subject to approval of the insolvency agreement by the court of the other State; see, for example, *Nortel Networks*, order of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (15 January 2009).

²⁸² See, for example, *AIOC*, para. 1.

²⁸³ See, for example, *Nakash*, para. 38.

²⁸⁴ See, for example, *ISA-Daisytek*, paras. 10.1-10.2, and *Lehman Brothers*, para. 14.6.

²⁸⁵ The English judge involved in the *Maxwell* case noted that “in general the attitude of the court is that if the administrator’s business judgment is that doing something would be in the best interest of creditors, the court will accept that judgment”.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁷ See *Re APB Holdings Ltd.*, High Court of Justice of Northern Ireland, Chancery Division, [1991] N.I. 17.

186. In addition to court approval, an agreement may authorize the parties to take such actions and execute such documents as might be necessary and appropriate for its effective implementation²⁸⁸ or the parties may expressly agree that they will do everything appropriate to give full effect to the terms of the agreement.²⁸⁹

(b) Amendment, revision and termination of a cross-border insolvency agreement

187. To accommodate changing circumstances, many agreements contain provisions on amendment. Typically, those agreements approved by the court stipulate that the agreement cannot be supplemented, amended or replaced in any manner except as approved by the respective courts, following notice to specified parties and a hearing.²⁹⁰ Some agreements require, in addition to the approval of the courts, the written consent of the parties. Those parties may be specified and include the debtor, the insolvency representatives, certain creditors or a creditor committee. Amendments may involve, for example, changing the terms of the agreement or adding a party, which in the group context might include an insolvency representative appointed in proceedings concerning additional group members.²⁹¹

188. Not all amendments to an agreement will require court approval. Examples of some that may not include (a) removing as a party any debtor that has ceased, or is about to cease, to be a member of the debtor group or that has ceased, or is about to cease, to be the subject of insolvency proceedings in any State; (b) substituting, adding or removing an individual as an insolvency representative; or (c) conforming amendments that result from the preceding examples in (a) and (b). Some agreements include a safeguard that no amendment may adversely affect any rights to indemnification, immunity or other protection contemplated by the agreement with respect to actions taken prior to such amendment.

189. Some agreements particularize who has the right to amend or terminate the agreement; when this could be done; and its impact. One agreement, for example, specified that any party in interest could apply to either court at any time to amend or terminate the agreement. In an agreement requiring the parties' consent for effectiveness, any amendment would generally need the consent of each party. Amendment would generally render the earlier version of an agreement or the relevant part of that agreement null and void.

190. Although not all insolvency agreements include a provision on termination, those that do mention it in the context of amendment or specify when termination would occur. Those situations might include:

- (a) The conclusion of the proceedings as defined by applicable law;
- (b) The entry of an order terminating the agreement by the court having jurisdiction over the agreement;
- (c) Approval of the termination by a creditor committee in accordance with applicable law;

²⁸⁸ See, for example, *Inverworld*, para. 37, and *Solv-Ex*, para. 16.

²⁸⁹ See, for example, *Federal-Mogul*, para. 12.2.

²⁹⁰ See, for example, *Quebecor*, para. 28.

²⁹¹ See *Lehman Brothers*, paras. 12.1-12.2, and chap. III, para. 18 above.

- (d) Written notification by the insolvency representative that the agreement is terminated;
- (e) Written notification by management that the agreement is terminated;
- (f) In reorganization, the entry into effect under applicable law of a reorganization plan.²⁹²

Sample clauses

Effectiveness and conditions precedent to effectiveness

Variant A

This agreement shall become effective only upon its approval by the courts of State A and State B.

Variant B

(1) According to the law of State A, the effectiveness of this agreement is subject to the approval of the creditors of the debtor. The State A insolvency representative will convene a creditors meeting in State A as soon as practicable and will use all reasonable endeavours to obtain the creditors' approval of this agreement.

(2) The State A insolvency representative will report the terms of this agreement to the State A court within [...] days of the creditors meeting referred to in paragraph (1).

(3) The State B insolvency representative will report the terms of this agreement to the State B court within [...] days of this agreement.

Amendment, revision and termination

This agreement may not be supplemented, modified, terminated or replaced in any manner except by the written agreement of the parties and approval of the courts of both States A and B. Notice of any legal proceeding to supplement, modify, terminate or replace this agreement shall be given in accordance with paragraph [...] of this agreement.

8. Costs and fees

191. Costs may be incurred in the course of administration of insolvency proceedings, be it for the investigation of the debtor's assets, the insolvency representative's remuneration, costs of the proceedings (e.g. court fees) and so forth. To ensure efficient administration of the proceedings, many insolvency agreements address the costs and fees of proceedings, and at least some specifically address the insolvency representative's remuneration.²⁹³ In general, agreements follow the

²⁹² See *Lehman Brothers*, para. 14.7. The agreement also provided that it would terminate upon a decision by the court or relevant committee that it had achieved all of its objectives with respect to a particular proceeding.

²⁹³ See *Solv-Ex*, para. 9.

principle that obligations incurred by the insolvency representatives should be funded from the respective insolvency estate.²⁹⁴

192. Insolvency agreements typically address the costs and fees that are to be paid, how they are to be paid and which court has jurisdiction over the issue. Some provide, for example, that fees of professionals retained by the debtor or even by the secured lenders or the lenders providing post-commencement finance should be subject to the jurisdiction of the court of the forum State; approval by another court is not required. Typically, such a provision will apply in respect of each State involved in the agreement and may require parties in interest to request the courts to consider whether a different allocation of expenses would be more appropriate, based on the facts and circumstances of the case. Similarly, the fees, costs and ordinary expenses of the insolvency representative and of professionals retained by the insolvency representative would generally be paid from the insolvency estate in the State in which they are appointed.²⁹⁵ A detailed procedure for accounting, including the exchange of monthly accounts between the insolvency representatives and a requirement for those accounts to be treated confidentially, may also be stipulated.

193. Where an insolvency agreement covers parallel insolvency proceedings, provisions on costs might address how the costs are to be apportioned between them. In one agreement²⁹⁶ involving both main and non-main proceedings for example, the legal costs of the non-main proceeding were to be met from the assets of the debtor as an expense of the administration of the main proceeding, but subject to certain limits and to applicable law as to what those costs could include, for example verification of claims lodged, including wages due, and recovery of assets as a result of actions initiated or pursued by the insolvency representatives. The agreement also specified the amount that the insolvency representatives of the non-main proceeding would receive as an expense of the administration of the main proceeding and determined which judge would have jurisdiction to set the fees.

194. Some insolvency agreements include a provision concerning disclosure of costs and fees, requiring costs and remuneration received in each proceeding to be disclosed in the other proceedings, to ensure transparency and to guarantee trust and confidence between the courts of different jurisdictions regarding payment of compensation to professionals. In a case where no written insolvency agreement was concluded,²⁹⁷ one court approved the fees of the professionals retained in the foreign proceeding and, in turn, the foreign representative participated in the review of the fees of professionals retained in the local proceeding.

²⁹⁴ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 14; see also Principle 5.1 of the Principles of European Insolvency Law, ed. McBryde, Flessner and Kortmann, Law of Business and Finance, Vol. 4, Kluwer 2003, which is common to many European national insolvency laws. The CoCo Guidelines recommend that obligations incurred by the insolvency representative during proceedings and the insolvency representative's fees should be funded from the assets administered in the proceedings in which it is appointed (Guideline 11.1).

²⁹⁵ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 14.

²⁹⁶ See, for example, *SEND0*, pp. 5-7. The CoCo Guidelines recommend that obligations and fees incurred by the insolvency representative in the main proceedings prior to the opening of any non-main proceedings, but concerning assets to be included in the estate in principle should be funded by the estate corresponding to the non-main proceedings (Guideline 11.2).

²⁹⁷ See *United Pan-Europe*.

Sample clauses

Costs and fees

The insolvency representatives of States A and B agree that their respective fees, costs and ordinary course expenses (including those of the professionals and other agents retained by each of them, as well as the cost of assisting one another) in the first instance shall be payable from the funds that each representative holds in State A or B, respectively. Nothing in this agreement shall preclude the insolvency representatives from transferring funds to each other to meet fees approved by the relevant court, costs and ordinary course expenses of administration or for purposes of distribution, if to do so would in the reasonable opinion of either insolvency representative be consistent with the objectives of this agreement.

9. Safeguards

195. The terms of an insolvency agreement should not lead to infringement of national law or the rights and obligations of parties in interest. Consequently, an agreement may include a range of safeguard provisions i.e. provisions that protect or preserve a certain status that can be related to rights, principles or facts. Typically, safeguard provisions are intended to preserve rights and jurisdiction, exclude or limit liability and warrant the parties' authority to enter into the agreement. The latter is of particular importance, as parties want to be assured that their counterpart is appropriately authorized and that applicable law will be observed. As noted above (see para. 50), some insolvency agreements include a sentence at the end of a provision to the effect that, notwithstanding the foregoing, the provision should not be construed as having a certain effect. Other agreements include more general safeguard provisions.²⁹⁸

(a) Preservation of rights and jurisdiction

196. An insolvency agreement can stipulate that its terms or any actions taken pursuant to it should not prejudice or affect the powers, rights, claims and defences of the debtor and its estate, the insolvency representative, the creditors or equity holders under applicable law nor preclude or prejudice the right of any person to assert or pursue their substantive rights against any other person under applicable law.²⁹⁹ Provisions on the preservation of jurisdiction may also be included, for example that nothing in the agreement is intended to affect, impair, limit, extend or enlarge the jurisdiction of the courts involved, as, notwithstanding cooperation and coordination, each court should be entitled at all times to exercise its independent jurisdiction and authority with respect to matters presented to it and the conduct of the parties appearing before it.³⁰⁰

197. An insolvency agreement may also provide examples of what it should not be construed as doing, including:

²⁹⁸ The Court-to-Court Guidelines provide that the Guidelines should not affect any powers, orders or substantive determination of any matter in controversy before the court or other court nor a waiver by any party of its rights or claims (Guideline 17).

²⁹⁹ See, for example, *360Networks*, para. 32; *Loewen*, para. 28; and *Philip*, para. 27.

³⁰⁰ See, for example, *Laidlaw*, para. 8, and *Commodore*, para. T.

(a) Requiring the debtor, the creditor committee or the insolvency representative to breach any duties imposed on it by national law, including the debtor's obligations to pay certain fees to the insolvency representative under the applicable law;³⁰¹

(b) Authorizing any action that requires specific approval of one or both courts;

(c) Precluding any creditor or other party in interest from asserting its substantive rights under applicable law including, without limitation, the right to appeal from decisions taken by one or all of the courts involved;

(d) Affecting or limiting the debtor's or other parties' rights to assert the applicability or otherwise of the stays ordered in the different proceedings to any particular proceeding, asset or activity, wherever pending or located.³⁰²

198. A similar type of clause might provide that approval of a certain action does not extend to approval of all steps taken in pursuance of that action. For example, where relief from the automatic stay is granted for a specific purpose, such as to allow the insolvency representative to investigate the debtor's assets, the granting of the relief should not be construed as approving any specific actions the insolvency representative might take in pursuit of that purpose.

(b) Limitation of liability

199. An insolvency agreement may provide that, notwithstanding cooperation between the different parties, neither the insolvency representatives nor the professionals retained by them, their employees, agents or representatives should incur any liability in respect of or resulting from the actions of their counterparts in other States. The parties may also agree to include further persons in such a clause, such as a mediator, if the provisions on dispute resolution include mediation.³⁰³

(c) Warrantees

200. Some insolvency agreements contain a provision in which each party represents and warrants to the other that its execution, delivery and performance of the agreement are within its power and authority;³⁰⁴ such a provision may not be required where the court is to approve the agreement.

Sample clauses

Preservation of rights

Neither the terms of this agreement nor any actions taken under the terms of this agreement shall prejudice or affect the powers, rights, claims and defences of the debtors and their estates, the creditor committee, the insolvency representatives or any of the debtor's creditors under applicable law, including the laws relating to insolvency of States A and B and the orders of the courts of States A and B.

³⁰¹ See, for example, *360Networks*, para. 34, and *Livent*, para. 24.

³⁰² See, for example, *Systech*, para. 23.

³⁰³ See, for example, *Manhatinv*, para. 21.

³⁰⁴ See, for example, *Everfresh*, para. 19, and *Inverworld*, para. 32.

Preservation of jurisdiction

Nothing in this agreement shall increase, decrease or otherwise affect in any way the independence, sovereignty or jurisdiction of any of the relevant courts in States A or B, including, without limitation, the ability of any of the relevant courts under applicable law to provide appropriate relief.

Limitation of liability

(1) The State A insolvency representative acknowledges:

(a) That the State B insolvency representative acts as insolvency representative of the debtor in accordance with the applicable law of State B and without any personal liability;

(b) That neither it nor the debtor has any claim whatsoever against the State B insolvency representative other than under this agreement.

(2) The State B insolvency representative acknowledges:

(a) That the State A insolvency representative acts as insolvency representative of the debtor in accordance with the applicable law of State A and without any personal liability; and

(b) That neither it nor the debtor has any claim whatsoever against the State A insolvency representative other than under this agreement.

Warrantees

Each party represents and warrants to the other that its execution, delivery and performance of this agreement are within its power and authority and have been duly authorized by it or approved by the court as applicable.

Annex I

Case summaries^a

1. *AbitiBowater (2009)*^b

The case of *AbitiBowater* included a Delaware corporation as the ultimate parent company of a multinational enterprise that operated through its various subsidiaries and affiliates in the United States, Canada and other countries. AbitiBowater Inc. and certain of its subsidiaries commenced reorganization proceedings under Chapter 11 of the United States Bankruptcy Code in the United States. Some of the Chapter 11 debtors and other subsidiaries of AbitiBowater commenced reorganization proceedings in Canada. Though the United States and the Canadian proceedings were separate proceedings, an insolvency agreement was developed to implement administrative procedures to coordinate certain activities, to protect the rights of parties, to ensure the maintenance of the courts' respective independent jurisdictions and to give due effect to any applicable doctrines, including comity. The insolvency agreement contains all provisions common to a "standard" insolvency agreement.^c It provides also that, upon request by either court, the insolvency representative in the Canadian proceedings or the debtors in the United States proceedings should provide to the respective court copies of all or any orders, decisions, opinions or similar papers issued by the other court in the reorganization proceedings. Further, it states explicitly that the agreement should not abrogate the requirements of a particular provision of law i.e. Interim Rule 5012 on Communication and cooperation with foreign courts and foreign representatives of the United States Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure. In addition, the agreement incorporates the Court-to-Court-Guidelines by reference.

2. *ABTC (2000)*^d

In the case of *AgriBioTech Canada Inc. (ABTC)*, parallel insolvency proceedings were conducted in Canada and the United States with respect to the subsidiary of one of the largest forage and turf grass seed producers in the United States. One key point of the agreement was coordination of the sales of the debtor's assets, which were made conditional on approval by both courts. The resulting

^a The majority of the agreements referred to in this annex are available on one or another of the following websites: www.globalinsolvency.com; www.iiiglobal.org; www.casselsbrock.com. Those not publicly available at the time this publication went to press are marked with an asterisk.

^b Superior Court of the Province of Quebec, Case No. 500-11-036133-094 (July 28, 2009), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (Case No. 09-11296).

^c A comparison of a number of insolvency agreements entered into in recent years reveals that there are some more generic agreements which resemble each other and contain the same provisions, addressing background; purpose and goals; comity and independence of the courts; cooperation, including provisions on the procedure of communication, such as joint hearings; retention and compensation of insolvency representatives; notice; recognition of stays of proceedings; rights to appear and be heard; effectiveness; modification and procedure for resolving disputes under the insolvency agreements and preservation of rights. Those insolvency agreements are referred to here as "standard" agreements.

^d Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 31-OR-371448 (16 June 2000), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada, Case No. 500-10534 (28 June 2000) (unofficial version).

proceeds were to be kept in a segregated account under the authority of the Canadian court. Joint hearings by means of modern telecommunications were contemplated by the agreement, as well as the judges' right to discuss related matters in confidence. Creditors had the right to appear before either court and would then be subject to the respective court's jurisdiction. The debtor agreed to submit substantially similar reorganization plans in both jurisdictions, which the creditors could either jointly accept or reject. The Canadian court was appointed to process the creditor claims in accordance with Canadian law, but the validity of those claims was to be determined in accordance with the law governing the underlying obligation. The agreement also included a provision on avoidance of transactions.

3. *AIOC (1998)*^e

In this case, involving AIOC Corporation and AIOC Resources AG, an insolvency agreement dealing particularly with liquidation was developed between Switzerland and the United States. The difficulties in the case arose not only because of the differences between Swiss and United States insolvency law, but also because of the inability of the Swiss and United States insolvency representatives to abstain from their statutory responsibilities to administer the respective liquidations. The parties negotiated the agreement as a means of jointly liquidating assets in a manner consistent with the insolvency laws of both countries. The management of the liquidations by means of the insolvency agreement is one of the key features of the case. The agreement was based upon the Concordat, but focused generally on marshalling assets and, specifically, on procedures for administering the reconciliation of claims.

4. *Akai (2004)*^{f*}

The case of *Akai Holdings Limited* involved concurrent liquidation proceedings in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of China (SAR) and Bermuda. The objective of the insolvency agreement was the simultaneous administration of both liquidation proceedings from the Hong Kong SAR, which was the principal place of business of the debtor companies, although the agreement recognized the Bermuda proceeding as the "main proceeding". The agreement was drafted to take into account the relevant provisions of the Hong Kong SAR and Bermudan insolvency laws and enable the insolvency representatives to administer both liquidations in the most economical way. Accordingly, creditor claims could be filed in either jurisdiction. The Hong Kong SAR court approved the agreement, noting that in the absence of legislation to deal with matters affecting cross-border insolvency, the proposed agreement seemed to be the best way to serve the interests of creditors. As in the insolvency agreements in the *GBFE* and *Peregrine* cases (see paras. 12 and 30 below), the same individuals were appointed as insolvency representative for each of the companies in the two jurisdictions. As annexes, the agreement included several standard forms including for the proof of debt and a notice of rejection of the proof of debt.

^e United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District Court of New York, Case Nos. 96 B 41895 and 96 B 41896 (3 April 1998).

^f High Court of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, Cases No. HCCW 49/2000 and HCCW 50/2000 (6 February 2004), and the Supreme Court of Bermuda.

5. *Calpine (2007)*^g

Calpine Corporation, a Delaware corporation, was the ultimate parent company of a multinational enterprise that operated through various subsidiaries and affiliates in the United States, Canada and other countries. Reorganization proceedings commenced in the United States and in Canada, with the respective debtors being separate and distinct. At the outset, the proceedings were conducted in tandem with memorandums of understanding being concluded on specific issues. However, in recognition of the close relationship between the companies, for example they were each the largest creditors of the other, an insolvency agreement was developed, inter alia, to coordinate and harmonize the proceedings. The Canadian court rejected an application at the beginning of proceedings for approval of the insolvency agreement as premature, holding that the proceedings were not aimed at a global restructuring of all the applicants and that an insolvency agreement should not be used as a mechanism to re-litigate issues but to advance coordination and cooperation. Subsequently, the court approved the insolvency agreement when satisfied that it had been properly negotiated and advanced the interests of various parties in interest on both sides of the border. *Calpine* resembles in form a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c), although it did not include a specific provision on rights to appear and be heard. Further, one memorandum of understanding, aimed at the resolution of intercompany claims, preceded and was subsequently incorporated into the agreement. In addition, the agreement contained a provision that required the Canadian and the United States debtors to negotiate a specific claims agreement to address claims filed by each other (and their respective creditors) in the other’s case. The goals set out in the agreement were: to avoid duplication of activities, to honour the sovereignty of the courts involved and to facilitate the fair, open and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings. The agreement also contained provisions on access to information and the development of a reorganization plan. The agreement incorporated by reference the Court-to-Court Guidelines.

6. *Commodore (1994)*^h

The *Commodore Business Machines* case involved insolvency proceedings in the Bahamas and the United States. The insolvency agreement was entered into by the Bahamian insolvency representatives and the creditor committee. Its main purpose was to convert the involuntary Chapter 7 proceedings under the United States Bankruptcy Code, which had commenced on the application of some creditors, into Chapter 11 proceedings in the United States and to resolve contemplated litigation. The parties agreed that the Bahamian insolvency representatives would perform the functions customarily performed by a debtor in possession under Chapter 11. Other objectives of the agreement included facilitating the liquidation of assets in both jurisdictions and avoiding conflicting decisions by the courts involved. Consequently, the Bahamian insolvency representatives were appointed as debtors in possession in the United States proceedings. The agreement regulated the submission of claims; the retention and compensation of insolvency

^g United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 05-60200 (9 April 2007), and Court of Queens Bench of Alberta, Case No. 0501-17864 (7 April 2007).

^h United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York and the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas (1994).

representatives, accountants and attorneys; and the responsibility of the insolvency representatives to inform both courts and the creditor committee, to manage funds, to sell assets, to lend or borrow monies and to initiate legal proceedings.

7. *Eddie Bauer (2009)*ⁱ

Eddie Bauer Canada, Inc., and Eddie Bauer Customer Services Inc. commenced insolvency proceedings in Canada, while the United States parent company Eddie Bauer Holdings, Inc., and certain of its affiliates and subsidiaries commenced insolvency proceedings in the United States. None of the United States or Canadian debtors were debtors in both proceedings. However, the principal indebtedness of the Canadian debtors was an intercompany loan between each of them and the United States debtors. Though the insolvency proceedings in the United States and Canada were separate and independent, an insolvency agreement was viewed as necessary to implement basic administrative procedures to, among other things, coordinate certain activities and effectuate an orderly and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings. The agreement contains all provisions of a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c). It also stipulates that, upon request, the Canadian or United States debtors should provide to the respective court copies of any orders, decisions, opinions or similar papers issued by the other court in the insolvency proceedings. The agreement incorporated by reference the Court-to-Court Guidelines.

8. *EMTEC (2006/2007)*^{j*}

The case of *EMTEC* involved a group interlinked in a classical pyramidal structure with a holding company, incorporated in the Netherlands, and below it three French companies and a German company, which held the share capital of other companies located in the European Union or Asia. Insolvency proceedings commenced in France for all companies in the group, including those whose registered offices were located abroad. Non-main insolvency proceedings were opened in Germany upon the request of the insolvency representative of the French proceedings. Both insolvency representatives then entered into an agreement for the purpose of establishing conditions for distribution of the assets among the creditors and cooperation between the insolvency representatives, in particular the exchange of information regarding verification of claims and distribution of assets. The agreement provided that the insolvency representative of the main proceedings would transfer certain funds to the insolvency representative of the non-main proceeding, which the latter would then distribute to the creditors without discriminating between the creditors in the different proceedings. The insolvency representative in the non-main proceeding agreed to avoid double payment to creditors that had filed in both proceedings. It was further agreed that claims admitted in both proceedings would be paid in the proceedings in which they would receive the higher amount. The insolvency representative of the non-main proceeding agreed to inform the insolvency representative of the main proceeding in writing before making any distribution. The agreement provided that it was governed exclusively by French law and that the French court would have exclusive jurisdiction over any dispute concerning the agreement.

ⁱ United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 09-12099 (24 June 2009), and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Commercial List).

^j Commercial Court of Nanterre and the Insolvency Court of Mannheim.

9. *Everfresh (1995)*^k

The first insolvency agreement modelled on the Concordat principles was finalized in a case involving the United States and Canada. Everfresh Beverages Inc., a United States company with Canadian operations, applied for commencement of reorganization proceedings in both States at the same time. The agreement explicitly addressed a broad range of cross-border insolvency issues such as choice of law; choice of forum; claims resolution, including classification and treatment of unsecured claims; asset sales; and avoidance proceedings. Creditors were given the express right to submit claims in either proceeding. The agreement followed many of the principles of the Concordat very closely, using as a starting point Principle 4, which addresses the situation where there is no main proceeding but essentially two parallel proceedings in different States. The agreement was finalized approximately one month after proceedings began and used to hold the first cross-border joint hearing to coordinate the proceedings.

10. *Federal-Mogul (2001)*^l

Federal-Mogul Global Inc. concerned reorganization proceedings of a major automotive parts supplier in the United States and in Great Britain. The insolvency agreement, which had to take into account pending asbestos claims against the English subsidiaries, established as its goals the orderly and efficient administration of the insolvency proceedings, the coordination of activities and the implementation of a framework of general principles. The agreement gave responsibility for the development of a reorganization plan and the handling of the asbestos and insurance claims to the United States debtors in possession. The acquisition, sale and encumbrance of assets were subject to prior approval by the insolvency representatives, as were most other activities outside the ordinary course of business. Further, the agreement dealt with communication procedures between the debtors and the insolvency representatives; confidentiality issues; rights to appear before the respective courts; the mutual recognition of stays of proceedings; and the retention and compensation of insolvency representatives and professionals.

11. *Financial Asset Management (2001)*^m

In the *Financial Asset Management Foundation* case, insolvency proceedings concerning a trust were opened in Canada and the United States. An insolvency agreement was entered into by the debtor, the insolvency representatives and the main creditor. Each court agreed to defer in general to the judgement of the other court, as was “appropriate and feasible”. The agreement outlined the procedure for joint hearings and appearance before either court. It also confirmed the enforceability of a judgement that the main creditor had previously obtained against the debtor before a court in California. The agreement further specified the responsibility of the courts for determining certain issues, for example, the United

^k Ontario Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 32-077978 (20 December 1995), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 95 B 45405 (20 December 1995).

^l United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 01-10578, and the High Court of England and Wales, Chancery Division in London (2001).

^m United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of California, Case No. 01-03640-304, and the Supreme Court of British Columbia, Case No. 11-213464/VA.01 (2001).

States court was to be responsible for determining whether or not the debtor violated any order of the aforementioned judgment.

12. *GBFE (2003)*^{n*}

The Greater Beijing First Expressways Limited (*GBFE*) case involved insolvency proceedings in the British Virgin Islands and the Hong Kong SAR, concerning the liquidation of a toll way operator. The case is very similar to *Peregrine*, as the proceedings in the British Virgin Islands were mainly initiated to support the Hong Kong SAR proceeding and to further avoid jurisdictional conflicts and the dissipation of assets. Similarly to *Peregrine*, the insolvency representatives appointed in both proceedings were the same professionals, in order to coordinate activities, facilitate the exchange of information and identify, preserve and maximize the value of and realize the debtor's assets. Responsibilities for matters were split between both proceedings. The Hong Kong SAR representatives, for example, were responsible for the conduct of day-to-day business and the adjudication of creditor claims, while the British Virgin Island representatives were responsible for the realization of assets. In addition, the insolvency agreement regulated the filing of claims, currency of payments, the representatives' remuneration and notice requirements. It also included standard forms, as in the *Akai* and *Peregrine* agreements, including the proof of debt and notice of rejection of proof of debt.

13. *Inverworld (1999)*^o

Inverworld involved the United States, the United Kingdom and the Cayman Islands. It was a complicated case in which applications for commencement of insolvency proceedings were made for the debtor and several subsidiaries in the three jurisdictions. To avoid the ensuing conflicts, various parties created insolvency agreements that were approved by the courts in each of the three jurisdictions. The agreement arrangements included: dismissal of the United Kingdom proceedings, with certain conditions being imposed regarding the treatment of United Kingdom creditors; strict division of outstanding issues between the other two courts; and recognition by each court of the other court's actions as binding, in order to prevent parallel litigation and lead to a coordinated worldwide settlement.

14. *ISA-Daisytek (2007)*^{p*}

In the *ISA-Daisytek* case, parallel insolvency proceedings commenced in England and in Germany. The decision of the English court that the English proceedings were the main proceeding pursuant to the EC Regulation was challenged and not recognized for over one year in Germany. As a result, there had been uncertainty as to the respective status and powers and responsibilities of the English and German insolvency representatives. After the German courts recognized the English proceeding as main proceeding, the German and English insolvency

ⁿ High Court of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, HCCW No. 338/2000, and the High Court of Justice of the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court, Suit No. 43/2000 (2003).

^o United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Case No. SA99-C0822FB (22 October 1999), the High Court of England and Wales, Chancery Division (1999) and the Grand Court of the Cayman Islands (1999).

^p High Court of England and Wales, Chancery Division, Leeds, and the Insolvency Court of Düsseldorf.

representatives developed a “cooperation and compromise agreement” in order to resolve all outstanding issues between them and to deal with future steps in the insolvency proceedings. The insolvency agreement included a compromise provision, which regulated payment of proceeds in the German proceedings and dividends from certain foreign subsidiaries to the English proceedings, distributions to creditors and liability of the insolvency representatives. The agreement also included a provision on approval, specifying that according to German law, the effectiveness of the agreement was subject to the approval of the creditors and that the German insolvency representative would report the terms of the agreement to the responsible German court after the creditors’ meeting and that the English insolvency representatives would report the terms of the agreement to the responsible English court. The agreement further provided that it should be construed in accordance with English law and that the English courts would be exclusively responsible for enforcing its terms.

15. *Laidlaw* (2001)^q

The case of *Laidlaw Inc.* involved insolvency proceedings pending in Canada and the United States of a multinational enterprise operating through various subsidiaries and affiliates in the United States, Canada and other countries. The debtors submitted the insolvency agreement for the courts’ approval in order to implement basic administrative procedures necessary to coordinate certain activities in the insolvency proceedings. The agreement is a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c) and closely resembles other “standard” agreements, such as *Loewen*, including provisions on comity and independence of the courts; cooperation, including joint hearings; retention and compensation of insolvency representatives; notice; recognition of stays of proceedings; procedures for resolving disputes under the agreement; effectiveness of and modification of the agreement; and preservation of rights.

16. *Lehman Brothers* (2009)^r

From 15 September 2008 (the date of commencement of the United States proceedings), more than 75 insolvency proceedings commenced over time with respect to Lehman Brothers Holdings Inc. and its affiliated debtors in some 16 jurisdictions worldwide. Those proceedings involved different types of insolvency proceedings and different administering bodies (judicial, administrative, governmental, regulatory) in different jurisdictions. Prior to commencement of the proceedings, Lehman Brothers was one of the largest financial services firms in the world and a global group of companies that was characterized by a centralized cash management system and widespread sharing of information across 2,700 different software applications dispersed throughout subsidiaries around the globe. Given the integrated and global nature of Lehman Brothers’ businesses and the location of the debtors’ assets and activities across different States, the debtors and their insolvency representatives commenced discussions approximately one month after commencement of the United States proceedings, with a view to reaching an

^q Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 01-CL-4178 (10 August 2001), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Western District of New York, Case No. 01-14099 (20 August 2001).

^r United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 08-13555 (17 June 2009).

insolvency agreement that would facilitate the coordination of the different proceedings and enable the courts and insolvency representatives to cooperate in the administration of their respective proceedings. The initial signatories of the insolvency agreement included the United States debtors and the representatives of proceedings in Germany, Hong Kong SAR, Singapore and Australia. The agreement was intended to cover all proceedings spread over 16 jurisdictions. To further the aims of the agreement and recognizing that not all representatives would be able or willing to sign the agreement, the agreement expressly permits adherence to its terms without formal signature. The agreement includes details of the procedural history and the need for concluding such an agreement. Because of the substantive differences between participating jurisdictions, it is a statement of intentions and guidelines rather than a legally enforceable agreement. Other provisions cover communication among insolvency representatives, among courts and among creditor committees (incorporating the Court-to-Court Guidelines by reference where applicable), comity, notice, asset preservation, claims, reorganization plans, amendment, execution and application. The agreement also specifically permits insolvency representatives to enter into bilateral insolvency agreements with other parties to address issues specific to their proceedings, establishes a mechanism for resolution of intercompany claims and contemplates the addition of more parties over time.

17. *Livent (1999)*^s

Livent Inc., involving insolvency proceedings in the United States and Canada, was the first case in which joint cross-border hearings were conducted via a closed-circuit satellite television/videoconferencing facility. Two hearings were held. The first hearing was conducted to approve a cross-border insolvency agreement for the settlement of creditor claims against the debtor. The second hearing was to approve the sale of all or substantially all of the debtor's assets. The insolvency agreement expressly provided for such hearings and allowed the two judges some discretion to discuss and resolve procedural and technical issues relating to the joint hearing. The joint hearing was successfully concluded after two days and the courts issued complementary orders permitting the sale of assets in both countries to a single successful purchaser. The agreement also included provisions on asset sales, claims procedures, executory contracts, the allocation of sale proceeds and the application of avoidance laws.

18. *Loewen (1999)*^t

The debtor *Loewen Group Inc.*, a large multinational company, applied for commencement of insolvency proceedings in Canada and the United States and immediately presented both courts with a fully developed insolvency agreement establishing procedures for coordination and cooperation. The debtor had quickly identified cross-border coordination of court proceedings as vitally important to its reorganization plans and took the initiative of constructing a draft insolvency agreement that was approved as a "first day order" in both proceedings. The agreement resembled a "standard" insolvency agreement (see footnote c) and

^s United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 98-B-48312, and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 98-CL-3162 (11 June 1999).

^t United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 99-1244 (30 June 1999), and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 99-CL-3384 (1 June 1999).

provided that the two courts could communicate with each other and conduct joint hearings in accordance with stipulated rules; creditors and other interested parties could appear in either court; the jurisdiction of each court over insolvency representatives from the other jurisdiction was limited to the particular matters in which the foreign insolvency representative appeared before it; and any stay of proceedings would be coordinated between the two jurisdictions.

19. *MacFadyen (1908)*^u

In the case of *P. MacFadyen & Co, Ltd.*, probably the earliest reported case involving a cross-border insolvency agreement, insolvency proceedings were commenced against the deceased debtor in England and in India. The debtor had carried on business through two companies, one located in England and the other in India. The English and the Indian insolvency representatives negotiated a cross-border insolvency agreement, which provided for concurrent continuation of both insolvency proceedings, treatment of both companies as one, a rateable distribution of the assets to all creditors, regular exchange of information between the insolvency representatives on claims admitted by them and recognition of claims duly admitted in one proceeding in the other proceeding. It also set forth the responsibility of each insolvency representative for the recovery and realization of the assets in its jurisdiction. The agreement was subject to the approval of the courts in England and in India. In approving the agreement, the English court addressed the challenge brought by one creditor against the authority of the English insolvency representative to enter the agreement, holding that the agreement was a “proper and common-sense business arrangement to make, and one manifestly for the benefit of all parties interested”.

20. *Madoff (2009)*^v

In December 2008, insolvency proceedings commenced in England and the United States against Mr. Madoff and companies in the Madoff group, which engaged in the business of securities trading (Bernard L. Madoff Investments Securities LLC). The insolvency representatives of the proceedings concluded two insolvency agreements and sought approval by the United States court in June 2009. The basis of both agreements was the close relationship between the two companies and the fraud committed by Mr. Madoff; each of the debtor companies was likely to have assets and/or liabilities in both England and the United States, as well as elsewhere, and evidence with respect to the assets and liabilities of each debtor was likely to be held by the other. The first agreement (the “cross-border agreement”) provides details of the insolvency proceedings, including recognition of the respective insolvency proceedings under the national law enacting the UNCITRAL Model Law and, similar to the *Lehman Brothers* agreement, of the need for the agreement. It addresses a number of issues commonly addressed in such agreements, including the right to appear, costs, comity, amendment, effectiveness, and communication and information-sharing, with the Court-to-Court Guidelines to be “formally adopted” by each court. With respect to identification, preservation and realization of assets, the insolvency representatives should coordinate and cooperate and, in particular, agree on a case-by-case basis as to which of them was best placed

^u Re *P. MacFadyen & Co, ex parte Vizianagaram Company Limited* [1908] 1 K.B. 675.

^v United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Adv. Pro. No. 08-1789 (9 June 2009).

to deal with any particular asset. The insolvency representatives are also to consider implementing a mechanism for the resolution of intercompany claims. The second insolvency agreement on information-sharing (the “information agreement”) provides a mechanism for information sharing between the insolvency representatives and their respective agents, and details information to be shared, its permitted use and confidentiality. It also notes a mutual understanding that the insolvency representatives are fully cooperating with law enforcement agencies in the United States and the United Kingdom.

21. *Manhatinv* (2000)^w

The insolvency agreement in *Manhattan Investment Fund Limited* (*Manhatinv*), a case involving the United States and the British Virgin Islands, listed a number of objectives including coordinating the identification, collection and distribution of the debtor’s assets to maximize their value for the benefit of creditors and the sharing of information (including certain privileged communications) between the respective insolvency representatives to minimize costs and to avoid duplication of effort. The insolvency agreement included detailed provisions on cooperation between the insolvency representatives, who were to develop a workplan addressing material steps to be taken. It also included a provision for mediation of disputes between the insolvency representatives arising under the agreement.

22. *Masonite* (2009)^x

The case of *Masonite International Inc.* involved the Canadian parent company of a multinational enterprise operating worldwide through various subsidiaries and affiliates. Reorganization proceedings commenced for the Canadian parent company and certain of its subsidiaries and affiliates in the United States and in Canada. In March/April 2009, an insolvency agreement was approved by the United States and Canadian courts, in order to assist in coordinating activities between the two sets of proceedings. The agreement resembled a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c) and provided, recognizing that both the United States debtors and the Canadian debtors might be creditors of each of the other’s estates, that the debtors and their respective insolvency representatives should cooperate with each other in connection with actions taken in both proceedings and take any other appropriate steps to coordinate the administration of the reorganization proceedings for the benefit of the debtors’ respective estates. It further contained provisions that information publicly available in either jurisdiction should be publicly available in the other and that the insolvency representatives, the debtors, their creditors and other parties in interest should be subject to the personal jurisdiction of either court, as applicable, with respect to the particular matters in which they appeared before the courts. The insolvency agreement also determined that both courts might provide advice or guidance to each other with respect to legal issues in accordance with a certain procedure, including a writing requirement,

^w United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 00-10922 (April 2000), the High Court of Justice of the British Virgin Islands (19 April 2000) and the Supreme Court of Bermuda, Case No. 2000/37 (April 2000).

^x Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 09-8075-00CL (March 16, 2009), and United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 09-10844 (April 14, 2009).

adherence to the notice provision of the agreement and the possibility of inviting the debtors, the insolvency representatives or any other party in interest to make submissions in response to or in connection with any written advice or guidance received from the other court. In addition, the agreement included the Court-to-Court Guidelines by reference. The reorganization proceedings were conducted through a single plan approved by both courts. The entire reorganization of the Masonite companies both in Canada and the United States was successfully completed within only 85 days following initial filings.

23. *Matlack (2001)*^y

In the case of *Matlack Inc.*, a bulk transportation group operating in the United States, Mexico and Canada, an insolvency agreement was developed to coordinate insolvency proceedings pending in Canada and in the United States. The agreement resembled a “standard” agreement (see footnote c) and incorporated the Court-to-Court Guidelines as an appendix. Both courts agreed to recognize the respective foreign court’s stay of proceedings to prevent adverse actions against the debtors’ assets. The debtors, their creditors and other interested parties could appear before either court, and would by virtue of such appearance be subject to that court’s jurisdiction. Other issues dealt with by the agreement were the retention and compensation of professionals, notice requirements and the preservation of creditors’ rights.

24. *Maxwell (1991/1992)*^z

The case of *Maxwell Communication Corporation plc.* involved two primary insolvency proceedings initiated by a single debtor, one in the United States and the other in the United Kingdom, and the appointment of two different and separate insolvency representatives in the two States, each charged with a similar responsibility. The United States and English judges independently raised with their respective counsel the idea that an insolvency agreement between the two administrations could resolve conflicts and facilitate the exchange of information. Under the agreement, two goals were set to guide the insolvency representatives: maximizing the value of the estate and harmonizing the proceedings to minimize expense, waste and jurisdictional conflict. The parties agreed essentially that the United States court would defer to the English proceedings, once it was determined that certain criteria were present. Specificities included that some existing management would be retained in the interests of maintaining the debtor’s going concern value, but the English insolvency representatives would be allowed, with the consent of their United States counterpart, to select new and independent directors; the English insolvency representatives should only incur debt or file a reorganization plan with the consent of the United States insolvency representative or the United States court; and the English insolvency representatives should give

^y Superior Court of Justice of Ontario, Case No. 01-CL-4109, and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 01-01114 (2001).

^z In re Maxwell Communication Corporation plc, 93 F.3d 1036, 29 Bankr.Ct.Dec. 788 (2nd Cir. (N.Y.) 21 August 1996) (No. 1527, 1530, 95-5078, 1528, 1531, 95-5082, 1529, 95-5076, 95-5084), and Cross-Border Insolvency Protocol and Order Approving Protocol in Re Maxwell Communication plc between the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 91 B 15741 (15 January 1992), and the High Court of England and Wales, Chancery Division, Companies Court, Case No. 0014001 of 1991 (31 December 1991).

prior notice to the United States insolvency representative before undertaking any major transaction on behalf of the debtor, but were pre-authorized to undertake “lesser” transactions. Many issues were purposely left out of the agreement to be resolved during the course of proceedings. Some of those issues, such as distribution matters, were later included in an extension of the agreement.

25. *Mosaic (2002)*^{aa}

This case involved parallel insolvency proceedings in Canada and in the United States. From the beginning, the parties understood that the insolvency of the Mosaic web of companies was going to involve a number of complicated and contentious hearings in both jurisdictions and that establishing a framework within which the courts could independently, but cooperatively, deal with the various corporate entities was critical. The agreement took the form of a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c), closely resembling, in both format and contents, the agreements in *Loewen* and *Laidlaw*, including provisions on comity and independence of the courts; cooperation, including joint hearings; retention and compensation of insolvency representatives; notice; recognition of stays of proceedings; procedures for resolving disputes under the agreement; effectiveness and modification of the agreement; and preservation of rights. The agreement was instrumental to the success of cross-border sales in the proceedings.

26. *Nakash (1996)*^{bb}

The insolvency agreement in the *Nakash* case involved the United States and Israel. It required express statutory authorization in Israel and direct court involvement generally in its negotiation. It focused on enhanced coordination of court proceedings and cooperation between the judiciaries, as well as between the parties (previous agreements listed in this annex had focused on the parties). Unlike previous cases involving cross-border insolvency agreements, this case did not involve parallel insolvency proceedings for the same debtor. The relevant conflict and central issue in the case that the agreement sought to resolve was between the pursuit of a judgement against the debtor in Israel and the automatic stay arising from the debtor’s insolvency proceedings (pursuant to Chapter 11) in the United States, which should have prevented pursuit of the judgement. The debtor was not a signatory to the agreement and opposed its approval and implementation.

27. *360Networks (2001)*^{cc}

In *360Networks Inc.*, the insolvency agreement involved the United States and Canada. The 360 Group was a fibre-optics network provider with international operations, comprising more than 90 companies registered in about 33 jurisdictions with nearly 2,000 employees. As the main part of its assets and employees were located in both Canada and the United States, insolvency proceedings were

^{aa} Ontario Court of Justice, Toronto, Court File No. 02-CL-4816 (7 December 2002), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Case No. 02-81440 (8 January 2003).

^{bb} United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 94 B 44840 (23 May 1996), and the District Court of Jerusalem, Case No. 1595/87 (23 May 1996).

^{cc} British Columbia Supreme Court, Vancouver, Case No. L011792 (28 June 2001), and United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 01-13721 (29 August 2001).

commenced in both jurisdictions. The initial orders included a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c) with the following goals: promoting orderly, efficient, fair and open administration; honouring the respective courts’ independence and integrity; promoting international cooperation and respect for comity between the Canadian and United States courts and any foreign court; and implementing a framework of general principles to address administrative issues arising from the cross-border nature of the proceedings. To achieve these goals, the insolvency agreement addressed, among other things, court-to-court coordination and cooperation, including joint hearings; notice; the retention and compensation of professionals; joint recognition of stays of proceedings; future foreign proceedings; and a procedure for resolving disputes under the agreement. However, the two restructuring processes progressed relatively independently with little reference to the agreement. Plans substantially similar to each other were filed in each jurisdiction, each being dependent on the approval of the other. Although the insolvency agreement made provision for joint hearings, none were needed.

28. *Nortel Networks (2009)*^{dd}

The case of *Nortel Networks Corporation* involved parallel insolvency proceedings in the United States and Canada for members of a large telecommunications group headquartered in Canada with subsidiaries and affiliates worldwide. Though the debtors in the United States and Canadian proceedings were different, an insolvency agreement was developed at the commencement of the proceedings to implement administrative procedures, coordinate activities in the insolvency proceedings and protect the rights of the parties. It was approved by both courts within one day. The agreement resembles a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c), including provisions on comity and independence of courts, cooperation and appearances, effectiveness, modification, procedures on resolving disputes under the agreement and incorporated the Court-to-Court Guidelines by reference. As in *Pope & Talbot* (see para. 33 below), the agreement specifies that when a question of the proper jurisdiction of the court is raised in either insolvency proceeding, the court might contact the other court to determine an appropriate process by which the issue of jurisdiction would be determined. The agreement further stipulates that the courts might also jointly determine that other cross-border matters arising in the insolvency proceedings should be dealt with under and in accordance with the principles of the agreement.

29. *Olympia & York (1993)*^{ee}

The case of *Olympia & York Developments Limited* involved a Canadian parent company and its subsidiaries that operated primarily in the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom. The insolvency agreement was drafted to balance the interests of parties involved, in particular the Canadian insolvency representative and the United States debtors in possession, and to achieve a consensus among the various parties regarding the corporate governance of the debtors by reconstructing the board of directors of each corporation. The agreement included provisions on the composition, authority, actions, removal and re-election of the directors and also on the modification and approval of the agreement. The

^{dd} Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 09-CL-7950 (14 January 2009), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 09-10138 (15 January 2009).

Olympia & York agreement resulted in the speedy and efficient reorganizations of the debtors by allowing the current management of the United States debtors to remain in place.

30. *Peregrine* (1999)^{ff}

In the *Peregrine Investments Holdings Limited* case, the debtor was incorporated in Bermuda and had its principal place of business in the Hong Kong SAR, where insolvency proceedings were commenced. Shortly afterwards, insolvency proceedings were also initiated in Bermuda, primarily to avoid jurisdictional conflicts and to ensure that the insolvency representatives appointed in the Hong Kong SAR had full authority in other jurisdictions and in relation to assets located outside of the Hong Kong SAR. The insolvency representatives were the same persons in both proceedings, except for one person appointed only in the Bermudan proceedings, but all were employed by the same international firm. The agreement was developed to harmonize and coordinate the proceedings; ensure the orderly and efficient administration of the proceedings in the two jurisdictions; identify, preserve and maximize the value of the debtor's worldwide assets for the collective benefit of the debtor's creditors and other parties in interest; coordinate activities; and share information. The agreement determined that the Bermudan proceedings would be the main proceedings and the Hong Kong SAR proceedings the non-main proceedings. Nevertheless, substantially all of the liquidation of the debtor's assets was to be carried out in and from the Hong Kong SAR, as the debtor's business activities were and had always been focused there. The agreement determined which matters should be principally dealt with in the Hong Kong SAR, for example the adjudication of claims of creditors and distribution of dividends to creditors. It also included provisions on the rights and powers of the insolvency representatives with respect to the exchange of information; costs and their taxation; and applications to the courts. As in the *Akai* and *GBFE* insolvency agreements, the agreement contained standard forms relating to the claims process.

31. *Philip* (1999)^{gg}

This *Philip Services Corporation* case is noted as being the first "cross-border pre-pack".^{hh} Prior to the initiation of insolvency proceedings in the United States and Canada, the debtor negotiated a reorganization plan with its creditors over several months. It was intended that, following court approval, the plan would be implemented in both jurisdictions. As in the *Loewen* case, a fully developed insolvency agreement was presented to and approved by the courts as an initial order. The case has been cited as an example of an agreement providing for broad

^{ee} Ontario Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. B125/92 (26 July 1993), and United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case Nos. 92-B-42698-42701 (15 July 1993) (Reasons for Decision of the Ontario Court of Justice: (1993), 20 C.B.R. (3d) 165).

^{ff} High Court of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, HCCW Companies (Winding-up) No. 20 of 1998, and the Supreme Court of Bermuda Companies (Winding-up) No. 15 of 1998 (1999).

^{gg} United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 99-B-02385 (28 June 1999), and the Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 99-CL-3442 (25 June 1999).

^{hh} A process available in some jurisdictions, where a reorganization plan is negotiated voluntarily prior to commencement of insolvency proceedings and subsequently approved by the court.

and general harmonization and coordination of cross-border proceedings, in line with the principles of the Concordat (as opposed to the very specific agreement in *Tee-Comm*. (see para. 43 below). The agreement resembled a “standard” agreement (see footnote c). The broad goals of the agreement included promoting orderly, efficient, fair and open administration; respecting the respective courts’ independence and integrity; promoting international cooperation and respect for comity; and implementing a framework of general principles to address administrative issues arising from the cross-border nature of the proceedings. To achieve those goals, the agreement addressed, among other things, court-to-court coordination and cooperation; the retention and compensation of professionals; and joint recognition of stays of proceedings. Under the agreement, the courts also agreed to cooperate, wherever feasible, in the coordination of claims processes; voting procedures; and plan confirmation procedures.

32. *Pioneer (2001)*ⁱⁱ

The *Pioneer Companies Inc.* case involved insolvency proceedings in the United States of a United States multinational enterprise and certain of its direct and indirect subsidiaries and affiliates and insolvency proceedings in Canada concerning one Canadian subsidiary, which was also a debtor in the United States proceedings. The insolvency agreement (concluded in both French and English) recognized that it was in the interests of the debtors and their stakeholders that the United States court should take charge of the principal administration of the reorganization and set forth general principles for the manner in which claims made against the debtors should be adjudicated, in particular relating to proof of claims.

33. *Pope & Talbot (2007)*^{ij}

The case of *Pope & Talbot Inc.* involved concurrent reorganization proceedings in the United States and Canada for a parent company conducting business in pulp and wood through its various Canadian and United States subsidiaries and with substantial assets located in both States. The debtor companies developed an insolvency agreement to facilitate the harmonization and coordination of activities in both jurisdictions and to provide transparency and ensure fairness to parties in interest in both States. The agreement resembled a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c), such as *Laidlaw*, *Loewen* and *Mosaic*, and also incorporated the Court-to-Court Guidelines by reference. It contained provisions on cooperation; reciprocal recognition of the stays ordered by the respective courts; rights to appear; retention and compensation of representatives and professionals; notice; effectiveness and modification; dispute resolution; and preservation of rights. As in the *Nortel Networks* case, the insolvency agreement included a provision permitting the courts to jointly find an appropriate process to resolve an issue of proper jurisdiction raised in either insolvency proceeding. It further contained a provision that any transaction outside the ordinary course of business for the sale, lease or use of real property of the debtors should be subject to the approval of the court of the jurisdiction in which the property was located, but

ⁱⁱ Quebec Superior Court, (Re PCI Chemicals Canada Inc.), Case No. 5000-05-066677-012 (1 August 2001), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas (Re Pioneer Companies Inc.), Case No. 01-38259 (1 August 2001).

^{ij} Supreme Court of British Columbia, Vancouver, Case No. SO77839, (14 December 2007), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case. No. 07-11738.

excluding the debtors' mills from that provision. The Canadian insolvency representative raised concerns with respect to that provision on the ground that it required the approval of both courts for the sale of the paper mills, viewing such requirement as entailing unnecessary expense, delay and possible duplication of decision-making processes. In a joint hearing, however, the courts agreed that that requirement would only enhance their ability to make the right decision with respect to sale of the assets.

34. *Progressive Moulded (2008)*^{kk}

In the case of *Progressive Moulded Products Limited*, an automotive parts group operating in the United States and Canada, an insolvency agreement was developed to coordinate insolvency proceedings pending in Canada and the United States. The agreement belonged to the group of "standard" insolvency agreements (see footnote c), for example, *Nortel Networks* and *Pope & Talbot*. The insolvency agreement was approved soon after the commencement of the proceedings and contained provisions, for example, on cooperation, including joint hearings; mutual recognition of stays of proceedings; rights to appear and be heard; effectiveness and modification; and procedures for resolving disputes arising under the agreement. The agreement also incorporated the Court-to-Court Guidelines by reference.

35. *PSINet (2001)*^{ll}

PSINet Inc. involved insolvency proceedings in Canada and the United States. The insolvency agreement was entered into to coordinate the insolvency proceedings pending in both States. The agreement set out certain cross-border insolvency and restructuring matters raised by the nature of the debtors' business operations in the United States and Canada and the interconnectivity and interdependence of the lines of communications in the group's global business and Internet operations, which required the assistance of both courts to resolve fairly and efficiently. Those matters included asset sale approval; allocation of proceeds; treatment of intercompany claims; contract claims; and approval and implementation of any reorganization plan involving as parties the debtors of each jurisdiction. The agreement established guidelines with respect to those matters, which were to be determined and resolved by joint hearings of the courts. The agreement also provided for issues concerning third-party-owned equipment, lease financing and real estate to be addressed by the court of the State in which the property or equipment was located. The agreement authorized use of the Court-to-Court Guidelines. The insolvency agreement was a key factor in the successful sale of PSINet's Canadian assets.

^{kk} Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Commercial List, Court File No. CV-08-7590-00CL (24 June 2008), and United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 08-11253 (14 July 2008).

^{ll} Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 01-CL-4155 (10 July 2001), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No. 01-13213 (10 July 2001).

36. *Quebecor (2008)*^{mm}

The *Quebecor World Inc.* case involved parallel proceedings pending in the United States and Canada. The debtors proposed approval of an insolvency agreement at the outset of the cases as one of their “first day” orders, anticipating the need for court-to-court communication and joint hearings to facilitate the proceedings due to the large scale of the debtors’ operations in both States. The United States judge delayed the approval of the insolvency agreement, in order to establish a creditor committee and provide it with the opportunity to comment on the procedure. As a result, the original agreement was amended to include expanded notice provisions; a provision to further develop a joint claims agreement with respect to the timing, process, jurisdiction and the law applicable to the resolution of intercompany claims filed by the debtors’ creditors in both proceedings; and a detailed provision relating to procedures to be followed when relief requested in one State was deemed to have a material impact in other States. The agreement also incorporated the Court-to-Court Guidelines. Joint hearings were held to approve the sale of the debtors’ European operations and resulted in the prompt entry of separate orders approving that sale.

37. *SemCanada Crude Company (2009)*ⁿⁿ

The case of *SemCanada Crude Company et al.* involved separate insolvency proceedings for different enterprise group members in Canada and the United States. The Canadian debtors had first proposed restructuring their businesses as stand-alone operations without further affiliation with the United States debtors. However, it became apparent that the businesses were closely integrated with the United States debtors, so that the Canadian debtors decided to join in the restructuring of the SemGroup through concurrent and integrated plans of reorganization in both Canada and the United States. An insolvency agreement was developed to implement basic administrative procedures and cross-border guidelines to coordinate certain activities in the proceedings, including the coordination of steps required to finalize, seek required approvals and implement the United States plan of reorganization in conjunction with the Canadian plans, including with respect to identifying creditors, calling and holding the required meetings of creditors and so forth. The agreement resembled in form a “standard” insolvency agreement (see footnote c) and incorporated the Court-to-Court Guidelines by reference.

38. *SENDO (2006)*^{oo}

In the case of *SENDO International Limited*, main insolvency proceedings were pending in the United Kingdom and non-main insolvency proceedings in France. The non-main proceedings were commenced at the request of the insolvency representative in the main proceeding because of employees of SENDO in France. Through the opening of the non-main proceedings, the employees in France were covered by French insolvency law, which was more favourable than English law,

^{mm} Montreal Superior Court, Commercial Division, No. 500-11-032338-085, and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York, No. 08-10152 (JMP) (2008).

ⁿⁿ Court of Queen’s Bench of Alberta for the Judicial District of Calgary, No. 0801-08510 (22 May 2009), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 08-11525.

^{oo} Insolvency proceedings before the High Court of Justice, Chancery Division of London, and before the Commercial Court of Nanterre (2006).

and the French insolvency representative could sell assets located on French territory and gather together statements of outstanding receivables registered by SENDO's French and foreign creditors. The insolvency representatives of both proceedings entered into an agreement (concluded in both French and English) to coordinate the two insolvency proceedings, noting that the EC Regulation only established very general operating principles. In the agreement, the insolvency representatives agreed to act, for the purposes of implementing such operating principles, with mutual trust and to adhere to the duty to communicate information and to cooperate as set forth in article 31 of the EC Regulation, with the main proceedings taking precedence over the non-main proceedings. The agreement included provisions on the treatment of notice and submission of claims of creditors; practical means of verification of claims; treatment of legal costs; and the treatment of the assets of the French branch of the debtor.

39. *Smurfit-Stone (2009)*^{PP}

In the *Smurfit-Stone Container Canada Inc.* case, insolvency proceedings commenced for the United States parent company and certain of its United States and Canadian subsidiaries and affiliates in the United States and in Canada. The insolvency proceedings in the United States were recognized as a foreign proceeding in Canada under the Canadian law enacting the UNCITRAL Model Law. The insolvency agreement was based on the transnational nature of the debtors' business, the fact that all debtors in the Canadian proceedings were also parties to the United States proceedings and the fact that all management decisions regarding the debtors of the Canadian proceedings were made in the United States. The insolvency agreement was needed to ensure the insolvency proceedings were coordinated to avoid inconsistent, conflicting or duplicative rulings of the courts, all parties in interest were provided sufficient notice of key issues in both proceedings, the substantive rights of all parties in interest were protected and the jurisdictional integrity of the courts was preserved. The agreement resembled a "standard" insolvency agreement (see footnote c) with provisions on comity and independence of the courts, cooperation, recognition of stays of proceedings, notice procedures, effectiveness and modification, procedures for resolving disputes under the agreement and preservation of rights, and so forth. In particular, recognizing that any of the debtors might be creditors of each of the other debtors' estates, it provided that the debtors should cooperate with each other in connection with actions taken in both proceedings and should take any other appropriate steps to coordinate the administration of the reorganization proceedings for the benefit of the debtors' respective estates and stakeholders. It also provided that the courts might coordinate activities in the insolvency proceedings, so that the subject matter of any particular action, suit, request, application, contested matter or other proceeding could be determined in a single court.

^{PP} Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Toronto, Case No. 09-7966-00 (12 March 2009), and United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware, Case No. 09-10235 (12 March 2009).

40. *Solv-Ex (1998)*^{qq}

In the case of *Solv-Ex Canada Limited and Solv-Ex Corporation*, involving the United States and Canada, a number of contrary rulings by the two courts had effectively deadlocked proceedings. Following negotiations between the parties, joint hearings, connected by telephone conference call, were arranged to approve the sale of the debtors' assets. The courts reached identical conclusions authorizing the sale and encouraged the parties to negotiate an insolvency agreement to govern further proceedings in the case. Procedural matters agreed between the parties included that identical materials would be filed in both jurisdictions and the presiding judges could communicate with one another, without counsel present, to agree on guidelines for the hearings and, subsequently, determine whether they could make consistent rulings. The agreement included further provisions on asset sales and claims procedures. The courts subsequently approved the agreement.

41. *Swissair (2003)*^{rr*}

Insolvency proceedings were commenced in Switzerland over several companies of the Swissair Group (Schweizerische Luftverkehr AG). To protect the assets of the respective companies abroad, insolvency proceedings were also initiated in other jurisdictions, including in England. To facilitate coordination, the Swiss and English insolvency representatives entered into an insolvency agreement. The insolvency agreement dealt with the realization of assets, the payment of liabilities, costs and expenses, and exchange of information, as well as the receipt and adjudication of creditor claims. It was designed to avoid duplication of work, while at the same time protecting creditor rights and respecting priorities.

42. *Systech (2003)*^{ss}

Systech Retail Systems Corp. involved insolvency proceedings in the United States and Canada for a large provider of retail point-of-sale field services, operating through various Canadian and United States subsidiaries and affiliates. The debtor companies developed an insolvency agreement to establish basic administrative procedures between the proceedings in both jurisdictions. The insolvency agreement resembled a "standard" agreement (see footnote c), including provisions on comity and independence of the courts; cooperation; retention and compensation of insolvency representatives and professionals; notice; joint recognition of stays of proceedings under the laws of both jurisdictions; rights to appear and be heard; and procedures on resolving disputes under the agreement. The agreement also included the Court-to-Court Guidelines. Subsequent to approval of the agreement by both courts, a joint hearing was held in accordance with the Guidelines, which resolved and coordinated a number of cross-border issues in the case.

^{qq} Alberta Court of Queen's Bench, Case No. 9701-10022 (28 January 1998), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of New Mexico, Case No. 11-97-14362-MA (28 January 1998).

^{rr} Insolvency proceedings before the district courts of Bülach (Swissair and other members of SAirGroup), Zurich (SAirGroup) and the High Court of England and Wales, Chancery Division in London, Case No. 2344 of 2002 (18 February 2003).

^{ss} Ontario Court of Justice, Toronto, Court File No. 03-CL-4836 (20 January 2003), and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, Raleigh Division, Case No. 03-00142-5-ATS (30 January 2003).

43. *Tee-Comm. (1997)*^{''}

The insolvency agreement in *Tee-Comm. Electronics Inc.*, a case involving the United States and Canada, may be characterized as a specific-purpose agreement with a narrow focus. It established a framework under which the insolvency representatives in the two jurisdictions would jointly market the debtors' assets, so as to maximize the value of the estate. Accordingly, it addressed only the sale of those assets, which was the key issue at the outset of the case, but no other matters, such as entitlement to and distribution of proceeds.

44. *United Pan-Europe (2003)*^{'''}

In the *United Pan-Europe Communications N.V.* case, the debtor was a leading cable and telecommunications company based in the Netherlands with ownership interests in direct and indirect operating subsidiaries, including in the United States. Insolvency proceedings commenced in the United States and the Netherlands. As the debtor's Netherlands counsel was of the view that an insolvency agreement was not permissible under Netherlands law and procedure, the debtor's Netherlands and United States counsel worked closely together, without entering into any written agreement, to resolve issues as they arose in the proceedings and to ensure that all decisions complied with both Netherlands and United States laws. Both insolvency representatives were involved in the deliberations. The coordination included continuous provision of information to the courts and insolvency representatives; retention and compensation of counsel and insolvency representatives; the development of solicitation procedures for use in both cases; asset sales; and a reorganization plan. The reorganization plan was structured to meet the requirements of both jurisdictions, avoiding provisions that would be permitted in one jurisdiction but not in the other, such as subordination. As a result of the cooperation, the United States and the Netherlands proceedings closed on the same day.

^{''} In re AlphaStar Television/Tee-Comm Distribution, Inc, Ontario Court of Justice, and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware (27 June 1997).

^{'''} Amsterdam Court (Rechtbank) and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (Case No. 02-16020).

Annex II

Decision of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law and General Assembly resolution 64/112

A. Decision of the Commission

1. At its 890th meeting, on 1 July 2009, the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law adopted the following decision:^a

The United Nations Commission on International Trade Law,

Noting that increased trade and investment leads to a greater incidence of cases where business is conducted on a global basis, and enterprises and individuals have assets and interests in more than one State,

Noting also that where the subjects of insolvency proceedings are debtors with assets in more than one State or are members of an enterprise group with business operations and assets in more than one State, there is generally an urgent need for cross-border cooperation in, and coordination of, the supervision and administration of the assets and affairs of those individual debtors and enterprise group members, including, as applicable, multiple parallel insolvency proceedings,

Considering that cooperation and coordination in cross-border insolvency cases has the potential to significantly improve the chances for rescuing financially troubled individuals and enterprise groups,

Acknowledging that familiarity with cross-border cooperation and coordination and the means by which it might be implemented in practice is not widespread,

Convinced that providing readily accessible information on current practice with respect to cross-border coordination and cooperation for reference and use by judges, practitioners and other stakeholders in insolvency proceedings has the potential to facilitate and promote that cooperation and coordination and avoid unnecessary delay and costs,

Recalling that the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency provides a legislative framework that facilitates effective cross-border coordination and cooperation,

1. *Adopts* the Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation contained in working paper A/CN.9/WG.V/WP.86 and authorizes the Secretariat to add further information with respect to recently adopted cross-border insolvency agreements and to edit and finalize the text of the Practice Guide in the light of the deliberations of the Commission;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to publish, including electronically, the text of the Practice Guide and to transmit it to Governments with the

^a *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixty-fourth session, Supplement No. 17 (A/64/17), para. 24.*

request that the text be made available to relevant authorities so that it becomes widely known and available;

3. *Recommends* that the Practice Guide be given due consideration, as appropriate, by judges, insolvency practitioners and other stakeholders involved in cross-border insolvency proceedings;

4. *Recommends* that all States continue to consider implementation of the UNCITRAL Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency.

B. General Assembly resolution 64/112

2. On 16 December 2009, the General Assembly adopted the following resolution:

Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law

The General Assembly,

Noting that increased trade and investment leads to a greater incidence of cases where business is conducted on a global basis and where enterprises and individuals have assets and interests in more than one State,

Noting also that, where the subjects of insolvency proceedings are debtors with assets in more than one State or are members of an enterprise group with business operations and assets in more than one State, there is generally an urgent need for cross-border cooperation in, and coordination of, the supervision and administration of the assets and affairs of those debtors,

Recognizing that cooperation and coordination in cross-border insolvency cases has the potential to significantly improve the chances for rescuing financially troubled individuals and enterprise groups,

Acknowledging that familiarity with cross-border cooperation and coordination and the means by which it might be implemented in practice is not widespread and that the availability of readily accessible information on current practice with respect to cross-border coordination and cooperation has the potential to facilitate and promote that cooperation and coordination and to avoid unnecessary delay and costs,

Noting with satisfaction the completion and the adoption on 1 July 2009 of the Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation by the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law at its forty-second session,^b

Noting that the preparation of the Practice Guide was the subject of deliberations and consultation with Governments, judges and other professionals active in the field of cross-border insolvency,

^b See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Sixty-fourth session, Supplement No. 17 (A/64/17)*, chap. III.

1. *Expresses its appreciation* to the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law for the completion and adoption of its Practice Guide on Cross-Border Insolvency Cooperation;^b

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to publish, including electronically, the text of the Practice Guide and to transmit it to Governments with the request that the text be made available to relevant authorities so that it becomes widely known and available;

3. *Recommends* that the Practice Guide be given due consideration, as appropriate, by judges, insolvency practitioners and other stakeholders involved in cross-border insolvency proceedings;

4. *Recommends also* that all States continue to consider implementation of the Model Law on Cross-Border Insolvency of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law.^c

^c Resolution 52/158, annex.