

The Draft UNCITRAL Model Law on Secured Transactions

Why and how?

Le projet de loi type de la CNUDCI sur les opérations garanties

Pourquoi et comment?

Georges Affaki
Spyridon V. Bazinas
Leif Böttcher
Michel Deschamps
Michèle Grégoire
Hans Kuhn
Michael J.T. McMillen
Jean-François Riffard



Editor/Éditeur:
Bénédict Foëx

Schulthess § 2016
ÉDITIONS ROMANDES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	5
Avant-propos	7
Contributors	9
Summary	13
Abbreviations	15

The draft UNCITRAL Model Law on Secured Transactions

Spyridon V. Bazinas	19-44
I. Introduction	19
II. The ST Guide and the need for a model law	20
III. The scope of the DML	23
A. The unitary, functional and comprehensive approach	23
B. The scope of the DML and the scope of the ST Guide compared	25
IV. Creation of a security interest	26
A. General rules	26
B. Asset-specific rules	28
C. The treatment of creation issues in the ST Guide and the DML compared	29
V. Third-party effectiveness of a security interest	30
A. General rules	30
B. Asset-specific rules	31
C. The treatment of third-party effectiveness issues in the ST Guide and the DML compared	31
VI. The registry system	32
A. The DML and the Registry Act	32
B. The treatment of registration issues in the ST Guide and the Registry Act compared	35
VII. Priority of a security interest	36
A. General rules	36
B. Asset-specific rules	37
C. The treatment of priority issues in the ST Guide and the DML compared	38

VIII. Enforcement of a security interest	40
A. General rules	40
B. Asset-specific rules	41
C. The treatment of enforcement issues in the ST Guide and the DML compared	41
IX. Law applicable to security interests	42
A. General rules	42
B. Asset-specific rules	43
C. The treatment of conflict-of-laws issues in the ST Guide and the DML compared	43
X. Conclusions	44

Réflexion sur la véritable nature de la “loi type” sur les opérations garanties

Jean-François Riffard **45–60**

I. La “loi type”: un instrument à haut degré de standardisation	47
II. La loi type: un instrument inadapté à l’uniformisation du droit des sûretés mobilières	50
III. Une loi type qui ne serait qu’une “loi modèle” ou “loi par l’exemple”	51
IV. Les contours de la “loi modèle” en matière de sûretés mobilières	53
A. Un modèle à conserver: les particules élémentaires	53
B. Un modèle à moduler: les éléments secondaires optionnels	57
En guise de conclusion: loi type / loi modèle, deux facettes d’un même instrument à densité variable	59

The UNCITRAL Model Law on Secured Transactions – a Swiss Perspective

Hans Kuhn **61–89**

I. Introduction	61
II. The Case for a Reform of Switzerland’s Secured Transactions Law	62
A. SMEs’ Access to Credit	62
B. Restricted Use of Assets as Collateral	64
1. Trade Receivables	65
2. Inventory	67
3. Equipment	67
a. Retention of Title	68
b. Financial Leasing	69
4. Intellectual Property and Other Rights	71

III. Calls for Reform	72
IV. What Role for the Model Law?	76
A. Importance of a Comparative Approach	76
B. Adoption of the Model Law by Switzerland?	78
1. Sound Legal Policies	78
2. Conceptual Issues	79
a. Uniform Security Interest vs. Diversity of Security Devices (Functional Approach)	79
b. Creation and Perfection of Security Interests	82
c. Extension of Security Interests to Proceeds	83
3. Terminology	85
C. Potential Stumbling Blocks	85
1. Consumer Transactions and Credit to Consumers	85
2. Access to Registry and Data Protection	86
3. Interface with Debt Enforcement and Insolvency Law	87
V. Conclusions	88

**German Law on Secured Transactions Quo Vadis?
Some Genuinely German Observations on the Draft UNCITRAL
Model Law**

Leif Böttcher 91-101

I. Secured transaction law from the German perspective	91
II. A short evaluation – How German law on secured transactions stands at the moment	92
A. The type of security	92
B. From Pfandrecht to Sicherungsübereignung and Sicherungsabtretung	92
C. The question of publicity	94
III. German law and the draft Model Law – two worlds colliding	94
A. German skepticism towards a registry system for movable assets	94
1. Confidentiality vs. publicity	95
2. New forms of collateral – a call for a registry system?	96
3. A registry system as legal transplant	97
a. The draft Model Law registry as a “model” for a German registry system?	97
b. Cultural aspects	98
4. German law vs. draft Model Law	100
IV. An outlook	100

The UNCITRAL Model Secured Transactions Law: A Shari'ah Perspective

Michael J.T. McMillen	103–135
I. Introduction	103
II. The Shari'ah and Rahn Principles	105
III. Scope of Application	112
IV. Select Definitional Matters	115
A. Possession	115
B. Priority	117
C. Mass or Product	118
V. Secured Obligations and Encumbered Assets	119
A. Obligations that May be Secured	120
B. Property that May be Encumbered and its Use	123
VI. Preservation and Creditor Rights	129
VII. A Few Comments on Remedies	132
VIII. Conclusion	134

Conflict-Of-Laws Rules on Receivables Financing The Need for Harmonization

Michel Deschamps	137–156
I. Example of a multi-jurisdictional transaction	140
II. The analysis to conduct and the role of conflict rules	141
A. The Analysis to conduct	141
B. The first step of the analysis	142
C. The substantive law analysis	143
III. The conflict rules of the jurisdictions in the Example	144
A. Ontario	145
B. Quebec	145
C. British Columbia	146
D. The United States	147
E. England	149
F. France	152
G. Germany	152
H. Switzerland	153
IV. The conflict rules of the Uncitral Model Law	154

Increasing Access to Credit through Reforming Secured Transaction Laws

Georges Affaki **157–170**

The Economic Impact of Secured Transactions	157
A. Optimizing the use of assets as collateral	160
B. Benefits to the country of reform	165
C. Calculating the credit price under an efficient collateral system	167

The Law of 11 July 2013 Amending the Belgian Civil Code with Respect to Security Interests in Movable Assets, and Repealing Various Provisions in this Area

Michèle Grégoire **171–198**

I. Introduction	171
II. Conditions for arranging a pledge	172
A. In principle, consensual	172
B. Protection of the pledgor consumer	173
C. Common Contract law	174
III. Conditions for enforcing the pledge	174
A. Registration	174
B. Erga omnes effect	176
C. Responsibility for processing the data	178
D. Dispossession	178
1. Tangible asset	178
2. Receivable	179
IV. Proof	181
V. Nature of and changes to the underlying asset	181
A. Principle	181
B. Fluctuating entities	182
C. Protection for the pledgor consumer	182
D. Future assets	183
E. Subrogation in rem	183
F. Ancillary proceeds	184
G. Inseverable nature	184
H. Alterations	185
VI. The parties' rights and obligations during the latency period	187
VII. Voluntary enforcement of the guarantee	189
VIII. Enforcement and perfection	190
IX. Conflicting ranks	194