



JCOERE Judicial Co-operation Supporting Economic Recovery in Europe

Report 1

Identifying substantive rules in preventive restructuring frameworks including the Preventive Restructuring Directive which may be incompatible with judicial co-operation obligations



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
FIRENZE

Judicial Cooperation Supporting Economic Recovery in Europe (JCOERE)

DG Justice Programme Project No. 800807

Report 1: Identifying substantive and procedural rules in preventive restructuring frameworks including the Preventive Restructuring Directive which may be incompatible with judicial cooperation obligations



JCOERE Project Report 1: Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Acknowledgements	10
The JCOERE Project Team	11
Chapter 1: Introduction to JCOERE Report 1	12
1.1 <i>Introduction</i>	12
1.2 <i>The Preventive Restructuring Directive (PRD): the Examinership Benchmark</i>	13
1.3 <i>JCOERE Project Summary</i>	14
1.4 <i>Methodology of the JCOERE Project</i>	16
1.5 <i>Chapter 2: Terminology</i>	19
Chapter 2: Preventive Restructuring Terminology	20
2.1 <i>Introduction to Chapter</i>	20
2.2 <i>Rescue (Corporate and Business), Rehabilitation, Reorganisation, and Preventive Restructuring</i>	20
2.2.1 Corporate Rescue	20
2.2.2 Business Rescue	20
2.2.3 Rehabilitation	20
2.2.4 Reorganisation	21
2.2.5 Restructuring	21
2.2.6 Preventive Restructuring	21
2.3 <i>Pre-Insolvency</i>	22
2.4 <i>Homologation</i>	22
2.5 <i>Concordat, Composition, Arrangement, and Plan</i>	22
2.5.1 Concordat	22
2.5.2 Composition	22



2.5.3	Arrangement	22
2.5.4	Restructuring Plan	23
2.6	<i>Examiner, Receiver, Trustee, and Administrator (PIFOR)</i>	24
2.6.1.	Examiner	24
2.6.2	Judicial Commissioner	24
2.6.3	Receiver	24
2.6.4	Trustee	24
2.6.5	Administrator	25
2.6.6	Insolvency Practitioner	25
2.6.7	Plan Expert (The Netherlands)	26
2.6.8	PIFOR (Practitioner in the Field of Restructuring)	26
2.6.9	The Observer (The Netherlands)	26
2.7	<i>Pledge, Mortgage, Charge, and Floating Charge</i>	26
2.7.1	Pledge	26
2.7.2	Charge (Fixed)	26
2.7.3	Mortgage	26
2.7.4	Floating Charge	27
2.8	<i>Non-Performing Loans</i>	27
2.9	<i>Interim and New Financing</i>	27
2.9.1	Interim Financing	27
2.9.2	New Financing	27
2.10	<i>Supervising Judge, Syndic Judge, Notary</i>	28
2.10.1	Supervising Judge	28
2.10.2	Syndic Judge	28
2.10.3	Notary	28
2.11	<i>Patrimonial Liability</i>	28
2.12	<i>Retention of Title</i>	28
2.13	<i>Right in Rem</i>	28
2.14	<i>Extra-Judicial Payment</i>	29
2.15	<i>Secured, Unsecured, Preferential, and Subordinated Creditors</i>	29

2.15.1	Secured Creditor	29
2.15.2	Unsecured Creditor	29
2.15.3	Preferential Creditor	29
2.15.4	Subordinated Creditors (Subordinated Debt)	30
2.16	<i>Self-Administration or Debtor in Possession</i>	30
2.16.1	Self-Administration	30
2.16.2	Debtor in Possession	31
2.17	<i>Court Protection, Stay, Moratorium</i>	31
2.17.1	Court Protection	31
2.17.2	Stay	31
2.17.3	Moratorium	31
2.18	<i>Intra- and Cross-Class Cram-Down</i>	31
2.18.1	Intra-Class Cram-Down	31
2.18.2	Cross-Class Cram-Down	31
2.19	<i>Absolute Priority</i>	32
2.20	<i>Relative Priority</i>	32
2.21	<i>Unfair Prejudice</i>	32
2.22	<i>Best Interest of Creditors</i>	32
2.23	<i>Conclusion and Transition</i>	33
	Chapter 3: The Regulation of Cross-Border Insolvency and Restructuring in the EU	34
3.1	<i>Introduction: Cross-Border Insolvency in the EU</i>	34
3.2	<i>History and Development of European Insolvency Coordination</i>	34
3.3	<i>The Key Features of the EIR Recast</i>	36
3.4	<i>The Harmonisation Debate over European Insolvency and Restructuring</i>	37
3.5	<i>Jurisdiction in Cross-Border Restructuring Cases: Forum Shopping</i>	38
3.6	<i>Recognition and Enforcement: Including Restructuring Frameworks in Annex A</i>	40
3.7	<i>Conclusion</i>	41
3.8	<i>Chapter 4: Context of Preventive Restructuring in the EU</i>	41
	Chapter 4: Context of Preventive Restructuring in the EU	42
4.1	<i>The Evolution of Corporate Rescue and the Rescue Culture</i>	42

4.2	<i>Preventive Restructuring: Principles and Context</i>	42
4.2.1	Insolvency theory	42
4.2.2	Shifting from Liquidation to Rehabilitation, Restructuring, and Rescue	44
4.2.3	Communitarianism in Insolvency and Restructuring	45
4.3	<i>Rehabilitation of Companies in Financial Distress</i>	46
4.4	<i>Defining Preventive Restructuring</i>	47
4.5	<i>Preventive Restructuring in Europe</i>	51
4.6	<i>Specific Restructuring Provisions as Potential Causes of Conflict in Co-Operation</i>	53
4.6.1	The Stay of Individual Enforcement Actions	53
4.6.2	The “Intra-Class” Cram-Down (or Majority Rule)	54
4.6.3	The Cross-Class Cram-Down	55
4.6.4	Protection and Priority of Rescue Financing	58
4.7	<i>Summary and Conclusion: Implementation and Conflicts</i>	60
4.8	<i>Chapter 5: Exposition of the Preventive Restructuring Directive</i>	61
	Chapter 5: Exposition of the Preventive Restructuring Directive	62
5.1	<i>Introduction</i>	62
5.1.1	Context of Exposition within the JCOERE Project	62
5.1.2	Presentation of the Chapter	62
5.2	<i>Historical Context</i>	63
5.2.1	Committee on Legal Affairs Report (2011)	63
5.2.2	Commission Communication ‘A New Approach to Business Failure’ (2012)	64
5.2.3	Commission Recommendation and Impact Assessment (2014)	65
5.2.4	Conclusion	68
5.3	<i>The Commission Proposal</i>	69
5.3.1	The Stay	70
5.3.2	Protection for New Finance	71
5.3.3	Cross-Class Cram-Down	71
5.3.4	Decreased Court Formality	71
5.4	<i>The Consultation Process</i>	71
5.4.1	European Economic and Social Committee	72

5.4.2	The European Central Bank	72
5.4.3	European Parliament Committees: Committee on Legal Affairs	73
5.4.4	European Parliament Committees: Employment and Social Affairs (“EMPL”)	74
5.4.5	European Parliament Committees: Economic and Monetary Affairs (“ECON”)	75
5.5	<i>Council of the European Union</i>	76
5.5.1	The Stay	77
5.5.2	Protection of New Finance	78
5.5.3	Cross-Class Cram-Down	79
5.6	<i>Conclusion</i>	81
5.7	<i>Transition to Chapter 6:</i>	81
	Chapter 6: Mapping the Preventive Restructuring Frameworks and the EU Directive: Part 1 – Introduction and Methodology	83
6.1	<i>Introduction: The JCOERE Context</i>	83
6.2	<i>Introducing the Irish Examinership Procedure</i>	84
6.3	<i>Methodology</i>	84
6.4	<i>JCOERE Approach to Comparative Legal Analysis</i>	85
6.5	<i>General Context of Preventive Restructuring: Questionnaire Part 1</i>	86
6.5.1	Functions and Aims of Preventive Restructuring	86
6.5.2	Legislative Frameworks of the Contributing Jurisdictions in Context	86
a)	Ireland	87
b)	Italy	87
c)	Romania	89
d)	France	89
e)	The Netherlands	91
f)	Spain	92
g)	Austria	92
h)	Poland	93
i)	Germany	94
j)	Denmark	95
k)	England and Wales	95

6.6	<i>Conclusion</i>	96
6.7	Chapter 7: Mapping of Preventive Restructuring Frameworks and the EU Directive Part II – Substantive Aspects of Preventive Restructuring in Domestic Processes and in the Directive	97
	Chapter 7: Mapping of Preventive Restructuring Frameworks and the EU Directive: Part II – Substantive Aspects of Preventive Restructuring in Domestic Processes and in the Directive	99
7.1	Introduction to Part II of the Questionnaire Mapping Preventive Restructuring Frameworks	99
7.2	The Stay of Individual Enforcement Actions (PRD Article 6)	99
7.2.1	The Purpose of Article 6 in the PRD (Question 3)	100
7.2.2	Jurisdictional Contributions: Existence of the Stay (Article 6(1-8))	101
7.2.3	Summary of Implementation Requirements for Article 6(1)	104
7.2.4	Jurisdictional Contributions: Removal of Stay by Authority (Article 6(9))	105
7.2.5	Summary of Implementation Requirements (Article 6(9))	106
7.3	The Adoption of Restructuring Plans (Article 9)	107
7.3.1	The Purpose of Article 9 in the PRD (Question 4)	107
7.3.2	Jurisdictional Contributions: Voting Rights and Exclusions (Article 9(1))	108
7.3.3	Summary of Implementation Requirements	111
7.3.4	Jurisdictional Contributions: Class Formation (Article 9(4))	111
7.3.5	Summary of Implementation Requirements	113
7.3.6	Jurisdictional Contributions: Examination of Voting Rights and Class Formation by Authority (Article 9(5))	114
7.3.7	Summary of Implementation Requirements	117
7.3.8	Jurisdictional Contributions: Intra-Class Cram-Down (Majority Voting) (Article 9(6&7))	118
7.3.9	Summary of Implementation Requirements	120
7.4	The Confirmation of Restructuring Plans (Article 10)	121
7.4.1	The Purpose of Article 10 in the PRD (Question 5)	121
7.4.2	Jurisdictional Contributions: Conditions for Obligatory Court Confirmation of Restructuring Plans (Article 10(1))	122
7.4.3	Summary of Implementation Requirements	124
7.4.4	Jurisdictional Contributions: Conditions for Refusal to Confirm a Plan (Article 10(2))	124
7.4.5	Summary of Implementation Requirements	128
7.5	Cross-Class Cram-Down (Article 11)	129

7.5.1	The Purpose of Article 11 in the PRD (Question 6)	129
7.5.2	Jurisdictional Contributions: Existence of a Cross-Class Cram-Down (Article 11(1)(a-b))	130
7.5.3	Summary of Implementation Requirements	132
7.5.4	Jurisdictional Contributions: Dissenting Creditors and Conditions for Approval (Article 11(1)(c) and 11(2))	132
7.5.5	Jurisdictional Contributions: Question 6.3 – Unfair Prejudice Test (Article 11(2) para 2)	135
7.5.6	Summary of Implementation Requirements for Questions 6.2 and 6.3	136
7.6	Protection of New and Interim Financing	137
7.6.1	The Purpose of Article 17 in the PRD (Question 8)	137
7.6.2	Jurisdictional Contributions: Question 8 – Existence of Protection or Priority for Interim Financing (Article 17(1)&(4))	138
7.6.3	Summary of Implementation Requirements	141
7.7	Workers (Article 13)	141
7.8	Conclusion: Benchmarking the Directive	143
7.9	Chapter 8: Mapping of Preventive Restructuring Frameworks and the EU Directive Part II Specific Procedural Aspects of Preventive Restructuring in Domestic Processes and in the Directive	144
	Chapter 8: Mapping of Preventive Restructuring Frameworks and the EU Directive Part III Specific Procedural Aspects of Preventive Restructuring in Domestic Processes and in the Directive	145
8.1	<i>Introduction to Part III of the Questionnaire Mapping Preventive Restructuring Frameworks</i>	145
8.2	<i>The Threshold for Insolvency and Restructuring</i>	146
8.2.1	Threshold of Insolvency and Restructuring in the Contributing Jurisdictions	147
8.3	<i>Insolvency Practitioners in Preventive Restructuring (Article 5 – Debtor in Possession)</i>	150
8.3.1	Purpose and Spirit of Article 5: Debtor in Possession (Qn 9)	150
8.3.2	Jurisdictional Contributions (Article 5 – Debtor in Possession)	152
8.4	<i>Rights in Rem (Question 10)</i>	156
8.4.1	Introduction to the Concept of a Right in Rem	156
8.4.2	Contributor Definitions of a Right in Rem	157
8.4.3	A Right in Rem under the EIR Recast	158
8.4.4	Rights in Rem under the PRD	159
8.4.5	Jurisdictions Allowing Potential Impairment of Rights in Rem	159
8.5	<i>Conclusion and Transition</i>	161

	Chapter 9: Conclusion of the JCOERE Project Report 1	163
9.1	<i>Introduction</i>	163
9.2	<i>Summary of Findings</i>	164
9.2.1	Preventive Restructuring Terminology	164
9.2.2	The Regulation of Cross-Border Insolvency and Restructuring in the EI	164
9.2.3	The Context of Preventive Restructuring in the EU	164
9.2.4	Exposition of the Preventive Restructuring Directive	166
9.2.5	The JCOERE Questionnaire: Chapters 6-8	166
9.3	<i>Conclusion and Introduction to JCOERE Report 2</i>	168
	Annex 1 – Additional Submissions Contributing to the Exposition of the Preventive Restructuring Directive	
10.1	<i>The Experts Group on Restructuring and Insolvency Law (2016)</i>	169
10.2	<i>The National Parliament Submissions to the European Parliament</i>	172
10.3	<i>EMPL – Workers’ Rights</i>	173
10.4	<i>ECON – Article 7</i>	174
10.5	<i>Committee of the Regions</i>	175
	Annex 2 – Mapping the Preventive Restructuring Frameworks and the EU Directive for the JCOERE Project: Jurisdiction Questionnaire	
11.1	<i>Introduction</i>	176
11.2	<i>The Questionnaire</i>	179
	Annex 3: Contributor Responses to Jurisdiction Questionnaire (Pending Publication)	
12.1	<i>Ireland</i>	
12.2	<i>Italy</i>	
12.3	<i>Romania</i>	
12.4	<i>Austria</i>	
12.5	<i>France</i>	
12.6	<i>Denmark</i>	
12.7	<i>Germany</i>	
12.8	<i>The Netherlands</i>	
12.9	<i>Poland</i>	
12.10	<i>Spain</i>	



12.11 *United Kingdom (England & Wales)*

Annex 4 : Bibliography

Acknowledgements

The progress of the JCOERE Project (800807) from its commencement in December 2018 to the present has been intense, challenging and inspiring. The first JCOERE Report is now presented here in 9 Chapters. This considers the existing preventive restructuring frameworks in a number of member states in the European Union together with the reforms proposed in the Preventive Restructuring Directive passed in June 2019 (1023/2019). The publication of the JCOERE 1 Report could not be more timely, in that it sets out the context across Europe against which preventive restructuring frameworks will be implemented in accordance with the Directive. It also captures the debate around core concepts in restructuring, including the threshold of insolvency at which time restructuring processes are available, the imposition of a stay against creditors and other claimants, cram-down and cross-class cram-down, and the mechanism for approving restructuring schemes. There is much in this report that will be of interest to all those practising and researching in this area. JCOERE will now continue on to consider obligations regarding court to court co-operation in this context, which will form the subject matter for JCOERE Report 2.

As Principal Investigator, I would like to formally acknowledge the splendid work of our core team here at UCC. Dr Jennifer L. L. Gant, Aoife Finnerty and Molly O'Connor have all worked extremely well together and in collaboration with me to produce an excellent piece of work. Their team-work is second to none. In addition, I extend our thanks to all of our partner teams and their leaders, Dr Paul Omar and Caroline Taylor at INSOL Europe; Professor Lorenzo Stanghellini, Professor Andrea Zorzi, Dr Iacopo Donati, and Niccoló Usai at UNIFI; and Judge Nicoleta Nastasie, Dr Cristian Drăghici, Professor Ioana Panc, Professor Smaranda Angheni and Ioana Duca at UTM for their help and support.

I am also grateful to our Advisory Board members, in particular the Honourable Judge Michael Quinn and his judicial assistant Lorna Reid (and before that the Honourable Judge Caroline Costello), Adjunct Professor Jane Marshall, Professor Gerry McCormack and Dr Emilie Ghio, all of whom have given generously of their time at our project meetings in Cork, Florence and Copenhagen. We also extend our thanks to the other members of our Board, Declan Walsh and The Honourable Judge Anthony Collins, whose support will continue to be important into the next phase.

Finally, we are more than grateful to our national contributors Dr Emilie Ghio (France), Gert-Jan Boon (The Netherlands), Dr Antonio Sotillo Marti and Javier Vercher, with additional input from Nuria Bermejo and Professor Francisco Garcimartin (Spain). Dr Susanne Fruhstorfer (Austria), Sylwester Zydowicz with additional input from Michał Barłowski (Poland), Professor Dr Stephan Madaus (Germany), and Assistant Professor Line Langkjær (Denmark) who have responded so generously to our questionnaire and our follow up queries. They have complied with our intense deadlines and work programme and have done so with a great deal of intellectual interest, good humour, and enthusiasm, which is reflected in this excellent piece of work. We can honestly say that co-operation amongst European scholars and commentators is thriving and inspiring and points the way to an optimistic future for the European Union.

Professor Dr Irene Lynch Fannon, 14 January 2020.



The JCOERE Project Team

Voluntary Contributors to the JCOERE Project to whom the JCOERE Project Team owes its sincere thanks for excellent and detailed country reports given in response to the JCOERE Questionnaire:

- Dr Emilie Ghio, Birmingham City University and Dr Paul Omar, INSOL Europe (France)
- Gert-Jan Boon, University of Leiden (The Netherlands)
- Dr Antonio Sotillo Marti and Javier Vercher, Universitat de Valencia (Spain)
- Nuria Bermejo and Professor Francisco Garcimartin Universidad Autonoma de Madrid (Spain)
- Dr Susanne Fruhstorfer, Taylor Wessing (Austria)
- Sylwester Żydowicz, Taylor Wessing (Poland)
- Michał Barłowski, Wardynski & Partners, Warsaw (Poland)
- Professor Dr Stephan Madaus, Martin Luther University, Halle-Wittenberg (Germany)
- Assistant Professor Line Langkjær, Aarhus University (Denmark)

JCOERE Consortium

University College Cork:

- Professor Irene Lynch Fannon – Principal Investigator
- Dr Jennifer L. L. Gant – Post Doctoral Researcher
- Aoife Finnerty – Research Assistant
- Molly O'Connor – Project Manager

Università degli Studi di Firenze:

- Professor Lorenzo Stanghellini
- Professor Andrea Zorzi
- Dr Iacopo Donati - Post Doctoral Researcher
- Niccoló Usai – Research Assistant

Universitatea Titu Maiorescu:

- Judge Nicoleta Mirela Nastasie
- Dr Cristian Drăghici – Post Doctoral Researcher
- Professor Ioana Panc
- Professor Samaranda Angheni
- Ioana Duca

INSOL Europe:

- Dr Paul Omar
- Caroline Taylor

JCOERE Advisory Board

- The Honourable Judge Michael Quinn – High Court, Ireland
- The Honourable Judge Anthony M. Collins – General Court of the European Union
- Mrs Jane Marshall – Solicitor, Adjunct Professor, UCC
- Dr Emilie Ghio – Birmingham City University
- Mr Declan Walsh – School of Law UCC
- Professor Gerry McCormack – University of Leeds