



ICLG

The International Comparative Legal Guide to: **Lending & Secured Finance 2018**

6th Edition

A practical cross-border insight into lending and secured finance

Published by Global Legal Group, with contributions from:

Advokatfirmaet CLP DA
Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro
Allen & Overy LLP
Anderson Mori & Tomotsune
Asia Pacific Loan Market Association (APLMA)
BPSS Attorneys at Law
Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP
Carey Olsen
Carey
Cordero & Cordero Abogados
Crales & Urcullo
Cuatrecasas
Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
Dechert LLP
Dillon Eustace
Drew & Napier LLC
E & G Economides LLC
Fellner Wratzfeld & Partners
Ferraiuoli LLC
Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP
Gabinete Legal Angola Advogados
Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.

Holland & Knight LLP
HSA Advocates
HSBC
IKT Law Firm
Jadek & Pensa
JPM Jankovic Popovic Mitic
Kabiraj & Talibuddin
King & Wood Mallesons
Laga
Latham & Watkins LLP
Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law
Lloreda Camacho & Co.
Loan Market Association
Loan Syndications and Trading Association
Macesic & Partners LLC
Maples and Calder
Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal
McMillan LLP
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP
Montel&Manciet Advocats
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Morrison & Foerster LLP
Nielsen Nørager Law Firm LLP

Nixon Peabody LLP
Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd
Pinheiro Neto Advogados
PLMJ
Proskauer Rose LLP
Rodner, Martínez & Asociados
Sardelas Liarikos Petsa Law Firm
Shearman & Sterling LLP
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Škubla & Partneri s.r.o.
SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschutz
Rechtsanwalts-gesellschaft mbH
Trofin & Asociații
TTA – Sociedade de Advogados
Unicase Law Firm
Wakefield Quin Limited
White & Case LLP
Wildgen
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP





Contributing Editor
Thomas Mellor, Morgan,
Lewis & Bockius LLP

Sales Director
Florjan Osmani

Account Director
Oliver Smith

Sales Support Manager
Toni Hayward

Senior Editors
Caroline Collingwood,
Suzie Levy

Chief Operating Officer
Dror Levy

Group Consulting Editor
Alan Falach

Publisher
Rory Smith

Published by
Global Legal Group Ltd.
59 Tanner Street
London SE1 3PL, UK
Tel: +44 20 7367 0720
Fax: +44 20 7407 5255
Email: info@glgroup.co.uk
URL: www.glgroup.co.uk

GLG Cover Design
F&F Studio Design

GLG Cover Image Source
iStockphoto

Printed by
Stephens & George
Print Group
April 2018

Copyright © 2018
Global Legal Group Ltd.
All rights reserved
No photocopying

ISBN 978-1-912509-02-7
ISSN 2050-9847

Strategic Partners



Editorial Chapters:

1	Loan Syndications and Trading: An Overview of the Syndicated Loan Market – Bridget Marsh & Theodore Basta, Loan Syndications and Trading Association	1
2	Loan Market Association – An Overview – Nigel Houghton, Loan Market Association	6
3	Asia Pacific Loan Market Association – An Overview – Katy Chan, Asia Pacific Loan Market Association (APLMA)	11

General Chapters:

4	An Introduction to Legal Risk and Structuring Cross-Border Lending Transactions – Thomas Mellor & Marcus Marsh, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP	15
5	Global Trends in the Leveraged Loan Market in 2017 – Joshua W. Thompson & Caroline Leeds Ruby, Shearman & Sterling LLP	20
6	Avoiding Traps When Documenting Make-Whole Premiums for Term Loans – Meyer C. Dworkin & Samantha Hait, Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	26
7	Commercial Lending in a Changing Regulatory Environment: 2018 and Beyond – Bill Satchell & Sara Lenet, Allen & Overy LLP	31
8	Acquisition Financing in the United States: 2018... Continued Growth – Geoffrey Peck & Mark Wojciechowski, Morrison & Foerster LLP	38
9	A Comparative Overview of Transatlantic Intercreditor Agreements – Lauren Hanrahan & Suhrod Mehta, Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP	43
10	A Comparison of Key Provisions in U.S. and European Leveraged Loan Agreements – Sarah M. Ward & Mark L. Darley, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP	50
11	The Global Subscription Credit Facility and Fund Finance Markets – Key Trends and Forecasts – Michael C. Mascia & Wesley A. Misson, Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP	61
12	Recent Developments in U.S. Term Loan B – Denise Ryan & David Almroth, Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer LLP	64
13	The Growth of European Covenant Lite – James Chesterman & Jane Summers, Latham & Watkins LLP	70
14	Yankee Loans and Cross-Border Loans – Recent Developments – Alan Rockwell & Judah Frogel, Allen & Overy LLP	73
15	Debt Retirement in Leveraged Financings – David A. Brittenham & Scott B. Selinger, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP	82
16	Analysis and Update on the Continuing Evolution of Terms in Private Credit Transactions – Sandra Lee Montgomery & Benjamin E. Rubin, Proskauer Rose LLP	88
17	Know Your Client: Adopting a Holistic Approach to Law Firm Representation – Kelli Keenan & Shafiq Perry, HSBC	95
18	Law of Astana International Financial Centre: Key Considerations – Colby Jenkins, Moore & Van Allen PLLC & Saniya Perzadayeva, Unicase Law Firm	99
19	Trade Finance on the Blockchain: 2018 Update – Josias Dewey, Holland & Knight LLP	102
20	Trends in the Expanding Global Private Credit Market: What to Expect for 2018 and Beyond – Jeff Norton & Scott Zimmerman, Dechert LLP	108
21	Replacing LIBOR: the Countdown to 2022 – Alexandra Margolis & Richard Langan, Nixon Peabody LLP	112
22	Investment Grade Acquisition Financing Commitments – Julian S.H. Chung & Stewart A. Kagan, Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP	119
23	Acquisition Finance in Latin America: Navigating Diverse Legal Complexities in the Region – Sabrena Silver & Carlos Viana, White & Case LLP	124
24	The Mid-Market and Beyond – Mark Fine & Sebastian FitzGerald, Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP	130

Continued Overleaf →

Further copies of this book and others in the series can be ordered from the publisher. Please call +44 20 7367 0720

Disclaimer

This publication is for general information purposes only. It does not purport to provide comprehensive full legal or other advice. Global Legal Group Ltd. and the contributors accept no responsibility for losses that may arise from reliance upon information contained in this publication. This publication is intended to give an indication of legal issues upon which you may need advice. Full legal advice should be taken from a qualified professional when dealing with specific situations.

Country Question and Answer Chapters:

25	Andorra	Montel&Manciet Advocats: Maïtena Manciet Fouchier & Liliana Ranaldi González	134
26	Angola	Gabinete Legal Angola Advogados / PLMJ: Bruno Xavier de Pina & João Bravo da Costa	140
27	Argentina	Marval, O'Farrell & Mairal: Juan M. Diehl Moreno & Diego A. Chighizola	147
28	Australia	King & Wood Mallesons: Yuen-Yee Cho & Elizabeth Hundt Russell	156
29	Austria	Fellner Wratzfeld & Partners: Markus Fellner & Florian Kranebitter	165
30	Belgium	Laga: Werner Van Lembergen & Laurent Godts	175
31	Bermuda	Wakefield Quin Limited: Erik L. Gotfredsen & Jemima Fearnside	181
32	Bolivia	Criales & Urcullo: Andrea Mariah Urcullo Pereira & Daniel Mariaca Alvarez	189
33	Brazil	Pinheiro Neto Advogados: Ricardo Simões Russo & Leonardo Baptista Rodrigues Cruz	196
34	British Virgin Islands	Maples and Calder: Michael Gagie & Matthew Gilbert	205
35	Canada	McMillan LLP: Jeff Rogers & Don Waters	212
36	Cayman Islands	Maples and Calder: Tina Meigh	222
37	Chile	Carey: Diego Peralta	229
38	China	King & Wood Mallesons: Jack Wang & Stanley Zhou	236
39	Colombia	Lloreda Camacho & Co.: Santiago Gutiérrez & Juan Sebastián Peredo	243
40	Costa Rica	Cordero & Cordero Abogados: Hernán Cordero Maduro & Ricardo Cordero B.	250
41	Croatia	Macesic & Partners LLC: Ivana Manovelo & Anja Grbes	258
42	Cyprus	E & G Economides LLC: Marinella Kilikitas & George Economides	266
43	Denmark	Nielsen Nørager Law Firm LLP: Thomas Melchior Fischer & Brian Jørgensen	274
44	England	Allen & Overy LLP: David Campbell & Oleg Khomenko	281
45	Finland	White & Case LLP: Tanja Törnkvist & Krista Rekola	290
46	France	Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP: Emmanuel Ringeval & Cristina Radu	298
47	Germany	SZA Schilling, Zutt & Anschutz Rechtsanwalts-gesellschaft mbH: Dr. Dietrich F. R. Stiller & Dr. Andreas Herr	309
48	Greece	Sardelas Liarikos Petsa Law Firm: Panagiotis (Notis) Sardelas & Konstantina (Nantia) Kalogiannidi	318
49	Hong Kong	King & Wood Mallesons: Richard Mazzochi & David Lam	326
50	Hungary	BPSS Attorneys at Law: Eszter Dávid & Gergely Stanka	333
51	India	HSA Advocates: Anjan Dasgupta & Harsh Arora	342
52	Indonesia	Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro: Theodoor Bakker & Ayik Candrawulan Gunadi	353
53	Ireland	Dillon Eustace: Conor Houlihan & Richard Lacken	361
54	Italy	Allen & Overy Studio Legale Associato: Stefano Sennhauser & Gian Luca Coggiola	370
55	Ivory Coast	IKT Law Firm: Annick Imboua-Niava & Osther Henri Tella	378
56	Japan	Anderson Mori & Tomotsune: Taro Awataguchi & Yuki Kohmaru	384
57	Jersey	Carey Olsen: Robin Smith & Laura McConnell	392
58	Luxembourg	Wildgen: Michel Bulach & Giuseppe Cafiero	402
59	Mexico	Gonzalez Calvillo, S.C.: José Ignacio Rivero Andere	410
60	Mozambique	TTA – Sociedade de Advogados / PLMJ: Nuno Morgado Pereira & Gonçalo dos Reis Martins	417
61	Norway	Advokatfirmaet CLP DA: Ragnhild Steigberg	425
62	Pakistan	Kabraji & Talibuddin: Maheen Faruqui & Zara Tariq	433
63	Portugal	PLMJ: Gonçalo dos Reis Martins	440
64	Puerto Rico	Ferraiuoli LLC: José Fernando Rovira-Rullán	447
65	Romania	Trofin & Asociații: Valentin Trofin & Mihaela Spiridon	454



Country Question and Answer Chapters:

66	Russia	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Grigory Marinichev & Alexey Chertov	464
67	Serbia	JPM Jankovic Popovic Mitic: Nenad Popovic & Janko Nikolic	472
68	Singapore	Drew & Napier LLC: Blossom Hing & Renu Menon	479
69	Slovakia	Škubla & Partneri s.r.o.: Marián Šulík & Zuzana Moravčíková Kolenová	489
70	Slovenia	Jadek & Pensa: Andraž Jadek & Žiga Urankar	496
71	South Africa	Allen & Overy LLP: Lionel Shawe & Lisa Botha	505
72	Spain	Cuatrecasas: Manuel Follía & María Lérica	515
73	Sweden	White & Case LLP: Carl Hugo Parment & Tobias Johansson	525
74	Switzerland	Pestalozzi Attorneys at Law Ltd: Oliver Widmer & Urs Klöti	532
75	Taiwan	Lee and Li, Attorneys-at-Law: Hsin-Lan Hsu & Cyun-Ren Jhou	541
76	United Arab Emirates	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Ayman A. Khaleq & Amanjit K. Fagura	550
77	USA	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP: Thomas Mellor & Rick Eisenbiegler	563
78	Venezuela	Rodner, Martínez & Asociados: Jaime Martínez Estévez	574

EDITORIAL

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

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

It is divided into three main sections:

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

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

Country question and answer chapters. These provide a broad overview of common issues in lending and secured finance laws and regulations in 54 jurisdictions.

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

Special thanks are reserved for the contributing editor Thomas Mellor of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP for his invaluable assistance.

Global Legal Group hopes that you find this guide practical and interesting.

The *International Comparative Legal Guide* series is also available online at www.iclg.com.

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

Indonesia



Theodoor Bakker



Ayik Candrawulan Gunadi

Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro

1 Overview

1.1 What are the main trends/significant developments in the lending markets in your jurisdiction?

To support the development of technology-based financial industry in Indonesia, in 29 December 2016, the Financial Services Authority (“OJK”) issued OJK Regulation No. 77/POJK.01/2016 regarding Technology-Based Fund-Lending Services (“POJK 77/2016”).

The Financial Technology-Based Money Lending Services or Fintech Peer-to-Peer Lending (“Fintech P2P”) platforms are meant to facilitate the provision of cash funds on an expeditious, easy and efficient basis especially for micro, small, and medium scale business operators (“UMKM”) to boost their competitiveness.

POJK 77/2016 sets out a range of comprehensive guidelines for the organisation of P2P Lending Services. It defines P2P lending services as financial services which are provided via online systems and which facilitate meetings between lenders and borrowers for the purpose of entering into loan agreements in the Indonesian Rupiah currency.

1.2 What are some significant lending transactions that have taken place in your jurisdiction in recent years?

As the largest issuer of bonds, the Government of Indonesia regularly taps the local market to finance the state budget. The Indonesian Government bond forms vary from conventional and retail government bonds to government sukuk in several tenors. Municipal bonds are issued by the province or district government for financing public utilities projects.

Although both government and corporate bonds are listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (“IDX”), they are mostly traded Over-the-Counter (“OTC”). Bank Indonesia (“BI”) also issues short-term bank certificates known as Certificates of the Central Bank.

The Republic of Indonesia (the “Republic”) returned to the global Sukuk markets through its issuance of US\$ 1.0 billion five-year and US\$ 2.0 billion 10-year Reg S/144A Trust Certificates due in 2022 and 2027, respectively (the “Wakala Sukuk”). The Wakala Sukuk is issued via Perusahaan Penerbit SBSN Indonesia III (“PPSI-III”), a legal entity established by the Republic solely for the purpose of issuing Shari’a compliant securities in foreign currencies in the international markets, and will be listed on the Singapore Stock Exchange and NASDAQ Dubai. The settlement date is 29 March 2017. The Wakala Sukuk tranches were priced on 22 March 2017 at par to yield 3.40% and 4.15%, respectively, and each tranche

has been assigned a rating of Baa3 by Moody’s Investors Service and BBB- by Fitch Ratings. It is the largest ever non-GCC US Dollar Sukuk transaction, and the largest ever US Dollar Sukuk issued by the Republic. The Sukuk are structured based on the Shari’a principle of Wakala. The Sukuk assets under this Wakala Sukuk issuance consist of (i) state-owned assets including land and buildings (51%), and (ii) project assets which are under construction or to be constructed (49%).

The other notable transaction is the financing of the US\$ 8 billion Tangguh LNG Train 3 Expansion project. The project was funded by a consortium of international and domestic banks with a debt value of US\$ 3.74 billion. The international lenders which were involved in the financing are Mizuho Bank, Bank of China, China Construction Bank, BNP Paribas, Korea Development Bank, Asian Development Bank, and the Japan Bank for International Cooperation. Domestic lenders involved in the financing are Bank Mandiri, Bank Rakyat Indonesia, Bank Negara Indonesia, and Indonesia Infrastructure Finance, with a total loan of US\$ 100 million. It is said that this is the first time Indonesian financial institutions involved in the financing of an international LNG project. The project is expected to have up to 75% of its annual LNG production sold to the Indonesian state electricity company, PT PLN (Persero) to support Indonesia’s growing energy demand.

2 Guarantees

2.1 Can a company guarantee borrowings of one or more other members of its corporate group (see below for questions relating to fraudulent transfer/financial assistance)?

Yes, a company guarantee is commonly acceptable in financing practice.

2.2 Are there enforceability or other concerns (such as director liability) if only a disproportionately small (or no) benefit to the guaranteeing/securing company can be shown?

Under Indonesian law, the validity of a legal act performed by an Indonesian company may be contested for want of a corporate benefit. Furthermore, under Indonesian law, there is uncertainty as to whether the issuance of a guarantee or a third party security or a stipulation in an agreement for the benefit of third parties by a company in order to secure the fulfilment of obligations of a third party is or can be regarded to be in the furtherance of the objects of that company (the

“*Ultra Vires Doctrine*”), and consequently, whether such guarantee or third-party security may be voidable or unenforceable under the laws of the Republic of Indonesia. In determining whether the issuance of a guarantee and third party security is in furtherance of the objects of a company, it is important to take into account the provisions of the articles of association of that company and whether that company derives certain commercial benefit from the transaction in respect of which the guarantee and third-party security is issued.

Based on the *Ultra Vires Doctrine*, validity or enforceability can in principle only be challenged by that company itself, i.e. arguably through (a) the shareholders of that company, (b) the board of directors of that company, (c) the board of commissioners of that company, or (d) by a receiver in the event of bankruptcy. By obtaining the written consent of all of the shareholders, board of directors and board of commissioners of the relevant company authorising that company to enter into a guarantee and third-party security for the benefit of the company for whose benefit it creates such guarantee or third-party security and confirming that such transaction is in the interests of that company, those parties should not be able to successfully challenge the validity or enforceability of that guarantee on the basis of the *Ultra Vires Doctrine*.

2.3 Is lack of corporate power an issue?

Yes, the Indonesian Company Law and the articles of association of an Indonesian company normally stipulate certain requirements to obtain a corporate power (approval) from the organs of the company, i.e. board of commissioners’ approval and/or shareholders’ approval. Lack of corporate approval would legally affect the validity of the corporate guarantee and cause the board of directors to be held liable against any loss in relation to such provision of corporate guarantee/security.

2.4 Are any governmental or other consents or filings, or other formalities (such as shareholder approval), required?

Please refer to our explanation in question 2.3 above.

2.5 Are net worth, solvency or similar limitations imposed on the amount of a guarantee?

On the amount of guarantee, it is not specifically stipulated in the regulations. Please note, however, that Indonesian Company Law stipulates that the board of directors must request shareholders’ approval to encumber the assets of the company having a value that exceeds 50% of the net assets in 1 (one) transaction or more, whether or not related to each other. Thus, it could somehow be interpreted that a guarantee needs to also consider the assets of the company.

2.6 Are there any exchange control or similar obstacles to enforcement of a guarantee?

There are no exchange control obstacles for the enforcement of a guarantee. The enforcement of a guarantee will be done through a court order. Please note, however, that the Indonesian court system recognises three levels of courts, namely the district court, court of appeal and Supreme Court. This means that if a borrower still challenges a decision from the judges of a district court and files an appeal to the court of appeal, the guarantee cannot be enforced by the lender pending the decision of the judges of court of appeal. This process would continue up to the Supreme Court, which can certainly take years for enforcement.

3 Collateral Security

3.1 What types of collateral are available to secure lending obligations?

To secure the lending obligations, in general, we can classify the common types of security as follows:

- Immovable assets – i.e. land, buildings, fixtures and vessels with gross weight of 20 cubic metres or more and aircraft – form of security granted: **mortgage**.
- Movable assets – i.e. machinery, inventory, raw material and vehicles – form of security: **fiduciary transfer**.
- Intangible assets – i.e. shares, intellectual property rights, etc. – form of security: **pledge**.

3.2 Is it possible to give asset security by means of a general security agreement or is an agreement required in relation to each type of asset? Briefly, what is the procedure?

A special agreement is required to create security over each type of assets. In general, the procedure for each type of security is as follows:

- Mortgage:
A mortgage deed must be signed before the Land Officer with jurisdiction over the land to be mortgaged. This deed must be in Bahasa Indonesia (the official language of Indonesia) and in the prescribed official form. The signed mortgage deed must be then registered at the relevant land offices. The mortgage is established at the moment it is entered in the land book located at the relevant land offices.
- Fiduciary security:
A fiduciary security deed must be signed before the notary. This deed must be in Bahasa Indonesia (the official language of Indonesia) and in the prescribed official form. Based on this deed, the transferor (borrower) transfers its legal title to the transferee (lender) for the period during which the debt remains outstanding. The fiduciary security is effective when the fiduciary security is recorded in the Fiduciary Register Book (*Buku Daftar Fidusia*) at the fiduciary registration office.
- Pledge:
A pledge agreement can be executed in a notarial deed or executed privately, setting out the pledge’s particulars. A pledge of shares is effective when the pledge is recorded in the shareholders’ register of the relevant company.

3.3 Can collateral security be taken over real property (land), plant, machinery and equipment? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Please refer to questions 3.1 and 3.2.

3.4 Can collateral security be taken over receivables? Briefly, what is the procedure? Are debtors required to be notified of the security?

Yes, the proper form of security over receivables is fiduciary transfer. Please refer to question 3.2 above.

3.5 Can collateral security be taken over cash deposited in bank accounts? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Yes, the most common form of security over a cash deposit is a pledge over the bank account. However, the fiduciary registration office has expressed the view that a bank account cannot be the subject of an Indonesian security interest and the enforceability of a pledge over a bank account is yet to be tested in court. Although its enforceability is doubtful, it is common practice to secure cash deposits with a pledge over a bank account.

3.6 Can collateral security be taken over shares in companies incorporated in your jurisdiction? Are the shares in certificated form? Can such security validly be granted under a New York or English law governed document? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Yes, collateral security over shares in companies incorporated in Indonesia can be taken. A pledge of Indonesian shares can be enforced provided the governing law is Indonesian law. See the procedure discussed above.

3.7 Can security be taken over inventory? Briefly, what is the procedure?

Security over the movable property can be taken by way of fiduciary transfer.

The Fiduciary Security must be made by a notarial deed and in the Indonesian language. The debt so secured can be in the form of:

- existing debts;
- future debts already agreed upon in a certain amount; or
- debts the amount of which can be determined at the time of execution based on the principal agreement.

The goods encumbered by a Fiduciary Security must be registered, including goods located outside Indonesian territory.

The fiduciary transferee shall apply for the registration of the Fiduciary Security and attach to the application a registration statement with the stipulated data. Upon registration on the date of receipt of the registration application, the applicant will obtain a Fiduciary Security Certificate stating the date of the application. The Fiduciary Security is created on the date of registration it in the Fiduciary Register Book (*Buku Daftar Fidusia*). The fiduciary security certificate has force of execution equal to a final court verdict.

3.8 Can a company grant a security interest in order to secure its obligations (i) as a borrower under a credit facility, and (ii) as a guarantor of the obligations of other borrowers and/or guarantors of obligations under a credit facility (see below for questions relating to the giving of guarantees and financial assistance)?

Yes, it can.

3.9 What are the notarisation, registration, stamp duty and other fees (whether related to property value or otherwise) in relation to security over different types of assets?

Registration fees for mortgages are normally based on the value of the secured amount under the mortgage (the lender has a choice

whether to use the actual value of the assets or the principal amount of the loan), and can be costly. There is also a registration fee for fiduciary transfers. However, the amount is nominal. Notary fees concerning fiduciary transfers and pledges of shares vary and are at the notary's discretion. Stamp duty of IDR 6,000 (approximately US\$ 0.50) is payable on any agreement signed by the parties.

3.10 Do the filing, notification or registration requirements in relation to security over different types of assets involve a significant amount of time or expense?

Please refer to question 3.9 above, particularly on the registration fee for mortgages. With regard to the estimated time for filing and registering a mortgage or Fiduciary Security, it would approximately take one month, while for the shares pledge it can be done once the pledge agreement has been executed.

3.11 Are any regulatory or similar consents required with respect to the creation of security?

Normally, creditor consent is required (unless the relevant security provider does not have any debt). A shareholder approval is also required in the situation as we have described in our response to question 2.5 above.

3.12 If the borrowings to be secured are under a revolving credit facility, are there any special priority or other concerns?

If it is a revolving credit facility and the initial loan has been repaid, the security needs to be re-created every time the facility is given. However, we understand, in practice, some creditors have different views. They are of the view that no re-creation of security is required since the initial security covers the entire facility.

3.13 Are there particular documentary or execution requirements (notarisation, execution under power of attorney, counterparts, deeds)?

Yes, please refer to question 3.9 above.

4 Financial Assistance

4.1 Are there prohibitions or restrictions on the ability of a company to guarantee and/or give security to support borrowings incurred to finance or refinance the direct or indirect acquisition of: (a) shares of the company; (b) shares of any company which directly or indirectly owns shares in the company; or (c) shares in a sister subsidiary?

Financial assistance is not an issue: there are no such prohibitions or restrictions other than those that may be set out in the Articles of Association of the company concerned. In addition, a company guaranteeing and/or giving security to support borrowings incurred to finance or refinance the direct or indirect acquisition of such shares may be deemed *ultra vires* unless there is direct commercial benefit. See also question 2.5 above.

5 Syndicated Lending/Agency/Trustee/Transfers

- 5.1 Will your jurisdiction recognise the role of an agent or trustee and allow the agent or trustee (rather than each lender acting separately) to enforce the loan documentation and collateral security and to apply the proceeds from the collateral to the claims of all the lenders?**

Indonesia indeed recognises the role of an agent for the above purpose. They are known as a “security agent”. The security agent is appointed by the lenders in a separate agreement. This agreement, among others, stipulates the period of appointment, rights and obligations of the security agent, termination, etc.

- 5.2 If an agent or trustee is not recognised in your jurisdiction, is an alternative mechanism available to achieve the effect referred to above which would allow one party to enforce claims on behalf of all the lenders so that individual lenders do not need to enforce their security separately?**

This is not applicable.

- 5.3 Assume a loan is made to a company organised under the laws of your jurisdiction and guaranteed by a guarantor organised under the laws of your jurisdiction. If such loan is transferred by Lender A to Lender B, are there any special requirements necessary to make the loan and guarantee enforceable by Lender B?**

Yes, Lender A may use a “cessie mechanism”, commonly known as an “assignment of claim receivables”, and assign its rights to Lender B by executing the “Cessie Deed”. Regarding the guarantee, all related guarantee deeds must be re-executed in favour of Lender B.

6 Withholding, Stamp and Other Taxes; Notarial and Other Costs

- 6.1 Are there any requirements to deduct or withhold tax from (a) interest payable on loans made to domestic or foreign lenders, or (b) the proceeds of a claim under a guarantee or the proceeds of enforcing security?**

Yes, there are requirements to deduct or withhold tax from interest payable on loans made to domestic or foreign lenders, as stipulated in Income Tax Law. For cross-border loans, the withholding tax rate can usually be reduced if the lender resides in a jurisdiction which has a tax treaty with Indonesia.

- 6.2 What tax incentives or other incentives are provided preferentially to foreign lenders? What taxes apply to foreign lenders with respect to their loans, mortgages or other security documents, either for the purposes of effectiveness or registration?**

No tax incentives would be given to a foreign creditor. However, foreign creditors may enjoy a certain tax rate to the extent its country has a treaty with Indonesia.

- 6.3 Will any income of a foreign lender become taxable in your jurisdiction solely because of a loan to or guarantee and/or grant of security from a company in your jurisdiction?**

No, unless, under the “force of attraction” rule, such loan or guarantee or grant generates income for the foreign lender attributable to its Indonesian business, if any.

- 6.4 Will there be any other significant costs which would be incurred by foreign lenders in the grant of such loan/guarantee/security, such as notarial fees, etc.?**

Please refer to question 3.9 above, particularly on the registration fee for mortgages.

- 6.5 Are there any adverse consequences to a company that is a borrower (such as under thin capitalisation principles) if some or all of the lenders are organised under the laws of a jurisdiction other than your own? Please disregard withholding tax concerns for purposes of this question.**

No, but recurring administrative requirements relating to the reporting of payment of interest and principal apply, and foreign loans received by certain categories of Indonesian borrowers require prior governmental approval.

7 Judicial Enforcement

- 7.1 Will the courts in your jurisdiction recognise a governing law in a contract that is the law of another jurisdiction (a “foreign governing law”)? Will courts in your jurisdiction enforce a contract that has a foreign governing law?**

Indonesian law recognises a choice of foreign law as the governing law of a loan agreement except to the extent that: (i) a loan term or a provision of that law is clearly incompatible with Indonesian public policy; and (ii) the Indonesian court must give effect to mandatory rules of the law of another jurisdiction with which the situation has a close connection.

Theoretically, courts in Indonesia can enforce a contract that has a foreign governing law. In practice, however, there have been cases where Indonesian courts have refused to give effect to choice of foreign law clauses for other specified or unspecified reasons. A foreign choice of law is not permitted for security agreements or guarantees, and these agreements must be governed by Indonesian law.

- 7.2 Will the courts in your jurisdiction recognise and enforce a judgment given against a company in New York courts or English courts (a “foreign judgment”) without re-examination of the merits of the case?**

Indonesian courts will not recognise judgments of foreign courts. Accordingly, it will be necessary for any matter in which a judgment has been obtained in a foreign court to be re-litigated in the Indonesian courts in order to enforce in Indonesia the cause of action giving rise to the foreign judgment, and such Indonesian courts may attribute such importance to the foreign judgment as they may deem appropriate.

7.3 Assuming a company is in payment default under a loan agreement or a guarantee agreement and has no legal defence to payment, approximately how long would it take for a foreign lender to (a) assuming the answer to question 7.1 is yes, file a suit against the company in a court in your jurisdiction, obtain a judgment, and enforce the judgment against the assets of the company, and (b) assuming the answer to question 7.2 is yes, enforce a foreign judgment in a court in your jurisdiction against the assets of the company?

- (a) It would take approximately six months to obtain a judgment in the district court. However, if the counter party (defendant) appeals to the higher courts (court of appeal and supreme courts), it may take years.
- (b) Foreign court judgments cannot be enforced in Indonesia.

7.4 With respect to enforcing collateral security, are there any significant restrictions which may impact the timing and value of enforcement, such as (a) a requirement for a public auction, or (b) regulatory consents?

On default, a security interest can be enforced through a public auction or private sale.

Public sale or auction

In theory, a public auction can be conducted without a court judgment or order if the owner of the assets is co-operative. In practice, however, a court order is required.

In the case of listed shares, however, the Indonesian Civil Code clearly specifies that an auction held by two brokers can be conducted in the market. In this case, no court order is required so long as a power of attorney to dispose of the shares has been given (usually at the time the pledge is created).

Private sale

A private sale is permitted if this means that a higher sale price can be achieved for the parties. Private sale requires consent from the owner of the assets, which is normally included in the relevant security documents.

For mortgage and fiduciary transfer, private sale can only be conducted:

- After the expiry of one month from written notification of the intended sale to interested parties and publication of this notice in at least two daily newspapers with circulation in the area where the asset is located.
- Where no third party has voiced an objection against the private sale. The law is unclear as to who these third parties may be, although it is safe to assume that they include, at least, the borrower's other creditors.

7.5 Do restrictions apply to foreign lenders in the event of (a) filing suit against a company in your jurisdiction, or (b) foreclosure on collateral security?

The above enforcement method as explained in question 7.4 also applies to foreign lenders.

7.6 Do the bankruptcy, reorganisation or similar laws in your jurisdiction provide for any kind of moratorium on enforcement of lender claims? If so, does the moratorium apply to the enforcement of collateral security?

Yes, it is known as Suspension of Payments (moratorium). The procedure is started by the debtor or its creditor petitioning the Commercial Court for a suspension of payments. The Commercial Court must then grant a provisional moratorium, and appoint a supervisory judge and an administrator or receiver to assist the debtor in managing its estate. The debtor will be entitled to manage and dispose of its assets jointly with the administrator. During this suspension period, the debtor does not have to make payments to its unsecured creditors and secured creditors cannot enforce their security without the court's consent. The purpose of a suspension of payments is to enable the debtor to propose a composition plan.

Creditors holding a mortgage, a pledge, a fiduciary security or any other *in rem* security right may enforce its right against the secured assets as if there were no bankruptcy. However, the aforesaid right is limited by the so-called "stay period". A stay is a restriction on the right of secured creditors and third parties to exercise their right. This stay applies for a time period of at most 90 (ninety) days as of the date of the bankruptcy judgment. The stay does not apply to claims of creditors whose rights are secured by cash deposits and the rights of creditors to set-off debts. By law, the 90-day stay will expire on an earlier date in case of an early termination of the bankruptcy or upon the commencement of the state of insolvency.

7.7 Will the courts in your jurisdiction recognise and enforce an arbitral award given against the company without re-examination of the merits?

A foreign or international arbitral award can be recognised and enforced in Indonesia as Indonesia has ratified the 1958 New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards through Presidential Decision No. 34 of 1981. The procedures for recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards are further regulated by Law No. 30 of 1999 on Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolutions. However, before the enforcement, the award needs to be registered at the District Court of Central Jakarta. Please note, however, that the Chairman of the District Court of Central Jakarta may refuse to issue the writ of execution if it views that the award violates public order. The decision rejecting the enforcement can be appealed at the Supreme Court and must be decided by the Supreme Court within 90 (ninety) days as of the registration of the appeal. A decision approving the enforcement of the award cannot be appealed.

8 Bankruptcy Proceedings

8.1 How does a bankruptcy proceeding in respect of a company affect the ability of a lender to enforce its rights as a secured party over the collateral security?

The mortgage, the pledge and the fiduciary transfer are "*in rem rights*" which are "*absolute*" and "*exclusive*", and create preferential rights to the holder of the security even in bankruptcy. Bankruptcy

of the mortgagor, the pledgor and the fiduciary transferor does not, in principle, affect the security right of the mortgagee, pledgee and transferee in that the assets in question are not regarded as being part of the bankruptcy assets. However, the creditors should note the “stay” period as we have elaborated in response to question 7.6, which restricts the ability of the creditors to enforce its rights.

8.2 Are there any preference periods, clawback rights or other preferential creditors’ rights (e.g., tax debts, employees’ claims) with respect to the security?

Yes, there are.

On the preference period with respect to the security, we believe that there should be no preference period, except that: once the bankruptcy estate is declared in the state of insolvency, the secured creditors must exercise their privileged right over the collateral within 2 (two) months as of the point the bankruptcy estate is declared to be in the state of insolvency. Otherwise, the appointed receiver is required to request the delivery of the collateral to be sold by the receiver. If the receiver has enforced the collateral, the proceeds that will be distributed to the secured creditors need first to be deducted by not only the amount of the mandatory preferred claims (which will also apply if the secured creditors enforced the collateral by themselves), but also the bankruptcy costs.

On the clawback rights, under Articles 41 and 42 of the Indonesian Bankruptcy Law, for the interest of the bankruptcy assets, only the receiver could request the nullification of a preferential transfer transaction conducted by the debtor before its bankruptcy, if such transaction was considered detrimental to the creditors (“**Bankruptcy Preferential Transfer**”). To nullify a Bankruptcy Preferential Transfer, the receiver must prove the following requirements:

- (i) the preferential transfer was performed by the debtor before it was declared bankrupt;
- (ii) the debtor was not obligated by contract (existing obligation) or by law to perform the preferential transfer;
- (iii) the preferential transfer prejudiced the creditors’ interests; and
- (iv) the debtor and such third party had or should have had knowledge that the preferential transfer would prejudice the creditors’ interests.

If the preferential transfer transaction was conducted within a period of 1 (one) year before the company’s bankruptcy, provided that the transaction was not mandatory for the debtor and unless it could be proven otherwise, both the debtor and the third party with whom the said act was performed were deemed to know that such transaction was detrimental to the creditors when such transaction belongs to one of the following three categories:

- (i) a transaction in which the consideration that the debtor received was substantially less than the estimated value of the consideration given;
- (ii) a payment or granting of security for debts which are not yet due; or
- (iii) a transaction entered into by the debtor with a certain relative or related parties.

There is no provision under the Bankruptcy Law which stipulates a specific period when the Bankruptcy Preferential Transfer claim can be made. However, request for the nullification of a Bankruptcy Preferential Transfer shall be made by the receiver. The claim can be made only if the debtor has a receiver.

If the underlying security documents are nullified due to the Bankruptcy Preferential Transfer, then the security will also become invalid.

On other preferential creditors’ rights, there are several kinds of creditors, generally regulated in the Indonesian Civil Code (“**ICC**”), Indonesian Bankruptcy Law, and Law No. 6 of 1983 which was lastly amended by Law No. 16 of 2009 regarding the General Provision of Taxation (“**Tax Law**”), which have preferential rights with respect to the *in rem* security as follows:

- A. Specific expenses stipulated by the Tax Law:
 - legal expenses arising solely from a court order to auction movable and/or immovable goods;
 - expenses incurred for securing the goods; and
 - legal expenses, arising solely from the auction and settlement of inheritance.
- B. Preferred creditors ranked above the secured creditors.

Tax claims and court charges which specifically result from the disposal of a movable or immovable asset (these must be paid from the proceeds of the sale of the assets over all other priority debts, and even over a pledge or mortgage) and the legal charges, exclusively caused by sale and saving of the estate (these will have priority over pledges and mortgages).
- C. The receiver’s fee.

8.3 Are there any entities that are excluded from bankruptcy proceedings and, if so, what is the applicable legislation?

No, there are no entities which are excluded from bankruptcy proceedings.

8.4 Are there any processes other than court proceedings that are available to a creditor to seize the assets of a company in an enforcement?

No, there are no processes other than the court proceedings which are available to a creditor to seize the assets of the company in enforcement.

9 Jurisdiction and Waiver of Immunity

9.1 Is a party’s submission to a foreign jurisdiction legally binding and enforceable under the laws of your jurisdiction?

Yes, a submission to a foreign jurisdiction should be binding and enforceable.

9.2 Is a party’s waiver of sovereign immunity legally binding and enforceable under the laws of your jurisdiction?

Sovereign immunity has not been explicitly legislated in Indonesia. The Republic of Indonesia has subscribed to the doctrine of restrictive sovereign immunity by its entry into the Convention on the Settlement of Investment Disputes between States and Nationals of other States of 1965. However, if a party is a state-owned company and enters into a commercial contract, it can be argued that such state-owned company has waived its entitlement (if any) to sovereign immunity.

In practice, the Government of Indonesia (“**GOI**”) does not use sovereign immunity as the basis of defence in a dispute which relates to its obligation under a commercial agreement.

Nevertheless, the GOI specifically does not waive any immunity in respect of:

- actions brought against the Republic arising out of or based upon U.S. federal or state securities laws;
- attachments under Indonesian law;
- present or future “premises of the mission” as defined in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations signed in 1961;
- “consular premises” as defined in the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations signed in 1963;
- any other property or assets used solely or mainly for Government or public purposes in the Republic or elsewhere; and
- military property or military assets or property or assets of the Republic related thereto.

The GOI is subject to suit in competent courts in Indonesia. However, Law No. 1 of 2004 on State Treasury prohibits the seizure or attachment of property or assets owned by the GOI.

10 Licensing

10.1 What are the licensing and other eligibility requirements in your jurisdiction for lenders to a company in your jurisdiction, if any? Are these licensing and eligibility requirements different for a “foreign” lender (i.e. a lender that is not located in your jurisdiction)? In connection with any such requirements, is a distinction made under the laws of your jurisdiction between a lender that is a bank versus a lender that is a non-bank? If there are such requirements in your jurisdiction, what are the consequences for a lender that has not satisfied such requirements but has nonetheless made a loan to a company in your jurisdiction? What are the licensing and other eligibility requirements in your jurisdiction for an agent under a syndicated facility for lenders to a company in your jurisdiction?

There are not necessarily any eligibility requirements for a lender to be a bank. Lenders to a company in Indonesia do not need to be licensed in Indonesia as long as the loan is not given in a manner that causes the lenders to be engaged in the banking business in Indonesia. There is no distinction between a lender that is a bank and a non-bank. Similarly with lenders, there is no specific licence for an agent in Indonesia. However, we normally assume that the lenders and agents have proper licences under its jurisdiction.

11 Other Matters

11.1 Are there any other material considerations which should be taken into account by lenders when participating in financings in your jurisdiction?

Lenders should also take into account the fulfilment by the borrower of several requirements including Bank Indonesia Regulation No. 16/21/PBI/2014 as amended by Bank Indonesia Regulation No. 18/4/PBI/2016 concerning the Implementation of Prudential Principles for the Management of Offshore Loans of Non-Bank Corporations (“NBCs”) (“**Regulation 16**”). Regulation 16, which came into force as of 1 January 2015, aims to mitigate various risks inherent to private external debt, specifically for non-bank corporations. In principle, Regulation 16 requires NBCs with offshore loans in foreign currency (except for trade credit) to implement prudential

principles by satisfying certain obligations to meet prescribed hedging ratios, liquidity ratios, and credit ratings, as follows:

- **Hedging Requirement.** Each NBC must effectuate a minimum hedging ratio of 25% of the combined negative spread between its Foreign Exchange Assets and its Foreign Exchange Liabilities which will be due (i) within three months after the end of the relevant quarter, and (ii) between the fourth and the sixth month after the end of the relevant quarter. The hedging ratio must be realised through a derivative transaction in the form of forward, swap and/or option. During the first year after effectiveness (until 31 December 2015), a reduced minimum hedging ratio of 20% applied.
- **Liquidity Ratio.** The NBC must meet a minimum liquidity ratio of 70%, calculated by dividing the total value of Foreign Exchange Assets that is available up to three months after the end of the last quarter by the amount of Foreign Exchange Liabilities that are due up to three months after the end of the most recent quarter. Receivables derived from forwards, swaps, and/or options which will be closed up to three months after the end of the most recent quarter may be included in the calculation. During the first year after effectiveness (until 31 December 2015), a reduced minimum liquidity ratio of 50% applied.
- **Credit Rating.** The NBC must have a credit rating (an issuer credit rating and/or a debt credit rating, as the case may be, depending on the type and term of the term of the offshore foreign currency debt) of at least BB- (or equivalent) issued by an authorised Rating Agency (including, amongst others, Fitch Ratings, Moody’s Investor Service and Standard and Poor’s). The rating may not be older than two years. The rating must be a long-term debt rating if the NBC wishes to issue long-term bonds. The credit rating requirement is not applicable to offshore debt in foreign exchange (“**FX Offshore Loan**”) obtained, among others, (i) for the purposes of refinancing (i.e. without increase of principal), or (ii) from international institutional credit providers (bilateral or multilateral) in relation to infrastructure projects (including infrastructure in the fields of transportation, roads, irrigation, drinking water, sanitation, telecommunication and informatics, electricity, and oil and gas). Institutions that are specifically mentioned in Regulation 16 are, among others, the International Finance Corporation (“**IFC**”), Japan Bank for International Cooperation (“**JBIC**”), Japan International Cooperation Agency (“**JICA**”), Asian Development Bank (“**ADB**”) and Islamic Development Bank (“**IDB**”). The Credit Rating requirement would be applicable on the FX Offshore Loan that is signed or issued as of 1 January 2016.

The enactment of the BI Regulation No. 18/4/PBI/2016 dated 22 April 2016 has expanded the coverage of exemption on credit rating requirement so that multifinance companies would not be subjected to the credit rating requirement provided that certain requirements on financial soundness level and gearing ratio have been met. In addition to multifinance companies, the Indonesia Eximbank (*Lembaga Pembiayaan Ekspor Indonesia*) has also been exempted from the credit rating requirement.

It should also be noted that, according to the Regulation 16, as of 1 January 2017, hedging transactions for the purpose of fulfilling the hedging requirement must be conducted with banks in Indonesia. Receivables from hedging transactions which are not conducted with banks in Indonesia will not be considered as Foreign Exchange Assets, and will not be considered as fulfilment of the hedging and liquidity ratio requirements.

Furthermore, Bank Indonesia Regulation No. 17/3/PBI/2015 concerning Mandatory Use of the Rupiah in the Territory of Indonesia (“**Regulation No. 17**”), which is effective for cash transactions as of 31 March 2015, and for non-cash transactions, 1 July 2015

stipulates that individuals or corporations must use the Rupiah in all cash and non-cash transactions in Indonesia. Transactions extend to the use of cheques, giro slips, credit cards, debit cards, ATM cards, and electronic money, which include:

- (a) payment transactions;
- (b) other settlement of obligations that must be fulfilled on money terms; and/or

- (c) other financial transactions.

There are some specific exemptions to this mandatory use of the Rupiah that are stipulated in Regulation No. 17 (including its exemptions and formality to obtain those exemptions).



Theodoor Bakker

Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro
Graha CIMB Niaga, 24th Floor
Jalan Jend. Sudirman Kav. 58
Jakarta 12190
Indonesia

Tel: +62 21 250 5125
Fax: +62 21 250 5001
Email: tbakker@abnrllaw.com
URL: www.abnrllaw.com

Mr. Theodoor Bakker graduated from Leiden University in the Netherlands, is admitted to the Amsterdam Bar and is a registered Foreign Lawyer under the Indonesian Advocates Law. He has worked in Southeast Asia since 1984, over time building up extensive experience in: direct foreign investment; project finance work, including private power and petrochemical projects; aircraft finance; infrastructure development; and general manufacturing investment. During the Asian financial crisis, he was involved in many aspects of restructuring and insolvency, and has advised on foreign law issues of bankruptcy reform in Indonesia. His practice now also encompasses capital market transactions, structured finance, and mergers and acquisitions. He is an international commercial arbitrator, is a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Arbitration and is registered at BANI, LCIA, SIAC and HKIAC. He has published various articles on insolvency and cross-border investment issues and teaches at the Faculty of Law of University of Indonesia and at the Ministry of Law and Human Rights.



Ayik Candrawulan Gunadi

Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro
Graha CIMB Niaga, 24th Floor
Jalan Jend. Sudirman Kav. 58
Jakarta 12190
Indonesia

Tel: +62 21 250 5125
Fax: +62 21 250 5001
Email: agunadi@abnrllaw.com
URL: www.abnrllaw.com

Mr. Ayik Candrawulan Gunadi joined ABNR as an associate in September 2001 and became a partner on 1 October 2013. He graduated in 1997 from the Faculty of Law, Parahyangan Catholic University, majoring in Economic and Business Law, and in 2000 completed his LL.M programme at the Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands, majoring in Business and Trade Law. Before joining ABNR, he worked for a law firm and reputable insurance company in Indonesia. He also worked in the Netherlands, as foreign trainee with an international legal and tax consultants in Rotterdam, and thereafter with a Dutch Bank in Amsterdam. He has extensive experience in matters involving corporate law, foreign investment, intellectual property and project finance, and has been actively involved in infrastructure projects in Indonesia.

Mr. Gunadi returned to ABNR after a few months post with a major Indonesian power company as its senior legal manager. He has been listed by The Asia Pacific Legal 500 2016 as a recommended lawyer in Projects & Energy and Intellectual Property.



COUNSELLORS AT LAW

Ali Budiardjo, Nugroho, Reksodiputro, usually abbreviated to ABNR, was established in Jakarta in 1967 as a partnership of legal consultants in Indonesian business law. The firm is one of Indonesia's largest independent full-service law firms. The commitment we make to clients is to provide broad-based, personalised service from top-quality teams of lawyers with international experience that includes groundbreaking deals and projects. ABNR's reputation has been recognised around the world by independent industry surveys and law firm guides. ABNR was selected, based on its high level of integrity and professionalism, to be the sole Indonesian member of the world's largest law firm association Lex Mundi and of the prestigious Pacific Rim Advisory Council ("PRAC").

Current titles in the ICLG series include:

- Alternative Investment Funds
- Anti-Money Laundering
- Aviation Law
- Business Crime
- Cartels & Leniency
- Class & Group Actions
- Competition Litigation
- Construction & Engineering Law
- Copyright
- Corporate Governance
- Corporate Immigration
- Corporate Investigations
- Corporate Recovery & Insolvency
- Corporate Tax
- Cybersecurity
- Data Protection
- Employment & Labour Law
- Enforcement of Foreign Judgments
- Environment & Climate Change Law
- Family Law
- Fintech
- Franchise
- Gambling
- Insurance & Reinsurance
- International Arbitration
- Lending & Secured Finance
- Litigation & Dispute Resolution
- Merger Control
- Mergers & Acquisitions
- Mining Law
- Oil & Gas Regulation
- Outsourcing
- Patents
- Pharmaceutical Advertising
- Private Client
- Private Equity
- Product Liability
- Project Finance
- Public Investment Funds
- Public Procurement
- Real Estate
- Securitisation
- Shipping Law
- Telecoms, Media & Internet
- Trade Marks
- Vertical Agreements and Dominant Firms



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

www.iclg.com