THE CAPE TOWN CONVENTION AND AIRCRAFT PROTOCOL: ECONOMIC AND LEGAL SUCCESS

Charles W. Mooney, Jr.
Charles A. Heimbold, Jr. Professor of Law
University of Pennsylvania Law School

UNIDROIT
Rome
2 December 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

- Background on Cape Town Convention (CTC) and Aircraft Protocol
- Content of CTC and Aircraft Protocol
- Economic and Market Assessments
- Secured Transactions Law Reform for Business Credit: Questions and Puzzles.

II. BACKGROUND ON CAPE TOWN CONVENTION AND AIRCRAFT PROTOCOL

- Security interests, title reservation agreements, and leases of large civil aircraft, helicopters, and engines
- Principal goal of CTC and Protocol is to facilitate and lower the costs of asset-based financing
- Relationship between CTC and Protocol
- UNIDROIT and ICAO partnership
- CTC and Aircraft Protocol: 71 Contracting States and E.U. (including Australia, China, Denmark, India, Ireland, Luxembourg, Russia, South Africa, Sweden, U.S., and U.K.)

III. CONTENT OF CAPE TOWN CONVENTION AND PROTOCOLS

- Relatively complete regimes for security interests and somewhat less so for title reservation agreements and leases (all are types of "international interests").
- Third-party effectiveness based on registration of international interests in international registry.
- Registry is object-based requiring a description of the relevant equipment.
- First-to-register priority rule.

III. CONTENT OF CAPE TOWN CONVENTION AND PROTOCOLS

- Provisions on default remedies for security interests; more limited for title reservation agreements and leases.
- Provisions for enhanced protection of creditor's rights in debtor's insolvency proceedings based on declaration mechanisms.

IV. ECONOMIC AND MARKET ASSESSMENTS

A. Economic Assessments.

- Anthony Saunders et al., *The Economic Implications of International Secured Transactions Law Reform: A Case Study*, 20 U. Pa. J. Int'l Econ. L. 309, 316-17 (1999) (empirical analysis of increase in value of U.S. airlines publicly traded shares attributable to change in U.S. bankruptcy law and lower anticipated costs of financing).
- Vadim Linetsky, *Economic Benefits of the Cape Town Treaty* (2009), available at http://www.awg.aero/assets/docs/economicbenefitsofCapeTown.pdf (estimating that savings from reducing repossession delay following default from ten months to two months would result in total savings of \$161 Billion from 2009-2030).

IV. ECONOMIC AND MARKET ASSESSMENTS (Cont'd)

- A. Economic assessments (Cont'd).
- Linetsky's estimates assume *full implementation of and compliance with* the Convention and Aircraft Protocol.
- Vadim Linetsky, Accession to the Cape Town Convention by the UK: An Economic Impact Assessment Study (2010), available at http://www.awg.aero/assets/docs/UKCTC%20Econ%20Impact%20Final%20Version.pdf (estimating enormous economic benefits from U.K. accession and implementation of CTC and Aircraft protocol).

IV. ECONOMIC AND MARKET ASSESSMENTS (Cont'd)

- B. Market Response.
- OECD's Aircraft Sector Understanding (updated in 2016): State-supported financing (e.g., export-import banks) provides a 10% discount of financing costs if debtor's State adopts CTC and Aircraft Protocol with qualifying declarations).

IV. ECONOMIC AND MARKET ASSESSMENTS (Cont'd)

- C. Further Study.
- Cape Town Convention Academic Project (joint venture between Oxford University and University of Washington, with support of UNIDROIT and Aviation Working Group) is developing conceptual framework for measuring economic benefits.

- Would MAC Protocol offer economic benefits comparable to Aircraft Protocol? (N.B., Value of MAC equipment exports in 2014 was almost as large as aircraft equipment exports.)
- Would some States be better off with a discrete, identifiable equipment-oriented law such as the MAC Protocol than with a broad and deep law like the UNCITRAL Model Law (UML)? If so, why?
- Would a modern secured transactions law (e.g., UML) necessarily lower the cost of business credit and facilitate credit that otherwise would not be extended? If not, why not?

- What is the role of a secondary market for equipment and various types of inventory in the success or failure of a secured transactions law?
- What is the relationship between the *nature* of a State's insolvency laws and the success of a secured transactions law (e.g., automatic or discretionary stay/moratorium, effectiveness of nonpossessory security interest in insolvency proceeding, etc.)?
- What is the relationship between the *rate of use* of a State's insolvency laws and the success of a secured transactions law?

- Could a secured transactions law be successful even it failed to subject title reservation transactions to the registration system and priority rules?
- Is it plausible that the CTC and Aircraft Protocol could be effective in lowering the cost of business credit in a given State but a modern regime permitting third-party effectiveness through a registration covering, e.g., "all inventory now owned or hereafter acquired" would not have such an effect in that State? If so, why?

- What are the relationships between the structure and strength of a State's financial institutions and other extenders of business credit and the success (or potential success) of a modern secured transactions law?
- Can attributes of a State's culture and its business credit markets impair the beneficial effects of a modern secured transactions law? For example, is there a stigma associated with a public registration of a security interest? Is a registration seen as a signal to the market that a business debtor is desperate in its need to obtain credit?

- For some States, is a modern secured transactions law a necessary but insufficient element of a healthy market for business credit?
- For other States, would adopting a modern secured transactions law have a minimal impact on an already healthy market for business credit that persists even in the absence of such a law?

THANK YOU!

