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Foreword

For centuries, international trade and trade finance has been paper based, staff intensive, and cumbersome. The industry has made several attempts over the last decade to simplify this complexity by converting paper documentation into digital form for computer processing. Unfortunately, these digital processing platforms suffered from low adoption because they provided only partial solution to some of the parties involved in a trade finance transaction.

More recently, BAFT and its members saw an opportunity to significantly “leapfrog” forward the digitization of trade finance with the emergence of blockchain/distributed ledger technology (“DLT”). In 2016, the BAFT Innovation Council established the BAFT Distributed Ledger Payment Commitment Working Group (“DLPC Working Group”) to produce standardized rules for the transformation of a payment commitment into a digital asset to be used in any trade finance solution sitting on any DLT platform.

The result of the DLPC Working Group’s efforts consist of these BAFT DLPC Business Best Practices and the accompanying BAFT DLPC Technical Best Practices. The Technical Best Practices set forth specifications for the standardized conversion of the promise to pay embedded in a negotiable instrument used for trade finance into a digital asset. The digital asset, in turn, can work on any DLT platform and, therefore, is interoperable across different platforms. These Business Best Practices provide the parties using a DLPC with a set of rules governing their activity. They also contain a framework that ensures the payment commitment, although converted into a digital form, is still legally binding and enforceable.

BAFT first published DLPC Technical and Business Best Practices in April 2019 for “Trial Use.” After soliciting and incorporating industry feedback, the DLPC Working Group published in June 2020 the “Initial Release” of the specifications with the expectation of wide industry adoption as the use of DLT-based trade finance solutions increases. The DLPC Working Group recognizes that the trade finance industry is still early in its shift from paper to digital assets on DLT solutions and platforms. We consider these best practices to be living documents and now release this version 1.1, containing adjustments based on the use of the DLPC standards in live transactions in the spring/summer of 2020.
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Definitions

Any term that is not defined in this document shall have the meaning given to that term in the Uniform Commercial Code as adopted by the US State of Delaware or in the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of the US State of Delaware and the terms below shall have the following meanings:

**Attestation**: The act of recording a particular value or state of: (a) information, or changes to that information, on a distributed ledger; or (b) acceptance of that information or those changes. The attestations that may be required or permitted shall be determined by the type of instrument being recorded and the governance rules of the network on which the instrument is recorded. Attestation of events or actions may be automated, if permitted by the relevant network rules and procedures.

**Commitment**: A commitment means a legally binding obligation to pay a specific amount of money. During the DLPC life cycle, a commitment is made when the terms and conditions are agreed to and the commitment state is recorded as either “Contingent” or “Effective” as described in Section 2.2 below. When a DLPC reaches an “Effective” state, the DLPC becomes an unconditional promise to pay a specific amount of money.

**Committee**: The party to the DLPC who is proposed to become or is an actual obligee/beneficiary, to which effect the DLPC carries the required attestations.

**Committer**: The party to the DLPC who is proposed to become or is an actual obligor, whose attestation to that effect is carried in the DLPC.

**DL**: Distributed ledger

**DLT**: Distributed ledger technology

**DLPC**: A record of a payment commitment on a distributed ledger that conforms to the DLPC Business and Technical Best Practices [see here](#). A DLPC has a lifecycle comprising the following states: (1) Pre DLPC (2) DLPC Initiated (3) DLPC Contingent (4) DLPC Effective and (5) DLPC Discharged. This lifecycle is described in more detail in Section 2.2.

**Distributed Ledger Business Network**: A group of parties that use a distributed ledger to conduct business transactions among themselves. As a precondition to joining the network, these parties must all agree to conduct such business on the distributed ledger compliant to the network rules and governance.

**UCC**: Uniform Commercial Code as adopted by the US State of Delaware.

**UETA**: Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of the US State of Delaware.
1. Introduction

Several industry initiatives are underway to establish Distributed Ledger Business Networks to enable different types of trade and trade finance transactions to be executed and recorded on DLTs. Maximizing the utility of these networks requires that standards be developed to support interoperability between them, independent of the type of underlying DLT or trade finance instrument used, or the participants in those networks. The central contract in a trade finance transaction is usually a negotiable instrument, defined by the law of many jurisdictions as a written document bearing a signature. Embedded within a negotiable instrument, along with other contract terms, is a legally binding and enforceable payment commitment (a promise to pay). This payment commitment is the focus of the BAFT DLPC.

The BAFT DLPC is a payment commitment in the form of a digital asset that has been designed to work in any DLT-based trade finance solution sitting on any DLT platform. The DLPC therefore offers two key advantages to a payment commitment embedded in a paper negotiable instrument: (a) it provides a technology-neutral solution that allows companies to record a digital representation of a payment commitment on DLT that can operate within any DLT-based trade finance solution sitting on any DLT platform and also across different DLT platforms, resulting in interoperability; and (b) it is supported by a legal framework that seeks to provide the same degree of business utility and protections for banks and corporations as is provided by the laws governing negotiable instruments.

These Business Best Practices, and the accompanying Technical Best Practices (see here), provide the parties using a DLPC with a set of rules governing their activity, within a framework that ensures the payment commitment, although converted into a digital form, is still legally binding and enforceable.

1.1. A Particular Problem

In trade finance today, the same set of data is replicated multiple times between transaction parties because each party keeps instrument data in their own trade and general ledger systems. Communication between parties involved in a trade transaction is conducted via SWIFT messages, emails and paper documents and is used to process events in the lifecycle of a trade instrument, i.e., to issue, amend, examine, and pay. This situation creates time lags and opportunities for data to become out-of-sync or subject to fraud.

Several DLTs and Distributed Ledger Business Networks are being pursued to address the problems above, which introduces the challenge of interoperability across these solutions. These Business Best Practices, read together with the Technical Best Practices (see here), address this interoperability challenge.
1.2. The Solution

In addition to each party’s internal data (data silo), a single source of trusted data is needed to which all the permissioned parties may have access. It would reflect the real-time state of that instrument, terms, payment commitments, and lifecycle activities. The resulting solution would provide the parties with the confidence to transact digitally and in real-time.

DLT provides the capability to realize this solution through:

- a trusted source of data (immutable audit log, tamper-proof, cryptographically secure, etc.)
- visibility to all authorized parties
- one common view of the trade instrument’s terms, payment commitments, lifecycle events, etc.
- support for real-time processing across the transaction parties.

### Key Benefits for Financial Institutions, Banks, Insurers and Banking Regulators

a. Customer satisfaction gains; supports the digital journey of most banks and corporates
b. Contributes to the digital transformation of the bank’s back office
c. Reduces some risks, disputes, clerical errors, etc.
d. Speeds up processing
e. Potential reduction of overhead and costs associated with audit and regulation (e.g. real time, reliable data and records)
f. Accelerated automation and efficiency in transaction processing and reconciliation can help to reduce counterparty credit risks
g. Process simplification using the DLPC.
1.4. The Role of Distributed Ledger Payment Commitment (DLPC)

All trade instruments, irrespective of their type, result in a commitment to make a payment (conditional, unconditional) to other parties of the instrument. The expression of the payment commitment embedded in a trade instrument can vary widely between instruments, depending on the instrument’s terms and conditions and lifecycle events. Therefore, a standardized and common way to represent payment commitments for any trade instrument will facilitate individual payment commitments as well as the aggregation of commitments in portfolio views across groupings of trade instruments. Together with standardization of the trade instruments themselves, the DLPC will facilitate interoperability between networks.

2. DLPC Lifecycle and Accounting Methodology

2.1. Instrument Lifecycle and G/L Accounting

Payment commitments are created, modified and extinguished by the lifecycle events of trade instruments. Each trade instrument has its own set of product-specific terms and own lifecycle. Despite the diversity of types, terms, and lifecycles of trade instruments, banks recognize a payment commitment in a standardized way by making entries in its books. Similarly, the DLPC records the payment commitments related to trade instruments in a standardized way on a DL.

![Figure 3: Current G/L model vs DLPC G/L model](image)

Whereas G/L liability entries primarily record just the liability arising from a payment commitment, a DLPC records additional details. It identifies a party making the commitment (identified in the DLPC fields in this document as the “Committer”), a party the commitment is made to (identified in the DLPC fields in this document as the “Committee”), an amount, start and end dates of the commitment, and more.

Like G/L liability entries, there can be more than one DLPC entry related to the same trade instrument. This is because within the same instrument, there may be bilateral payment commitments made between different parties or a single party may have more than one bilateral commitment. The Payment Commitment Relationship Diagrams and Figures in Section 3 below illustrate the possible commitments commonly existing between the parties involved in a trade finance transaction.
2.2. DLPC Lifecycle

A DLPC goes through the various states of a lifecycle shown in Figure 4 and the changes associated with its states will be recorded in “data fields” on the DL, as described in Section 2.1 of the Technical Best Practices document [see here].

While the terms of the DLPC are being discussed (i.e. “Pre DLPC” in Figure 4), the parties to a trade transaction will formulate the required information to “Initiate” the new DLPC record on the ledger, depending on the type of trade instrument that they want to execute. That trade instrument will be identified by a specific ID field (that we refer to as the “Reference ID”). The DLPC, when initiated, will refer to, and thereafter be linked with, that Reference ID and, in addition, will have its own unique DLPC ID. The DLPC ID is designed to be unique across networks and ledgers so that payment commitments and their underlying transactions may be readily identified and interoperable. A DLPC comes into existence only when some of the specified data fields for the DLPC have been recorded on the distributed ledger. To reach the “DLPC Initiated” state, at a minimum, the record must contain the DLPC ID field.

Once initiated, if a DLPC does not meet the requirements to be legally binding, it can continue to be updated without restriction, until those requirements are met. When those requirements are met, and the terms of the trade transaction have been agreed upon, the DLPC will be recorded as either a Contingent DLPC or an Effective DLPC. A DLPC is Contingent while it, or the trade transaction to which it is linked, is subject to any conditions. When those conditions have been fully met, the DLPC is to be recorded as Effective. Contingent DLPCs and Effective DLPCs permit only Compliant Changes that meet the requirements of Section 3 of the Technical Best Practices document. When a DLPC becomes Effective, it becomes an unconditional promise to pay the Amount to the order of the Committee on

1 Although the relevant data fields for a DLPC must be present, this may be accomplished flexibly in different ways on different distributed ledgers and instruments. See paragraph 3.4 below.
the Due Date, in each case as such capitalized terms are specified in Fields 7, 5 and 9 of the DLPC. From that point onwards, if the parties wish, the DLPC may benefit from the legal protections described in Section 4 (“Contractual Relationships”) below.

An Effective DLPC transitions to a Discharged DLPC when the Committee indicates that it has received the promised Amount, or the Committer is otherwise relieved of its promise to pay, e.g. if the trade transaction is terminated (cancelled).

3. Trade Products that would utilize the DLPC

The DLPC has been created as a Note (i.e. a promise to pay, as described in Section 4 below) for use in, or in conjunction with, any digital trade instrument on any distributed ledger network. It has been especially created to meet the needs of any digitalized open account, supply chain, receivables or payables financing transaction. In addition, the DLPC would be equally useful in traditional trade finance instruments, if in digital form on a DL, that include payment commitments, including the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft/Bill of Exchange</th>
<th>Aval</th>
<th>Trade Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentary LC</td>
<td>Bankers’ Acceptance</td>
<td>Deferred Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standby LC</td>
<td>Guarantee</td>
<td>Letter of Undertaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Payment Obligation</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>Letter of Indemnity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promissory Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Some of the traditional products that would utilize the DLPC

BOX 1

Some examples of the lifecycle of a DLPC linked to a few trade instruments (such as drafts, documentary LCs and invoices) are shown in Figures 5 through 14 below, together with accompanying text. When reviewing these examples and Figures, please keep in mind:

(a) Each DLPC (shown as DLPC 1, DLPC 2, DLPC 3, etc.) records a unique and different payment commitment from all other DLPCs, but will be linked with its relevant trade instrument identified by the “Reference ID” in the DLPC data field.

(b) The boxes beneath the heading “DLPC State within an Instrument...” in the Figures show the state changes in the lifecycle of the DLPC as illustrated in the changes in the data fields.

(c) The data entered into the Figures is for illustration purposes only and does not conform to the Specifications set out in Section 4 of the Technical Best Practices document. The Figures are meant to show only simplified workflows for some common types of trade instruments. They do not represent best practice workflows or even typical workflows for the lifecycle of a trade transaction, which are usually far more complex. Rather, they provide a general guide as to when a DLPC should be created in a workflow and how the Commitment State and Discharged State of a DLPC can change over the course of a transaction.
3.1. Drafts (See BOX 1 Above)

Drafts (orders to pay) support trade acceptances and bankers’ acceptances, and are used independently, or in the context of, Letters of Credit and Documentary Collections. Because the laws governing drafts, such as UCC Article 3 and the Bills of Exchange Act, focus on a paper realization, drafts represent a significant obstacle to the digitization of international trade.

A draft is a simple instrument, made up of a short list of data elements (typically less than 20). An electronic version of the draft can be supported by a single DLPC, accompanied by draft specific data elements. This single DLPC representing the draft’s payment commitment can then be used to support electronic presentations of drafts, given a supporting legal framework.

![Figure 5: Outline of data fields for an electronic Draft linked with a DLPC](image-url)
3.1.1. Accepted Draft lifecycle with DLPC

When electronic Draft is accepted by the Buyer, buyer becomes obligated to pay the Seller, and DLPC becomes effective. Once payment is made on the due date, DLPC is discharged.
3.1.2. Accepted and Endorsed Draft lifecycle with DLPC

Figure 7: Lifecycle of a DLPC linked with an electronic Draft that is accepted and endorsed

* When electronic Draft is accepted by the Buyer, buyer becomes obligated to pay the Seller, and DLPC becomes effective. The accepted Draft is endorsed and discounted by a Seller’s Bank allowing the Seller to get paid early. Buyer now is obligated to pay the Seller’s Bank. Once payment is made on the due date, DLPC is discharged.

3.2. Documentary LC (See BOX 1 Above)

To model how a documentary LC can be designed with DLPCs, the starting place is to identify the payment commitments that may occur during the lifecycle of a letter of credit. For example, in Figure 8 below, we show various possible payment commitment relationships in a syndicated letter of credit where LC parties are identified and the payment commitment obligations between them indicated. There is no implied workflow in the diagram, so the payment commitments represent what would exist, if created during the instrument’s lifecycle.

Each arrow represents a payment commitment between two parties; it records that commitment with the data shown in the colored box. The attribute names in the DLPC are generalized to represent bilateral payment commitments in the variety of contexts that exist in trade products. As such, the parties are identified as a Committer and Committee, rather than the party type of those parties in the context of the parent instrument, e.g., Issuing Bank and Beneficiary.
Figure 8: General example of payment commitment relationships in a syndicated letter of credit

On the DL, these DLPCs would be related to the LC and its instrument parties as shown in Figure 9.

Figure 9: Relationship of DLPCs and the parties to the LC in the syndicated LC example

By having all payment commitments represented by a standard DLPC embedded in the trade instrument, it is easy to access them across populations of trade instruments residing on the DLT. This permits aggregation of payment commitments by committer, committee, due date, commitment type, currency, amount, etc. Through its association to its parent instrument and parties, aggregation could include the trade instrument types or other characteristics of the parent, while maintaining the separate identity of the DLPC.

Payment commitments can change over the lifecycle of an instrument. Some events create new instruments with their own lifecycle and payment commitments. For instance, when an LC is created it will reflect the conditional payment commitment specified by the original terms of the LC, but a subsequent amendment, payment, etc., may increase or decrease that commitment. In the case of a time payment, the conditional payment commitment of the
LC is reduced, and a banker’s acceptance or deferred payment is created. Those instruments will have their own effective payment commitment due at maturity.

3.2.1. **Documentary Letter of Credit (At Sight) Lifecycle with DLPC**

Upon the receipt of the application for a letter of credit, Issuing Bank issues a LC with a LC reference number. DLPC is in contingent state and remains as such until compliant documents are presented to the issuing bank by the advising bank on behalf of a beneficiary. Once that occurs, DLPC state changes to effective and buyer is obligated to pay an issuing bank. Once payment is made on the due date, DLPC is discharged.
Figure 11: DLPC 2 and the issuing bank/beneficiary relationship under the DLPC

If the letter of credit is not confirmed and issuing bank accepted the documents, then issuing bank has an effective payment commitment (DLPC2) to the Beneficiary. The advising bank advises the LC but doesn’t take on a payment obligation.

Figure 12: DLPC 3 and the issuing bank/confirming bank relationship on DLT

If the letter of credit has been confirmed by the confirming bank and the documents are clean, the issuing bank has an effective commitment DLPC3 with the confirming bank.
If a letter of the credit is confirmed, and the documents are clean, the confirming bank has an effective commitment to the Beneficiary.

3.3. Invoice (See BOX 1 Above)

An Invoice would generally need only one DLPC linked to it. In section 3.3.1 we illustrate the lifecycle of such an invoice with reference to the lifecycle of the DLPC linked to it.
3.3.1. Invoice Lifecycle with DLPC

![Invoice Lifecycle Diagram]

When invoice is accepted by the seller, DLPC becomes effective. DLPC is discharged when invoice is paid.

3.4. The DLPC may be Implemented Flexibly

As indicated in paragraph 2.1 of the Technical Best Practices (see here), a DLPC is recorded in 13 simple data fields on a distributed ledger. It is, however, not mandatory that all distributed ledgers should represent or show those fields in the same way, so long as the ledger contains a record of all 13 fields. Accordingly, different distributed ledgers may represent or show these fields, and the sequences or changes in those fields during the lifecycle of the DLPC, in different ways. Companies may choose to implement select DLPC use cases which address specific pain points, such as the use cases for drafts, which may enable electronic presentations. This flexibility ensures that the DLPC may be used on any distributed ledgers for any digital trade transactions. Please see section 2 of the Technical Best Practices for further details.

4. Contractual relationships

4.1. A Digital Promise to Pay

The DLPC is a promise to pay in digital form embedded in an electronic trade related instrument realized on a distributed ledger, irrespective of the type of instrument in which the DLPC is embedded or to which it refers. To provide a legal foundation for the roles, obligations and processes within the lifecycle of a DLPC, all participants of a network utilizing the DLPC will agree to be bound by the contractual terms governing the network and the DLPC as

---

2 The discussion in this Section 4 is based upon the DLPC Working Group’s understanding of the law as of the date of this document. Persons wishing to utilize a DLPC in the context of a specific commercial transaction are advised to seek appropriate legal advice to confirm that its use will create effective legal relationships as intended by the parties.
a requirement in order to conduct business within the network. The contract terms governing the network, the trade finance instruments on the network and the DLPC, will ideally specify the law - or the laws (see further paragraph 4.1.4 below) - to govern the network, the instruments, and the DLPC, as well as the choice of, and process related to, the forum for settlement of any disputes between the parties.

In addition, the DLPC Contract Terms appearing in section 4.2 below include three components: (a) agreed contract terms describing the rights and obligations of parties to a DLPC; (b) an incorporation of a residual body of law to govern the resolution of issues not resolved by the agreed contract terms; and (c) a choice of forum and service of process arrangements for suit in the chosen forum. The DLPC may originate as a “conditional” payment obligation when the Commitment Type field in the DLPC shows “Contingent” and, over its lifecycle it may become “unconditional”, when the Commitment Type field in the DLPC shows “Effective”. From that point onwards, it is an “unconditional promise to pay” and, under the DLPC Contract Terms in section 4.2, the parties accept that the DLPC is a “Note” that should benefit from the legal protections summarized in the following paragraphs.

4.1.1. Agreed Contract Terms

The DLPC has been designed to benefit from the provisions of established legal frameworks for negotiable instruments, namely Article 3 of the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and Section 116 of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act (UETA), both as adopted by the State of Delaware. These Delaware statutory provisions have been chosen because the Delaware UCC provides an up to date rule set defining the rights and obligations of parties to negotiable instruments that is detailed and is as close to self-contained as one finds in a common-law environment. Furthermore, it is derived from the international law merchant, and consequently its principles are generally similar to those of the laws of other civil-and common-law jurisdictions, thereby making it attractive to a wide spectrum of banks operating globally. Moreover, the Delaware UETA provides a legal environment that expressly facilitates electronic transactions and enables legally binding and enforceable negotiable promises to pay in digital form, which is precisely what the DLPC is. The Delaware UETA also confers on the person to whom the obligation was originally issued, or the most recent transferee, of an electronic record (as defined in UETA) the same rights and defenses as a holder of an equivalent negotiable instrument under the UCC, including those of a holder in due course, as if the electronic record were a negotiable instrument in written form. Accordingly, experts familiar with these laws have drafted the contractual language in paragraph 4.2 below for the application of the Delaware UCC and UETA to the DLPC.

In the normal course of trade finance transactions, it is expected that use of the DLPC will in fact satisfy the requirements of UETA and will therefore benefit from the statutory protections of the UCC and UETA. Even if a particular DLPC does not in fact satisfy all the statutory requirements, all parties to a DLPC on a network using the contractual language in paragraph 4.2 below, agree among themselves that the DLPC should be treated like notes or transferable records under the Delaware UCC and UETA. However, in such a case a third party who has not agreed to the contractual language in paragraph 4.2 could assert claims or rights based on the DLPC not being a negotiable instrument or not having been properly transferred.

4.1.2. Residual Law

To resolve interstitial issues not covered by the Delaware UCC and UETA, Delaware law has been chosen as the governing law for the DLPC. Delaware law is generally recognized as providing a sound legal environment for banking and financial transactions and our legal experts advise that Delaware law allows virtually complete party autonomy in choice of law for commercial transactions without the requirement of a nexus or connection of the
parties or the transaction to Delaware, provided that the parties have submitted to the jurisdiction of the courts of Delaware and have agreed to the service of legal process.

4.1.3. Choice of Forum

A further benefit in choosing Delaware law as the governing law for DLPC transactions is that the Delaware UETA expressly permits the parties to an “electronic contract” (such as the DLPC) to choose an exclusive judicial forum for the adjudication of any disputes concerning use of the DLPC.

4.1.4. Freedom of Parties to Choose Another Governing Law and/or Dispute Settlement Forum for the DLPC

The challenge of many laws around the world is that there is no legal certainty for digital payment undertakings. In contrast, Delaware law provides a legal framework under which the DLPC is legally binding and enforceable because Delaware law: (a) expressly recognizes the validity of electronic payment commitments in the form of notes designed like the DLPC; (b) expressly permits a choice of Delaware law and forum clause, allowing parties outside of Delaware to nevertheless get the benefit of Delaware law; and (c) highly favors freedom of the parties to contract. Moreover, Delaware courts are sophisticated commercial courts. Accordingly, the choice of Delaware law and Delaware forum to apply to the DLPC maximizes the likelihood that the rules of the DLPC based on Delaware law will be enforced as written, and one of the mandatory fields for the DLPC expressly provides for the choice of law to be applied to the DLPC.³

Notwithstanding the preferred choice of Delaware law and forum for the DLPC as recommended in these Business Best Practices, unless their legal advisers counsel otherwise, the parties to any network that wish to use the DLPC:

- May choose to apply a different law to govern the network and the trade transactions on that network, in addition to choosing Delaware law to apply to the DLPC (thereby allowing the DLPC to benefit from the digital friendly Delaware law);
- May choose to apply Delaware law to the DLPC as recommended in these Best Business Practices, but choose a different forum to settle any disputes related to the DLPC, in which event proof of Delaware law would normally need to be provided to that forum under the processes and procedures of that forum; and
- May choose to apply a different law to govern the DLPC, and a different forum to settle payment disputes involving the DLPC, if they so prefer.

However, in making any of these choices, the parties should seek the counsel of their legal advisers and assess whether the choice would risk greater legal uncertainty or increase the costs of dispute settlement.

4.2. DLPC Contract Terms

Parties to a trade or trade finance transaction on a DL who would like to use the DLPC as recommended in these Business Best Practices, could utilize the following proposed contract terms applicable to the DLPC:

Each person, whether in the capacity of the issuer, obligor, obligee, transferee (being identified as committer or committee in the DLPC) or otherwise who is a party to, or who seeks to derive an interest in or a benefit from, the Distributed Ledger Payment Commitment (DLPC) on this network agrees that:

³ See Data Field 13 ("Applicable Rules") in Section 2.1 of the DLPC Technical Best Practices [see here].
a. an Effective DLPC is an electronic record of an unconditional promise to pay that evidences the obligation arising from the transaction (if any) identified in Field 3 of the DLPC,
b. the Effective DLPC, if it were in writing, would be a note under Article 3 of the Uniform Commercial Code of the State of Delaware in the United States of America,
c. the Effective DLPC is a transferable record under Section 116 of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act of the State of Delaware (“Section 116”),
d. the person to whom the obligation is payable is the person identified as the committee in the DLPC, to whom the obligation was issued or most recently transferred and is therefore at that time the person in control of the transferable record for purposes of Section 116,
e. the person in control of the transferable record and an obligor under the transferable record who is the person identified as the committer in the DLPC, have the rights and defenses described in Section 116,
f. discharge of any Effective DLPC also constitutes discharge of the obligation(s) evidenced by the DLPC,
g. the rights and obligation(s) of parties to the DLPC are governed by the local law of the State of Delaware,
h. a state or federal court sitting in the State of Delaware has exclusive jurisdiction to resolve any dispute relating to the DLPC4,
i. service of process upon it in connection with any dispute relating to the DLPC shall be fully effective if sent to and received by such party via registered or certified U.S. mail or delivery by a nationally recognized express transportation company (including, without limitation, DHL, FedEx, or United Parcel Service) at a specified U.S. address5, and
j. these contract terms shall apply to all DLPCs on all networks implementing DLPCs, regardless of whether such person is identified as an issuer, obligor, obligee, transferee or otherwise in any such DLPC or claims rights or asserts obligations with respect to any such DLPC under any other contract or law.

5. Security Interests

Security Interest and Perfected Security Interest are well-known credit-related concepts with a legal framework established by local jurisdiction, such as the UCC in the United States.

Below are representative general definitions:

What is SECURITY INTEREST? An enforceable claim that is created by a security agreement or by the law that secures the fulfillment of a pledge. The lender has security interest in collateral provided by a borrower to guarantee timely payment.*

What is PERFECTED SECURITY INTEREST? Any secure interest in an asset, which cannot be claimed by any other party. A lien might be registered against it. Known as perfected lien.*

4 Because the DLPC is to be governed by Delaware law (paragraph 4.2 (f)), under current law, parties can be certain that courts in Delaware will accept jurisdiction and give effect to that choice of law. If parties want to choose courts in other jurisdictions (within or outside the United States), they will want to assess whether this may increase the costs of dispute settlement or risk greater legal uncertainty.

5 Parties choosing Delaware law to govern a contract must be capable of being served with legal process in Delaware or elsewhere. This requirement may be satisfied by parties specifying, in the network data or elsewhere, a publicly accessible U.S. address for service of process, which may be in care of an agent (including, without limitation, Corporation Service Company, CT Corporation, InCorp, or National Registered Agents).

6 In the United States and certain other jurisdictions, the term “security interest” is also defined to include the interest of a buyer in certain payment rights including the interest of a buyer in a promissory note.
*Black’s Law Dictionary.*

For each trade instrument and transaction type that the DLPC proposes to support, there are common practices for establishing and perfecting security interests. For example, with Letters of Credit, a security or credit agreement may be established between the borrower and creditor, often covering all assets of the borrower, including Accounts Receivable and Inventory. A UCC Financing Statement may then be filed to perfect the security interest.

The DLPC does not propose to alter the rules and conditions for establishing and perfecting security interests. Corporates and banks should refer to the laws in each local jurisdiction and their relationship to each instrument or transaction type to establish and perfect security interests.

It is hoped that the DLPC will make transfer of interests in certain trade finance products easier and will provide a framework which could be used for modernizing the laws dealing with trade finance products.

6. **Risk Structure and Mitigation**

For each trade instrument and transaction type that the DLPC proposes to support, there are different risk structures, and the level of risk each participant is exposed to varies depending on its role in the transaction.

For example, with Letters of Credit, the issuing bank takes on the risk of the applicant. The advising bank may elect to confirm the letter of credit, in which case it would take on the risk of the issuing bank. The beneficiary is protected from the risk of non-payment by the applicant.

Separate from the risk mitigation that may be available based on the risk structure of the instrument or transaction itself, participants may choose to mitigate risk by establishing separate agreements among the parties with covenants and other terms and conditions of performance.

The DLPC does not propose to alter the Risk Structure or the practices of Risk Mitigation that pertain to each instrument and transaction type. Corporates and banks should refer to the laws in each local jurisdiction and their relationship to each instrument or transaction type to determine appropriate risk mitigation techniques.

7. **Compliance and AML Requirements**

It is believed that the best practices described in this document would not conflict with the compliance, AML and data protection requirements currently in effect. Consequently, regulated financial institutions or others subject to these requirements will continue to use processes they have in place. With respect to the increased EU data protection provisions of GDPR, we note that the DLPC is designed to be recorded on a permissioned distributed ledger system and participants will be able to withhold data that they consider should be held confidential.