

Private M&A 2022

Contributing editors

Will Pearce and Louis L Goldberg

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP





Davis Polk

Davis Polk is a leader in global M&A. Clients call on our lawyers because of our track record of getting deals done.

With the benefit of our long history of innovation and creative problem-solving, Davis Polk brings strategic and sophisticated judgment, commercial awareness and unsurpassed service to our clients across the full spectrum of M&A transactions.

Our M&A clients rely on the seamless integration of Davis Polk's unparalleled tax, finance, executive compensation and regulatory practices.

Learn more at davispolk.com.

davispolk.com

©2021 Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

ATTORNEY ADVERTISING. Prior results do not guarantee similar outcome.

Publisher

Tom Barnes

tom.barnes@lbresearch.com

Subscriptions

Claire Bagnall

claire.bagnall@lbresearch.com

Head of business development

Adam Sargent

adam.sargent@gettingthedealthrough.com

Published by

Law Business Research Ltd

Meridian House, 34-35 Farringdon Street

London, EC4A 4HL, UK

The information provided in this publication is general and may not apply in a specific situation. Legal advice should always be sought before taking any legal action based on the information provided. This information is not intended to create, nor does receipt of it constitute, a lawyer-client relationship. The publishers and authors accept no responsibility for any acts or omissions contained herein. The information provided was verified between August and September 2021. Be advised that this is a developing area.

© Law Business Research Ltd 2021

No photocopying without a CLA licence.

First published 2017

Fifth edition

ISBN 978-1-83862-702-7

Printed and distributed by

Encompass Print Solutions

Tel: 0844 2480 112



Private M&A 2022

Contributing editors

Will Pearce and Louis L Goldberg

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

Lexology Getting The Deal Through is delighted to publish the fifth edition of *Private M&A*, which is available in print and online at www.lexology.com/gtdt.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through provides international expert analysis in key areas of law, practice and regulation for corporate counsel, cross-border legal practitioners, and company directors and officers.

Throughout this edition, and following the unique Lexology Getting The Deal Through format, the same key questions are answered by leading practitioners in each of the jurisdictions featured. Our coverage this year includes new chapters on Latvia and Spain.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through titles are published annually in print. Please ensure you are referring to the latest edition or to the online version at www.lexology.com/gtdt.

Every effort has been made to cover all matters of concern to readers. However, specific legal advice should always be sought from experienced local advisers.

Lexology Getting The Deal Through gratefully acknowledges the efforts of all the contributors to this volume, who were chosen for their recognised expertise. We also extend special thanks to the contributing editors, Will Pearce and Louis L Goldberg of Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP, for their continued assistance with this volume.



London

September 2021

Reproduced with permission from Law Business Research Ltd

This article was first published in September 2021

For further information please contact editorial@gettingthedealthrough.com

Contents

Comparing UK and US private M&A transactions	5	Denmark	76
Will Pearce and William Tong Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP		Anders Ørjan Jensen and Charlotte Thorsen Gorissen Federspiel	
The use of completion accounts in private M&A transactions	10	Dominican Republic	84
Tom Crossland and Fabian Sherwin Deloitte		Fabio J Guzmán Saladín and Pamela Benzán Guzmán Ariza	
Foreign direct investment controls in cross-border acquisitions	14	Egypt	89
Matthew Yeowart, Léonore De Mullewie and Sara Moshfegh Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP		Mohamed Hashish and Rana Abdelaty Soliman, Hashish & Partners	
HR, incentives and retention issues in M&A transactions	18	Finland	95
Matthew Emms BDO LLP		Fredrik Lassenius, Christoffer Waselius and Niko Markkanen Waselius & Wist	
Data privacy and cybersecurity in global dealmaking	24	France	104
Matthew Bacal and Pritesh Shah Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP		Jacques Naquet-Radiguet Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	
Riders on a storm: signs of a hardening M&A insurance market?	32	Georgia	111
Piers Johansen and Dominic Rose Aon M&A and Transaction Solutions		Archil Giorgadze and Ana Kochiashvili MG Law Office	
Australia	35	Germany	119
Michael Wallin and Andrew Jiang MinterEllison		Alexander Schwarz and Ralf Morshäuser Gleiss Lutz	
Austria	43	Greece	129
Christian Herbst and Maximilian Lang Schoenherr		Catherine M Karatzas, Anna K Manda and Olga Vinieri Karatzas & Partners Law Firm	
Belgium	50	Hong Kong	137
Dries Hommez and Florent Volckaert Stibbe		Yang Chu, Miranda So and Jason Xu Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	
Canada	60	Indonesia	147
John M Mercury, James T McClary, Bryan C Haynes, Ian C Michael, Kristopher R Hanc and Drew C Broughton Bennett Jones LLP		Yozua Makes Makes & Partners	
China	68	Israel	154
Jiangshan (Jackson) Tang Haiwen & Partners Howard Zhang Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP		Sharon A Amir and Idan Lidor Naschitz Brandes Amir	
		Italy	162
		Francesco Florio and Paolo Antonio Mulas Legance – Avvocati Associati	

Latvia	170	South Korea	271
Gints Vilgerts and Jūlija Jerņeva VILGERTS		Sky Yang, Mok Hong Kim, Hyunchul An and Joceline Park Bae, Kim & Lee LLC	
Luxembourg	177	Spain	278
Gérald Origer, Claire-Marie Darnand and Michaël Meylan Stibbe		Guillermo del Río Uría Menéndez	
Malaysia	185	Sudan	286
Dato' Foong Chee Meng, Tan Chien Li, Khor Wei Min and Vivian Chew Li Voon Foong and Partners		Mahmoud Bassiouny, Yassir Ali, Nadia Abdallah and Amgad Nagy Matouk Bassiouny	
Myanmar	195	Sweden	292
Takeshi Mukawa, Win Naing, Julian Barendse and Nirmalan Amirthanesan Myanmar Legal MHM Limited		Peter Sundgren and Matthias Pannier Vinge	
Netherlands	204	Switzerland	300
Hans Witteveen and Jeroen Tjaden Stibbe		Claude Lambert, Reto Heuberger and Andreas Müller Homburger	
New Zealand	215	Thailand	309
Erich Bachmann, Kate Telford and Julika Wahlmann-Smith Hesketh Henry		Panuwat Chalongkuamdee, Natira Siripun, Chositar Daecharux and Thosaphol Thurongkinanonth SRPP Limited	
Norway	222	Turkey	319
Ole K Aabø-Evensen Aabø-Evensen & Co		Noyan Turunç, Esin Çamlıbel and Kerem Turunç Turunç	
Philippines	234	United Arab Emirates	327
Lily K Gruba and Jorge Alfonso C Melo Zambrano Gruba Caganda & Advincula		Malack El Masry and Charlotte Jackson Ibrahim & Partners	
Portugal	241	United Kingdom	336
Francisco Santos Costa Cuatrecasas		Will Pearce, Simon Little and William Tong Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	
Serbia	250	United States	345
Nenad Stankovic, Sara Pendjer and Mitar Simonovic Stankovic & Partners NSTLaw		Cheryl Chan, Darren M Schweiger and Evan Rosen Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP	
Singapore	260	Zambia	354
Ong Sin Wei, Teo Hsiao-Huey, Soong Wen E and Daniel Chui WongPartnership LLP		Joseph Jalasi, Mailesi Undi and Jonathan Chileshe Eric Silwamba, Jalasi & Linyama Legal Practitioners	

Foreign direct investment controls in cross-border acquisitions

Matthew Yeowart, Léonore De Mullewie and Sara Moshfegh

Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP

In addition to merger control and other regulatory approvals, an ever-growing number of jurisdictions have now adopted foreign direct investment (FDI) screening mechanisms. These aim to determine whether investments by foreign entities raise broader national security or other 'public interest' concerns.

For more than 30 years, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States has been able to block acquisitions that threaten defence or other critical national interests. In recent years, similar regimes have proliferated across the world. The European Commission (EC) and the UK government have signalled the need for strengthened powers.

This spread of adoption, and increasing intensity, of FDI review, has been accelerating in the face of fears that the covid-19 pandemic will leave domestic businesses vulnerable to opportunistic foreign investors. Before the pandemic, only a handful of EU member states had an FDI screening regime in force. Now, around 18 member states have an active FDI screening regime.

Most of the recent reforms result from the entry into force of an EU-level FDI cooperation mechanism in October 2020. This article will focus on the evolving landscape of FDI controls outside the United States.

FDI regime frameworks

As with merger control review, there is no 'one-size fits all' approach when looking at different FDI regimes. Jurisdictions (particularly outside the European Union) have taken divergent approaches in seeking to protect their own interests through a variety of mechanisms.

FDI screening regimes – being born out of public interest concerns – tend to confer a great deal of discretion on government authorities, enabling them to cherry-pick transactions of interest. One mechanism through which governments achieve this is through the use of broad, nebulous concepts to demarcate the sectoral scope of their regime. Concepts such as 'national defence', 'national security', 'critical infrastructure' and 'critical technology' are frequently utilised by authorities to afford them latitude in staking jurisdiction.

Sectoral coverage

One of the major variances between FDI regimes lies in their sectoral coverage. Most countries take a focused approach, identifying (albeit broadly) particularly sensitive sectors within which foreign investments may be subject to review. Typically, this will include categories such as national defence, critical infrastructure and critical technology, as well as other sectors politically sensitive to the particular jurisdiction.

Certain other jurisdictions (including Australia, Canada and Germany) do not limit their review powers according to relevant sectors.

Transaction structure

A number of factors in the structure of the target and transaction may impact the obligation to notify. In Japan and India, for example, only direct acquisitions of an interest in a domestic company (with exceptions) are covered. Similarly, a filing can generally be excluded in jurisdictions where the target does not have subsidiaries, branches, offices or assets.

One notable exception to this is the United Kingdom, whose current FDI screening regime covers transactions where the target only has local revenues, without necessarily having a physical presence in the United Kingdom. In contrast, under the upcoming UK FDI screening regime (expected to enter into force on 4 January 2022), there will generally be no requirement for the target to generate local revenues in the United Kingdom for jurisdiction to be established.

Another factor that drives the early FDI risk assessment is the level of control of the target company being acquired. In many jurisdictions, a transaction will not be subject to review if no control is being acquired or if the equity acquired is below a certain threshold (eg, 10 per cent in Spain; 25 per cent under the upcoming mandatory UK FDI regime; and 49 per cent in Mexico). Similarly to the merger control context, minority investors and acquirers of a majority shareholding must, therefore, consider FDI screening risks. Early consideration of these issues may, depending on the circumstances, allow the parties to adjust the transaction structure to avoid triggering FDI notification obligations.

Notification obligation

Under most FDI screening regimes, notification is mandatory and suspensory. As such, where there is a relevant transaction caught by such a regime, the parties must notify the relevant authority and may not close the transaction prior to receiving clearance.

Notable exceptions include Canada, which, for most transactions, imposes only a post-closing notification and the United Kingdom, which currently operates a voluntary notification regime while reserving the power to 'call in' any transaction where it deems there to be a public interest in doing so. In contrast, the upcoming UK FDI regime (expected to enter into force on 4 January 2022) introduces a mandatory notification system for certain sensitive sectors (eg, artificial intelligence, civil nuclear and military and dual-use products).

The consequences for failure to comply with an obligation to notify are typically severe. Penalties will often include a fine that, in India and Spain for example, can be as large as the entire transaction value. In addition, most regimes have the power to require the parties to unwind the transaction pending approval while certain others have the ability to impose criminal sanctions (eg, individuals responsible for a failure to notify in Australia may be imprisoned for up to three years).

Investor identity

Some investors' home states may be perceived as potentially more hostile to the host country than others. This tends to affect the outcome of the screening rather than determine which transactions are caught by the initial filing obligation.

Nevertheless, certain FDI regimes do discriminate on the grounds of particular nationalities. For example, the FDI regimes of certain EU member states (including France, Germany and Spain) contain stricter rules for non-EU/EFTA investors. Similarly, India has expanded its regime to capture all indirect acquisitions of an Indian company by an investor located in a country that shares borders with India (in particular, China).

As such, filings can sometimes be excluded based on the type of acquirer. For instance, in individual EU member states, acquirers from elsewhere in the European Economic Area are regularly exempted from a filing requirement. In contrast, certain acquirers (eg, state-owned or Chinese investors) are more likely to trigger a foreign investment filing or face a higher substantive risk.

Timing implications

Given the suspensory nature of a number of FDI regimes, the relevant review period can have particularly acute timing implications for closing deals. For instance, the review process usually takes between four and six months in France, Germany and India. In complex cases, the review period can take as long as nine months to more than one year if remedies are required.

Such long lead times can extend far beyond other closing conditions (including merger control clearance in no-issues cases). It is, therefore, crucial that an FDI risk analysis is conducted ahead of negotiating conditions and termination rights in a transaction agreement.

Risk allocation

As described above, FDI screening raises the potential for prohibitively long review periods and the power of the relevant authorities to impose (substantial) remedies or prohibit or unwind transactions altogether where necessary. It is, therefore, crucial that parties give appropriate consideration to these risks from the outset and properly consider the allocation of risk in transaction agreements. Parties may increasingly desire deal protections such as a 'hell or high water' clause, obliging the buyer to proceed with the transaction regardless of any obligations imposed in connection with any regulatory approval, or reverse termination fees.

Information gathering

FDI filings generally require the parties to provide an extensive amount of (sensitive) information to the relevant authorities. In many jurisdictions, such as France and Germany, the statutory clock does not start until a complete notification has been received. Furthermore, where requests for additional information may have to be issued, certain jurisdictions, including France and Italy, have the ability to stop the clock of the review period until the requested information has been provided.

Most jurisdictions operate a clear separation between FDI screening and the merger control process. Although there will be overlaps in the information required to make concurrent FDI and

merger control filings in certain jurisdictions, there will be certain information specific to each and, therefore, an increased information gathering burden.

However, in some jurisdictions (eg, Australia, Russia, China and – currently – the United Kingdom), FDI-related and merger control issues are assessed within the same framework. While there will be FDI-specific lines of questioning, this one-stop shop approach makes for a more streamlined dual-review process.

Particularly in light of the timing implications discussed above, expedient information-gathering and initiation of the review period can materially advance the transaction closing date.

Practice points

In practice:

- FDI screening risk should be considered as early as possible in the deal-making process in order to inform both the structure of the investment and the negotiation of transaction documents;
- given the extensive review period of many FDI regimes, it may be prudent to engage in information gathering ahead of signing to expedite the notification process as far as possible; and
- like merger control reviews, hefty fines and unwinding orders (as well as, in some cases, criminal sanctions) may be imposed if the parties fail to notify a transaction, and the outcome of the FDI review may also result in remedies being imposed on the parties as a condition to clearance.

Legal developments

The increasingly expansive approach taken by governments in establishing jurisdiction to review transactions in recent years necessitates that dealmakers appropriately address this issue early in the deal process. This is particularly so in light of the wave of amendments made in response to the covid-19 pandemic, as well as the entry into force of the European Union's FDI framework.

Recent reforms

A number of G20 jurisdictions had taken steps to tighten FDI controls before, and entirely unrelated to, the pandemic. For instance, Germany's 17th amendment to its FDI regime came into force earlier in 2021. The amendment tightened the German FDI regime once again, notably expanding the list of sensitive sectors subject to mandatory notification (especially targeting 'critical technologies' such as artificial intelligence, robotics, semiconductors, nuclear technology, cybersecurity and aerospace, among many others).

In addition, new mandatory notification requirements were implemented within Germany's sector-specific FDI review, now covering all kinds of military equipment (eg, secret patents). There are also new shareholding thresholds for subsequent acquisitions (eg, 20 per cent, 25 per cent, 40 per cent, 50 per cent or 75 per cent for the sectors and groups subject to initial mandatory notification at 10 per cent).

In the United Kingdom, a stand-alone regime is expected to come into force on 4 January 2022 under the National Security and Investment Act. This will replace the current framework, which is tied to UK merger control review. This regime is expected to require mandatory notifications for certain sensitive sectors (eg, robotics, artificial intelligence, defence and military) while retaining the voluntary nature of notifications currently employed across sectors when there may be national security concerns.

Earlier in 2021, the Italian government amended its FDI screening regime, which entered into force on 14 January 2021. This new regime expanded the list of strategic sectors to new areas, including the financial, credit and insurance sectors.

Similarly, in July, the Dutch government enacted a bill that aims to introduce a screening mechanism for investments in targets active in

vital processes (eg, energy, banking and certain activities at Amsterdam airport and the port of Rotterdam) or sensitive technology (eg, military goods and dual-use items). The bill – for which the entry into force has not yet been determined – is set to have retroactive effect and will affect investments made after 8 September 2020.

Rapid responses to the covid-19 pandemic

Amid global trends of growing populism, the covid-19 pandemic has so far proven to be a catalyst for the adoption of heightened protectionist policy through FDI controls. Faced with a sudden drop in asset values, governments across the world have sought means to protect their domestic businesses from potentially predatory foreign investments. In combatting this perceived threat, FDI controls have become a popular tool for many governments.

The response by many governments has been as swift as it has been dramatic. Spain, a jurisdiction with a historically light-touch FDI regime, has enacted emergency regulations that impose significant regulatory tightening focused on non-EU/EFTA investors and, in particular, those owned or controlled by a foreign government. This focus on ex-European and government-controlled investors is seen by many as being particularly targeted at Chinese investors. Similar sentiment is believed to have motivated the Indian government to tighten its rules such that any acquisition of an Indian company by an investor located in a country that shares borders with India (which includes China) is subject to approval.

Even in jurisdictions undergoing broader, pre-pandemic initiated reforms, short-term responses have been adopted to protect particular interests. In the United Kingdom, in addition to the broader reform anticipated under the National Security and Investment Act, the government added 'the capability to combat and mitigate the effects of public health emergencies' as a public interest ground for intervention. The government's guidance issued in respect of this amendment indicated the breadth of this ground, stating that it might capture an internet service provider or food supply chain company, given the significance of those services in a pandemic-induced lockdown situation.

In Germany, while expanding the sectors subject to a lower 10 per cent shareholding mandatory filing threshold, personal protective equipment, pharmaceutical essentials and certain medical devices, including IV diagnostic devices, were included.

The rapid reactions of governments across the globe evidence just how quickly and dramatically FDI controls can evolve. While responses have diverged in their approach, the thrust in all cases has very much been a desire to claim jurisdiction to protect domestic businesses at the expense of foreign investors. Although legislative activity has slowed, the momentum is continuing in the direction of protectionism through greater government intervention in acquisitions.

EU seeks to harmonise European FDI review

On 11 October 2020, Regulation (EU) 2019/452 (the Regulation) creating an EU-wide framework for screening FDI came into force. The Regulation seeks to ensure EU-wide coordination and cooperation on the screening of FDI that is likely to affect security or public order but stops short of the EC's one-stop shop approach to merger control within the European Union. Under the EU FDI framework, the EC itself does not have any direct powers to interfere with transactions. Instead, it has two tracks of review powers under which it may issue an opinion.

The first opinion-making power applies where there is proposed FDI into the European Union that is (1) likely to affect projects of 'Union interest' and (2) reviewable on the basis of security and public order. Here, the EC may itself review the proposed investment and issue an opinion. The EC's opinions do not, themselves, carry any legal consequence; however, any member state that reviews the relevant FDI must take 'utmost account' of the EC's opinion and provide an explanation

Davis Polk

Matthew Yeowart

matthew.yeowart@davispolk.com

Léonore De Mullewie

leonore.demullewie@davispolk.com

Sara Moshfegh

sara.moshfegh@davispolk.com

5 Aldermanbury Square
London EC2V 7HR
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 20 7418 1300
Fax: +44 20 7418 1400
www.davispolk.com

to the EC if its opinion is not followed. Transactions of Union interest are expected to include projects that enjoy substantial EU funding or are covered by EU legislation 'regarding critical infrastructure, critical technologies or critical inputs', such as research (Horizon 2020), space (Galileo), transport (the Trans-European Networks for Transport), energy (TEN-E) and telecommunications.

The EC's secondary opinion-making power applies where an investment does not meet either of the limbs in the preceding paragraph but is subject to FDI screening by a member state. In such circumstances, the member state must inform the EC and other member states 'as soon as possible' following commencement of the review. The EC and other member states may each issue an opinion on the investment, and the reviewing member state must give 'due consideration' to any such opinions received in its review of the particular investment.

Aside from establishing this collaborative, approach to FDI reviews, the Regulation also establishes reporting requirements. Each member state, regardless of whether it has implemented an FDI screening regime, must produce an annual report of all FDI that took place in their territory over that time. The EC will then produce an annual report on the implementation of the Regulation, which will be made publicly available.

It is too soon to evaluate how much discretion will be afforded to reviewing member states departing from opinions handed down under either standard. Given the political nature of FDI review, it is likely, however, that this dual review process will raise tensions and not be without conflict between reviewing member states, their fellow member states and the EC.

Closing remarks

The recent rapid emergence and expansion of FDI controls in many major jurisdictions should be a focus for dealmakers as they seek to identify and take steps to mitigate adverse deal timing and execution risks. The flurry of protectionist legislative measures taken, in part in response to the sharp fall in asset values in reaction to the covid-19 pandemic, has jump-started the move towards ever-more prohibitive FDI regimes. While such swift and aggressive adoption of heightened protections is likely to slow, many expect that the momentum will continue in this direction in the coming years.

The ever-growing scope of governments' jurisdiction to review, together with the potential sanctions and remedial action that can be imposed on parties that fail to comply, necessitates engagement with potential FDI issues early in the transaction process; however, prudent attention to this regulatory issue can minimise the negative timing and risk implications now faced in cross-border transactions.



Davis Polk

**Clients turn to us
for exceptional
service,
sophisticated
advice and
creative, practical
solutions.**

Davis Polk is an elite global law firm with world-class practices across the board. Industry-leading companies and global financial institutions know they can rely on us for their most challenging legal and business matters.

Learn more at **davispolk.com**.

davispolk.com

©2021 Davis Polk & Wardwell LLP
ATTORNEY ADVERTISING. Prior results do not guarantee similar outcome.

Other titles available in this series

Acquisition Finance	Dispute Resolution	Investment Treaty Arbitration	Public M&A
Advertising & Marketing	Distribution & Agency	Islamic Finance & Markets	Public Procurement
Agribusiness	Domains & Domain Names	Joint Ventures	Public-Private Partnerships
Air Transport	Dominance	Labour & Employment	Rail Transport
Anti-Corruption Regulation	Drone Regulation	Legal Privilege & Professional	Real Estate
Anti-Money Laundering	Electricity Regulation	Secrecy	Real Estate M&A
Appeals	Energy Disputes	Licensing	Renewable Energy
Arbitration	Enforcement of Foreign	Life Sciences	Restructuring & Insolvency
Art Law	Judgments	Litigation Funding	Right of Publicity
Asset Recovery	Environment & Climate	Loans & Secured Financing	Risk & Compliance Management
Automotive	Regulation	Luxury & Fashion	Securities Finance
Aviation Finance & Leasing	Equity Derivatives	M&A Litigation	Securities Litigation
Aviation Liability	Executive Compensation &	Mediation	Shareholder Activism &
Banking Regulation	Employee Benefits	Merger Control	Engagement
Business & Human Rights	Financial Services Compliance	Mining	Ship Finance
Cartel Regulation	Financial Services Litigation	Oil Regulation	Shipbuilding
Class Actions	Fintech	Partnerships	Shipping
Cloud Computing	Foreign Investment Review	Patents	Sovereign Immunity
Commercial Contracts	Franchise	Pensions & Retirement Plans	Sports Law
Competition Compliance	Fund Management	Pharma & Medical Device	State Aid
Complex Commercial Litigation	Gaming	Regulation	Structured Finance &
Construction	Gas Regulation	Pharmaceutical Antitrust	Securitisation
Copyright	Government Investigations	Ports & Terminals	Tax Controversy
Corporate Governance	Government Relations	Private Antitrust Litigation	Tax on Inbound Investment
Corporate Immigration	Healthcare Enforcement &	Private Banking & Wealth	Technology M&A
Corporate Reorganisations	Litigation	Management	Telecoms & Media
Cybersecurity	Healthcare M&A	Private Client	Trade & Customs
Data Protection & Privacy	High-Yield Debt	Private Equity	Trademarks
Debt Capital Markets	Initial Public Offerings	Private M&A	Transfer Pricing
Defence & Security	Insurance & Reinsurance	Product Liability	Vertical Agreements
Procurement	Insurance Litigation	Product Recall	
Digital Business	Intellectual Property & Antitrust	Project Finance	

Also available digitally

[lexology.com/gtdt](https://www.lexology.com/gtdt)