

Bram Akkermans
Jaap Hage
Nicole Kornet
Jan Smits

Who Does What? On the allocation of regulatory competences in European Private Law



Editors:
Bram Akkermans
Jaap Hage
Nicole Kornet
Jan Smits

Who Does What? On the allocation of regulatory competences in European Private Law

Intersentia Ltd
Sheraton House | Castle Park
Cambridge | CB3 0AX | United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1223 370 172 | Email: mail@intersentia.co.uk

ISBN 978-17-8068-325-6
D/2015/7849/62
NUR 822

© 2015 Intersentia
Cambridge – Antwerp – Portland
www.intersentia.com | www.intersentia.co.uk

Cover photo: © Per Swantesson – Stocksy

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data. A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photo copy, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF AUTHORSxiii

Bram Akkermans, Jaap Hage, Nicole Kornet, Jan Smits

WHO DOES WHAT IN EUROPEAN PRIVATE LAW? AN INTRODUCTION 1

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. The Structure of this Book 2
- 3. Towards Criteria 2
- 4. Conclusions..... 11

PART I: GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

Jaap Hage

THE JUSTIFICATION OF VALUE JUDGMENTS. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR ARGUMENTS ABOUT THE BEST LEVEL TO REGULATE EUROPEAN PRIVATE LAW 15

- 1. The Role of Value Judgments in Law 15
- 2. Outline of the Argument..... 16
- 3. Syllogistic Justification 17
- 4. Valuation 18
 - 4.1. The Naturalist Fallacy 18
 - 4.2. Non-Cognitivism 20
 - 4.3. Supervenience 21
 - 4.4. Universalizability 22
- 5. The Justification of Standards 24
 - 5.1. Deductive Validity? 24
 - 5.2. Justification and Truth..... 26
- 6. Foundationalism and its Pitfalls 27
 - 6.1. Use of Existing Standards 28

6.2.	Naturalistic Fallacy	30
6.3.	Appeal to Self-evidence.....	30
6.4.	The 'Myth of the Given'	31
7.	Justification through Coherence	32
7.1.	Consistency, Comprehensiveness and Completeness	33
7.2.	Agent-Relativity of Justification.....	35
7.3.	Defeasible Coherentism	37
8.	Justification on the Balance of Reasons	38
8.1.	Reasons.....	39
8.2.	Balancing.....	40
8.3.	Reasoning about Relative Weight.....	41
9.	Comparative Value Judgments.....	42
10.	Procedural Approaches to Justification	44
10.1.	Pure, Perfect and Imperfect Procedures.....	44
10.2.	Single Agent Justification of Value Judgments	45
10.3.	Two-Agent Justification of Value Judgments.....	46
10.4.	Concluding on Procedural Justification.....	48
11.	Summary and Conclusions.....	48
12.	Recommendations.....	49
	Bibliography	52

Jan M. Smits

	WHO DOES WHAT? ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF COMPETENCES AMONG THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE MEMBER STATES	57
1.	Introduction.....	57
2.	State-of-the-Art: Focus on Subsidiarity and Federalism.....	59
2.1.	Introduction	59
2.2.	The Legal Approach: Distribution of Competences and Subsidiarity	60
2.3.	The Economic Approach: the 'Economics of Federalism'	61
2.4.	The Contribution of Political Science	62
3.	Gaps in Present-Day Scholarship and a Search for Criteria	63
3.1.	Introduction: Problems of the Present Approach.....	63
3.2.	How to make Progress?	64
4.	Finally: the Academic Challenge	66
	Bibliography	68

Jaap Hage

	ON WHICH LEVEL SHOULD PRIVATE LAW IN EUROPE BE CREATED?	73
1.	Introduction	73

2.	Methodic Preliminaries	74
2.1.	Default Reasoning and Shifts in the Burden of Proof	74
2.2.	Comparing the Alternatives	75
2.3.	The Relevant Data	76
3.	Utilitarianism	77
3.1.	Consequentialism	78
3.2.	One Intrinsic Value	78
3.3.	Aggregation	79
3.4.	Practical Implications	79
4.	The Best Rules	80
4.1.	What are the Best Rules?	81
4.2.	Expertise	81
4.3.	Externalities	83
4.4.	Coherence	83
4.5.	Scope of Rules	84
5.	Autonomy	86
6.	Side-Constraints and Transition	87
7.	Summary	88
8.	Comparison	89
8.1.	Arguments from the Existing Literature	89
8.2.	Parameters	90
8.3.	Conclusion	92
	Bibliography	93

PART II: SPECIFIC PERSPECTIVES

William Bull, Jiangqiu Ge, Catalina Goanță, Mark Kawakami, Jan Smits

WHO DOES WHAT IN CONSUMER LAW: A SEARCH FOR CRITERIA FOR CENTRALIZED LAWMAKING.....

1.	Introduction	97
2.	The Starting Point: Consumer Law must be dealt with at the National Level	98
3.	Centralization of European Consumer Law: Justifying the Departure from the Starting Point	100
3.1.	Fragmentation Criterion	102
3.1.1.	Consumer Confidence Factor	102
3.1.2.	Novelty Factor	104
3.2.	Permeability Criterion	105
3.3.	Application of the Criteria	107

4.	Doorstep Selling: Example of when Decision Making at Centralized Level is not Appropriate	107
5.	The Virtual Internal Market: Example of when Decision Making at Centralized Level is Appropriate	110
5.1.	Joe the Consumer (Number Profile)	111
5.2.	Joe the Consumer (Case Law Profile).....	113
5.3.	Centralization Criteria are Met	114
5.4.	Online Shopping – the Next Step in Terms of Trust	116
6.	Conclusion	117
	Bibliography	119

Anna Beckers, Nicole Kornet, Janwillem Oosterhuis

	WHO DOES WHAT IN COMMERCIAL LAW? THE CASE FOR A MULTI-LEVEL & MULTI-ACTOR APPROACH TO REGULATING COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS	125
1.	Introduction	125
2.	A Sketch of the Current Regulatory Landscape for Commercial Transactions	127
3.	How should Commercial Law be Regulated?	131
3.1.	Introduction	131
3.2.	Facilitating Party Autonomy	132
3.3.	Setting the Limits - Regulating Negative Externalities	134
3.4.	Criteria for Determining Who should make Rules for Commercial Transactions	137
3.4.1.	Regulation Serving the Commercial Interest	138
3.4.2.	Regulation Serving the Interests of the Market and Society	140
3.5.	Conclusion	145
4.	Case Studies	146
4.1.	Bills of Exchange – A Historical Perspective	146
4.2.	The Core of Commercial Exchange: Commercial Sales Transactions	151
4.3.	Corporate Social Responsibility in Global Supply-Chains: Regulating Adverse Human Rights Impact of Commercial Parties.....	156
5.	Conclusion	160
	Bibliography	162

Bram Akkermans

	EUROPEAN UNION CONSTITUTIONAL PROPERTY LAW: SEARCHING FOR FOUNDATIONS FOR THE ALLOCATION OF REGULATORY COMPETENCES	177
1.	Introduction	177
2.	European Economic Constitutional Law	180

3.	Property Law and the EU Internal Market.....	182
4.	Scenario: Return to Socialism or a New Type of Planned Economy.....	186
5.	Who does What?	188
6.	Scenario: South African Law	191
7.	Beyond the Economic Framework: Property as Democracy (or in Constitutional Context).....	194
8.	Multi-Dimensional and Multi-level Property Law.....	197
9.	Conclusion	200
	Bibliography	204

Willem Loof, Anna Berlee

	CASE STUDY: HARMONIZING SECURITY RIGHTS	211
1.	Introduction.....	211
2.	The Netherlands.....	212
2.1.	Security on Future Assets?.....	212
2.2.	Pledging Claims	212
2.2.1.	Specificity	214
2.2.2.	Pledging by Power of Attorney	215
2.2.3.	The Silent Pledge on Balance.....	216
2.3.	Retention of Ownership in Dutch Law	217
2.3.1.	The Limitations of Retention of Ownership under Dutch Law	217
2.3.2.	Alternatives.....	218
2.4.	The Balance of Powers.....	219
3.	English Law	220
3.1.	Charges.....	221
3.1.1.	Fixed Charges	221
3.1.2.	Floating Charges	221
3.1.3.	Judicial Inception, Legislative Dismantling	223
3.1.4.	Charges over Book Debts: Fixed or Floating?	224
3.1.5.	Spectrum Plus Ltd.....	225
3.2.	Reservation of Title.....	227
3.2.1.	Romalpa Aluminium Ltd.....	228
3.2.2.	Balance of Interests in English Law	230
4.	Belgian Reform of Security Rights in Relation to Movable.....	231
4.1.	Background to the Reform.....	232
4.2.	Pledge	232
4.3.	Reservation of Ownership	234
4.4.	The Balance of Interest in Belgian Law	236
5.	Harmonization of Security Rights; Article 9 UCC and Book IX DCFR	237
5.1.	The Functional Approach	237

5.2.	Article 9 UCC.....	237
6.	Book IX DCFR.....	238
6.1.	Key Elements of Harmonization of Security Rights.....	239
7.	Conclusion	240
	Bibliography	242

Caroline Cauffman, Niels Philipsen

	WHO DOES WHAT IN COMPETITION LAW: HARMONIZING THE RULES ON DAMAGES FOR INFRINGEMENTS OF THE EU COMPETITION RULES?	245
1.	Introduction	245
2.	Aims and Content of the Directive	247
2.1.	Aims of the Directive	247
2.2.	Content of the Directive	247
2.2.1.	Scope and Definitions.....	248
2.2.2.	Disclosure of Evidence	249
2.2.3.	Effect of National Decisions, Limitation Periods, Joint and Several Liability	251
2.2.4.	Passing-on of Overcharges	252
2.2.5.	Quantification of Harm.....	254
2.2.6.	Consensual Dispute Resolution	254
2.2.7.	Final Provisions.....	255
3.	Evaluation of the Directive	255
3.1.	Creating a Level Playing Field: was Harmonization as such Desirable? ...	255
3.1.1.	Arguments against Harmonization.....	257
3.1.1.1.	Economics of Federalism	257
3.1.1.2.	Experimentation.....	257
3.1.2.	Arguments in Favour of Harmonization	258
3.1.2.1.	Economic Arguments	258
3.1.2.2.	Non-Economic Arguments in Favour of Harmonization.....	264
3.1.3.	Concluding Remarks	268
3.2.	Increasing the Possibilities for Victims of Antitrust Infringements to Obtain Compensation	269
3.2.1.	Collective Action Mechanisms?	270
3.2.2.	Fault Requirements.....	271
3.2.3.	Burden and Standard of Proof	271
3.2.4.	Collection and Presentation of Evidence	272
3.2.5.	Evidential Value of National Competition Authorities and National Court Decisions	273
3.2.6.	Quantification of Damages	273
3.2.7.	The Passing-on Defence and Indirect Purchaser Claims	273
3.2.8.	Amount of Damages.....	274
3.2.9.	Time Limitations	274
3.2.10.	Costs.....	275

3.2.11. Applicable Law	275
3.2.12. Other Obstacles?	276
3.3. Improving the Interaction between Public and Private Enforcement of the Competition Rules	276
4. Conclusion	279
Bibliography	281
 Kristel De Smedt, Michael Faure	
WHO DOES WHAT? ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY IN THE EU	289
1. Introduction	289
2. Environmental Liability at European Level: a Law and Economics Analysis	291
2.1. Justification for the ELD	291
2.2. The Arguments of the Commission tested	293
2.3. Centralization to Satisfy Demand of Interest Groups?	296
3. Implementation of the ELD in the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany... ..	298
3.1. Relevant Aspects of the ELD's Transposition in Belgium	299
3.2. Relevant Aspects of the ELD's Transposition in the Netherlands	300
3.3. Relevant Aspects of the ELD's Transposition in Germany	301
4. Harmonization via the ELD?	303
5. The ELD's Effects in Practice and Way Forward	307
6. Conclusion	309
Bibliography	311

LIST OF AUTHORS

Bram Akkermans is assistant professor in European Private Law and associate director of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Anna Beckers is assistant professor of Private Law and Legal Methodology and fellow of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Anna Berlee is a PhD candidate of Comparative Property Law, specializing in Access to Property Registration and Privacy, and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

William Bull is a PhD candidate of European Private Law and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Caroline Cauffman is associate professor at Maastricht University, associate director of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI) and an assessor to the Belgian competition authority.

Kristel De Smedt is assistant professor of Foundations and Methods of Law and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Michael Faure is professor of International and Comparative Environmental Law, at the Faculty of Law at Maastricht University, and professor of Comparative Private Law and Economics, at the Erasmus School of Law Rotterdam, and fellow of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Jiangqiu Ge is a PhD candidate of Comparative Consumer Contract Law and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Catalina Goanță is a PhD candidate of European Private Law and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Jaap Hage is professor in Jurisprudence and fellow of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Mark Kawakami is a PhD candidate researching the role of private actors in reducing instances of labour exploitation in the global supply chain. He is a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Nicole Kornet is associate professor in Commercial law and associate director of the Maastricht Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Willem Loof is a PhD candidate of Comparative Property Law, specializing in Comparative Trust Law, and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Janwillem Oosterhuis is assistant professor of Foundations and Methods of Law and a member of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).

Niels Philipsen is associate professor in Law and Economics and Vice-Director of the Maastricht European Institute for Transnational Legal Research (METRO), and a resident fellow at (M-EPLI).

Jan M. Smits is professor of European Private Law and director of the Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI).