

The European legal framework for e-commerce

Chris Reed

Professor of Electronic Commerce Law
Centre for Commercial Law Studies

Of counsel to Tite & Lewis

Assessing effectiveness

- Tests
 - Does the framework meet the needs of on-line businesses?
 - Is law and regulation consistent and transparent?
 - Are other interests protected, e.g. consumers?
 - Is it complete, i.e. are there areas where further action is required?
- Practical assessment
 - Examine the stages of a cross-border on-line transaction
 - Advertising and regulatory compliance
 - Contracting with customers
 - Payment
 - Resolving disputes

Advertising and regulatory compliance (1)

- E-commerce directive arts. 3-4 country of origin regime
 - establishment in one EU jurisdiction allows cross-border supplies of on-line services to all others
 - licensing, approvals and conduct of business - home country regulation only
 - contracts with end-user consumers - host country regulation applies
 - heavily restricted ability to maintain application of host country regulation
 - based on trust in other regulators
 - harmonisation of national law to achieve the Single Market
- Some gaps in the financial services sector
- Non-application to gambling, taxation, real estate dealings

Advertising and regulatory compliance (2)

- Information requirements under the Distance Selling and E-Commerce Directives
 - identity (e.g.. name, registration/authorisation details)
 - terms & conditions; price & costs (inc. discounts, promotions, taxes)
 - procedural arrangements (e.g.. payment, delivery, contract formation)
 - procedural rights (e.g.. withdrawal)
- Timing
 - prior to conclusion, during performance
- Form
 - ‘durable medium’, ‘easily accessible’, ‘permanent manner’, ‘store and reproduce’

Contracting with customers

- Effectiveness achieved through E-Commerce and E-Signatures Directives
- Valid contracts
 - Formal validity (art. 9 E-Commerce directive)
 - Control of contract formation by the business (art. 10 E-Commerce directive)
- E-signatures meet national law requirements
 - E-signatures directive art. 5
 - Cross-border validity of signature certificates (art. 4)

Consumer contracts

- National law of consumer's country applies
- Consumer contract law partly harmonised
 - Distance selling directive
 - consumer's right to withdraw
 - performance and credit card provisions
 - Directive on unfair terms in consumer contracts
 - Exclusion and limitation of liability
- Uncertainties remain for unfair competition and national language laws

Payment

- Existing credit card legal framework works well
- Low value interbank payment less effective
 - Cross-border credit transfers directive of no benefit to e-commerce
- Electronic money directive is a failure
 - Barriers to entry are too high
 - In particular, restrictions on business activities prevent mixed activity business models
 - Likely effect is that businesses will need to use non-EU-issued e-money

Resolving disputes

- Reasonable certainty as to where an on-line business can sue or be sued
 - Brussels Regulation
 - But note uncertainty for B2C dealings in art. 15(1)(c)
- Less certainty as to applicable law
 - Choice of law for B2B dealings
 - Rome Convention and consumers
 - Improvement by aligning Rome with Brussels Regulation and clarifying “directed activities” drafting

Conclusions on effectiveness

- Regulatory compliance
 - Largely effective through country of origin regulation
 - Work in progress in financial services sector
- Contracting
 - Largely effective, especially B2B
 - Some uncertainties remain in unharmonised elements of consumer protection law
- Payment
 - Further action required
- Dispute resolution
 - Moving towards a satisfactory position, but not there yet

Completeness?

- Barriers to effective e-commerce still exist in two areas
 - Requirement to charge VAT at home country rates for B2C dealings
 - Wide variance in liability laws
 - Arts. 12-15 E-commerce directive clarify position for some intermediaries
 - But current complex mixed activity business models mean that their application is uncertain