International Seminar on Private International Law, Madrid 2014. Call for Papers

A new edition of the International Seminar on Private International Law (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) organized by Prof. Fernández Rozas and Prof. de Miguel Asensio, will take place on the 8 and 9 May 2014, at the faculty of Law of the Universidad Complutense of Madrid – although some sessions may be held elsewhere in Madrid.

The seminar will combine a general approach focusing on recent developments and future prospects in various fields of private international law, and a specific one, meaning that special attention is to be paid to issues which are currently being discussed, or which are in need of particular study. In this edition special attention will be given to the legislative process of revision affecting the EU insolvency regulation, to the unification of private international law in matrimonial matters, to and the forthcoming implementation of the Brussels I bis Regulation. New trends outside Europe, with special attention to projects identified in America, will also be addressed.

As in previous editions the main lectures of the seminar will be in charge of well-known scholars, such as Stefania Bariatti (Milano), Dário Moura Vicente (Lisbon) Hans Van Loon (former General Secretary of the Hague Conference), Bertrand Ancel (Paris II) and Johan Erauw (Gent). Nonetheless, the seminar is open to all scholars, either Spanish or foreigners, willing to participate with brief presentations. Papers can be presented in Spanish, English or French. Proposals including both the title and a brief summary are to be sent as soon as possible, and at any rate no later than the 2nd December, to Patricia Orejudo Prieto (patricia.orejudo@der.ucm.es). Subject to prior scientific evaluation, papers will be included in volume XIII (2013) of the *Anuario Español de Derecho Internacional Privado*. The final version of the accepted presentations is to be submitted before 14 April, 2014.

The registration deadline to attend the seminar will be announced in due time.

For more information see here.

Anuario Español de Derecho Internacional Privado (2012)

The last volume of the *Anuario Español de Derecho Internacional Privado* (2012), has just been released: for the table of contents click here.

Backed by the most prominent Spanish scholars on private international law, by lawyers, practitioners from the judiciary and other bodies of the State administration, the purpose of this volumen of the *Anuario* is to provide the Spanish legal community with a theoretical and a practical overview of the legal phenomena, related to cross-border situations linked to our country, that have taken place in 2012 in the fields of commercial arbitration, business law, labor law, social security law, criminal law, procedural law, nationality, immigration, family and inheritance law, foreign investment and exchange control regulations. This outline is aimed to work as point of reference for the doctrinal and practical Spanish developments to be presented to foreign academia.

With this aim the publication is divided into different sections, starting with an ambitious doctrinal one gathering the most important scientific contributions from Spanish and foreign authors, published after a prior comprehensive control by the members of the Editorial Board specialized therein. Also, the volume highlights the most interesting Spanish decisions, legislative reforms and international agreements signed by Spain in 2012, all of them accompanied by a deep and critical comment. News are given about the work of various international forums, such as the Hague Conference. A systematized set of the several hundred decisions delivered by the Spanish courts last year, as well as a comprehensive chronicle of the Spanish literature in the field of private international law (in a broad sense) completes the Yearbook.

El Derecho Inglés y los Contratos Internacionales (book)

Sixto Sánchez Lorenzo is Professor of Private International Law at the University of Granada (Spain) and member of the International Academy of Comparative Law.

English Law is the preferred legal system in international contracts. Uniform texts as those proposed by UNIDROIT or the European Union have not managed to supersede a leadership grounded on cosmopolitism and liberalism that characterize English Law. However, the rules and principles of English Law often remain distant and enigmatic for civil lawyers. This book is oriented to Spanish-speaking lawyers and intends to provide a synthesis of English Contract Law, emphasizing its particular rules with comparative references to civil law systems. At the same time, it deals with English case-law on international contracts. Even though English courts make use of the same tool that others European judges (the Rome I Regulation), the analysis of the influence of English Private International Law on European rules facilitates the interpretation of these rules in other European countries, but also reveals some idiosyncratic particularities in its application by English courts. Finally, substantive and conflict-of-law rules can be hardly separated. For English lawyers who are able to read Spanish, the book provides, paraphrasing H.L.A. Hart, an “external statement“ about both English Contract Law and Private International Law of Contracts.

Click here to access the table of contents.

Explanatory Report on the 2007 Hague Child Support Convention

The Hague Conference on Private International Law has announced that the Explanatory Report on the *Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance*, drawn up by Alegría Borrás and Jennifer Degeling, with the assistance of William Duncan and Philippe Lortie, is now available.

An electronic copy of the Report can be downloaded here. Paper copies can also be ordered from the Permanent Bureau at a cost.

Latest issue Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht (2013/3)

The third issue of 2013 of the Dutch journal on Private International Law, *Nederlands Internationaal Privaatrecht*, includes the usual overview of important Dutch and European case law, as well as three articles on the following topics: The functioning of the European Small Claims Procedure in the Netherlands; the EU Regulation on Succession and Wills; and Child Protection Measures against the background of Article 8 ECHR.

X.E. Kramer & E.A. Ontanu, The functioning of the European Small Claims Procedure in the Netherlands: normative and empirical reflections, p. 319-328. The abstract reads:

The European small claims procedure was the first uniform adversarial procedure in the EU, introduced to increase the efficiency and to reduce the costs of cross-border small claims litigation in the Member States. The European Commission

regards this procedure as an important potential contribution to access to justice in order to resolve small claims disputes. However, there are clear signs that this procedure is seldom used and the Commission seeks to improve its attractiveness. This paper focuses on the implementation and application of this European procedure in the Netherlands. Normative and empirical research has been conducted to assess how this procedure is embedded in the Dutch legal order and how it actually functions in practice and is perceived by the judiciary. The question is whether, from the Dutch perspective, this procedure meets the objectives of providing a simple, fast and low-cost alternative to existing national procedures, while respecting the right to a fair trial. The paper concludes with several recommendations for improvement.

P. Lokin, De Erfrechtverordening, p. 329-337. The English abstract reads:

This article focuses on (EU) Regulation No. 650/2012 dealing with the jurisdiction, applicable law, recognition and enforcement of decisions and the acceptance and enforcement of authentic instruments in matters of succession and the creation of a European Certificate of Succession. Is this Regulation, which shall be applicable to the succession of persons dying on or after 17 August 2015, a step forward for the Netherlands? In light of its application in the near future, the article gives a first introduction into the new rules and concentrates on some aspects of the Regulation which require more attention, such as the determination of one's last habitual residence and the transitional provisions when the deceased has made a choice for the applicable law prior to 17 August 2015.

R. Blauwhoff, Kinderbeschermingsmaatregelen in de Nederlandse IPR-rechtspraak in het licht van artikel 8 EVRM, p. 338-345. The English abstract reads:

Both private international law and human rights instruments may affect parental and children's rights in cross-border situations, yet reference to both types of instrument is seldom made in Dutch legal decisions regarding parental responsibilities. Accordingly, the aim of this article is foremost to explore the relationship between both types of instruments in cases other than child abduction cases on the basis of an analysis of (Dutch) case-law, since the entry into force of the 1996 Convention on the International Protection of Children (1st of May 2011) and under reference to developments in case-law of the European

Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) with regard to Article 8 ECHR. It is ventured that courts should have greater regard for the human rights dimension underpinning private international law decisions, especially in cases where tension arises between the law of the state of the child's present and former habitual residence. At the same time, the classic focus of the ECtHR on the accountability of national states sometimes falls short of taking into account the progress made in the field of cross-border co-operation in the ambit of the 1996 Hague Convention, especially in the area of cross-border contact arrangements.

Issue Dutch Commercial Law journal on international financing

For our readers who are able to read Dutch: The second issue of 2013 of the Dutch journal on Commercial Law, *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Handelsrecht* (NTHR), is an interesting issue dedicated to developments in international financing. It includes the following five contributions:

- J. Diamant, 'Macht', 'bezit' en 'controle': gedachten over het controlevereiste in de Collateral Richtlijn, p. 60-67.
- R.M. Wibier, Financiering op basis van vorderingen: de positie van het vorderingsrecht in het Burgerlijk Wetboek, p. 68-74.
- T.H.D. Struycken, Zekerheidsrechten in het internationale handelsverkeer, p. 75-87.
- P.M. Veder, Zekerheidsrechten en de Insolventieverordening: op zoek naar balans, p. 88-93.
- R.D. Vriesendorp & R. van den Sigtenhorst, Herstructureringen in de moderne financieringspraktijk: Nederland vs. de V.S., p. 94-101.

Conference: The Implementation of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in Spain (Sevilla, 4-6 November 2013)

The University of Sevilla will host on 4-6 November an international conference on the responsibility of transnational corporations with regard to human rights, focusing on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights: **"The Implementation of the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights in Spain"**. Here's an excerpt from the conference's website:

> *Recent years have witnessed the cristallysation of the social expectation that business enterprises, and transnational corporations in particular, have a responsibility to respect the human rights of the people and communities that may be adversely affected by their activities.*
>
> *The unanimous endorsement of the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights by the UN Human Rights Council has helped clarifying the scope of corporate responsibility to respect human rights, in interaction with the state's duty to protect those rights. The conceptual framework "Protect, Respect and Remedy" has contributed to a rapid development of policy and regulatory standards worldwide, as evidenced by the OECD revised guidelines on multinational enterprises, the review of IFC's social and sustainability framework, or ISO 26000 (Social Responsibility), among others.*
>
> *The UN Guiding Principles are not a point of arrival, but a starting point for future developments. Implementation of the new UN business and human rights framework simultaneously requires the review of existing State regulatory frameworks; the establishment or improvement of the corporate human rights policies and due diligence mechanisms; and the opening of new avenues of dialogue and responsibility between duty-bearers, rights-holders and other stakeholders. In the development of this complex program, there is an urgent*

need for academic reflection and political innovation.

The expansion of Spanish foreign direct investment in recent decades and the growing presence of Spanish transnational corporations in various countries have given raise to growing concern and pressure from civil society concerning the human rights impacts of their operations. Allegations of human rights violations have been particularly significant in relation to extractive industries and renewable energy projects in Latin America, including in relation to the rights of indigenous peoples. However, despite an important number of CSR initiatives in the past, the business and human rights agenda in Spain remains yet to be explored. The ongoing elaboration of the Spanish National Plan on business and human rights adds timeliness for this exploration.

The following is a synopsis of the main sections of the very rich programme of the conference (the detailed content of each panel, including the full list of speakers and paper presentations, is available on the conference's website and as a .pdf file):

Monday 4 November – **The UN Guiding Principles of Business and Human Rights: Prospects and Challenges**

Keynote Address: "Assessing the UN Framework for Business and Human Rughts. An International Human Rights Perspective" (*Prof. James Anaya*, Univ. of Arizona and United Nations Special Rapporteur on the rights of indigenous peoples)

- Panel 1: "Implementing Pillar I under UN and EU Law: The State Duty to Protect Human Rights";
- Panel 2: "Implementing Pillar II Business Responsibility to Respect Human Rights";
- Panel 3: "Implementing Pillar III. The Obligation to Remedy: Judicial and Non-Judicial Mechanisms".

– – –

Tuesday 5 November – **Spain and the Implementation of the UN Guiding Principles**

"Spain and the implementation of the Guiding Principles: The drafting and content of the National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights" (*Ms. Cristina*

Fraile, Director of the Human Rights Office, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Spain)

- Panel 4: "The implementation of Spain's obligations in the area of business and human rights";
- Panel 5: "The Implementation of the Responsibility to Respect by Spanish Companies";
- Panel 6: "Remedies for Alleged Human Rights Violations by Spanish Companies".

– – –

Wednesday 6 November – **Business, Human Rights, and Vulnerable Groups**

- Panel 7: "Business Enterprises and the Rights of Vulnerable Persons and Groups";
- Panel 8: "Business Enterprises and Human Rights in Conflict Situations".

(Many thanks to Prof. Fabrizio Marrella, Univ. of Venice, for the tip-off)

Civil Justice in the EU – Growing and Teething?

This post has been jointly drafted by Gilles Cuniberti, Xandra Kramer, Thalia Kruger and Marta Requejo.

Civil Justice in the EU – Growing and Teething? Questions regarding implementation, practice and the outlook for future policy is the title of the conference held in Uppsala, Sweden, on Thursday and Friday last week, co-organised by the Swedish Network for European Legal Studies in collaboration with the Faculty of Law at Uppsala University and the Max Planck Institute Luxembourg for International, European and Regulatory Procedural Law (see Prof. Cuniberti's announcement with the program here). This has been the first conference organized by the Max Planck Institute Luxembourg outside of the

Grand Duchy.

After the formal opening of the conference by **Antonina Bakardjieva Engelberkt**, Stockholm University, Chairman of the Swedish Network for European Legal Studies, Prof. **Burkhard Hess**, Executive Director of the MPI Luxembourg, delivered the keynote address, centered on the current situation of a European procedural law which transgresses the mere coordination of the national procedural systems. In the European framework the national systems do not appear any longer to be self-contained and self-standing: in many respects, European law ingresses and transforms the adjudicative systems of the EU-Member States. Today, European lawmaking often triggers far-reaching reforms of the national systems (Consumer ADR being one example). In addition, the ECJ transforms the adjudicative systems of the Member States as more and more areas of private and procedural law are communitarised and are subjected to its (interpretative) competence. On the other hand, the national procedures in the European Judicial Area are still divergent with regard to their efficiency. In this respect, the case-law of the ECHR on the right of a party to get a judgment in reasonable period of time has not helped to assimilate the level of judicial protection in the Member States. Yet, the different efficiencies of the national systems entail a growing competition among the "judicial marketplaces" in Europe which is reinforced by the European procedural instruments on the coordination of these systems.

Against this background, Prof. Hess stressed the importance of the Commissioner for Justice. Since the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty, the Commissioner for Justice implements a genuine lawmaking policy, not only with regard to cross-border litigation under Article 81 TFEU, but also with regard to the supervision of the national judicial systems. A new tool is the so-called judicial scoreboard aimed at the evaluation of the adjudicative systems of the EU-Member States. Although this scoreboard does not provide for substantial new information (the data are largely borrowed from the Council of Europe), the political ambition goes further: The Commission understands its mission in a comprehensive way covering all areas of dispute resolution, including the efficiency and the independence of the national court systems.

Prof. Hess went on to say the if the development of the European procedural law is regarded, not from the number of the instruments enacted so far, but from a systematic point of view, the balance would appear less successful. Until now, the

law-making of the Union has been mainly sectorial and the choices of legislative activities have not been comprehensive, but rather incidental. At present, there is no master-plan, no roadmap; a comprehensive and systematic approach is lacking. This situation has been criticized by the legal literature and alternatives have been discussed and proposed. All in all, a more systematic approach with a better coordination of the EU-instruments at the horizontal and the vertical level is needed. And it is the task of procedural science to discuss the different regulatory options with regard of their feasibility and efficiency in order to improve and to systemize European law-making in this field. Thus, the Director of the MPI Luxembourg announced that regulatory approaches of the European law of civil procedural are going to become a major research area of the Institute.

The first panel, which was chaired by **Marie Linton** (University of Uppsala), carried the title ***Avoiding Torpedoes and Forum Shopping***. The four speakers focused on two topics. First, **Trevor Hartley** (London School of Economics) and **Gilles Cuniberti** (University of Luxembourg) explored whether the remedy established by the Recast of the Regulation to reinforce choice of court agreements would indeed eliminate torpedoes, whether Italian or not. While agreeing that the new remedy would probably be satisfactory in simple cases, the speakers debated whether problems might still arise in case of conflicting or complex clauses. Then, **Erik Tiberg** (Government offices of Sweden) and **Michael Hellner** (University of Stockholm) discussed the consequences of the new rules of jurisdiction with respect to third states.

The second panel, addressing alternative dispute resolution, was composed of three speakers. In his speech **Jim Davies**, University of Northampton, provided a broad historical background of the recently adopted Directive on ADR for consumers (Directive 3013/11/EU), starting from the 1998 and 2001 European Commission's Recommendations and moving on to the Commission's Proposal and the Directive's final text. Thereafter, **Antonina Bakardjieva Engelbrekt**, Stockholm University, tackled the new rules on ADR with a view to assessing how these new provisions provide a further step toward network governance in EU consumer protection policy, especially highlighting the role of consumer organizations. Finally, **Cristina M. Mariottini**, Max Planck Institute Luxembourg, addressed two ADR systems concerning disputes over top level domains, and namely ICANN's New gTLD program and dispute resolution system and EURid's ADR system for disputes concerning the ".eu" domain, with a view to

assessing whether and to what extent the protection of consumers has been kept into consideration within these systems.

The third panel, entitled *Simplified procedures and debt collection – much ado about nothing?,* brought together four speakers. **Mikael Berglund** (Swedish Enforcement Authority) noticed that the European enforcement order and the European order for payment procedure are not frequently used in Sweden; on the European small claims procedure there are no reported cases at all. He explained that creditors do not find it worth the time and money because there is no reliable information on the debtor's assets in other Member States; also, that they have problems finding the competent enforcement authority. He presented several practical ideas to cure the enforcement 'Achilles' heel' of EU law. **Carla Crifó,** of the University of Leicester, provided information and several – limitedly available – data on the implementation and enforcement of the European order for payment procedure and the small claims procedure in England and Wales. This shows that little use is made of these European procedures. In this context, Ms Crifò stressed the problem of the use of English in European instruments which does not necessarily correspond to the legal terminology used in the United Kingdom. English courts and practitioners are usually not well-acquainted with these procedures. Against the background of the current "euroscepticism" in England, this situation is not likely to improve. **Xandra Kramer,** of the Erasmus University (Rotterdam)**,** addressed the potential of the uniform European procedures in view of their scope and limitation to cross-border cases. She presented data on the use and appreciation of these procedures in the Netherlands acquired in empirical research and gave recommendations for improvement. Though particularly the use of the European small claims procedures is disappointing up to date, she stressed that one should not be too pessimistic since the European procedures are very new compared to national procedure and the building of a well-functioning European procedural order will take time and efforts. **Cristian Oro Martinez**, from the MPI Luxembourg, reviewed some of the aspects of the Regulation on the European Small Claims Procedure which, besides the general lack of awareness of the instrument, may account for its relatively small success. These issues include, among others, problems such as the territorial scope of application of the Regulation (narrow definition of cross-border cases), the limitation of the right to an oral hearing with regard to non-consumer cases, or the problems arising out of the interface between the Regulation and other EU instruments (especially the Brussels I Regulation), as well as domestic procedural

law

Two other panels took place simultaneously after the coffee break, on Family Law and Collective Redress respectively. The first one was composed of three speakers. **Katharina Boele-Woelki,** of Utrecht University, discussed the issue of partial harmonisation, referring to the example of the Rome III Regulation. As today, only 16 of 28 Member States are participating in the Rome III framework. She indicated the different political reasons underlying Member States' choices whether to participate in the Regulation or not. She also showed that fragmented harmonisation is not only the result of enhanced cooperation, but also, in other instruments, of the particular status that some EU Member States (Denmark, Ireland and the UK) have with respect to civil justice. Thus, the application of enhanced cooperation in the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice is a matter of concern. Thereafter **Thalia Kruger,** of the University of Antwerp, discussed the element of choice in the Rome III Regulation, showing that a rule that looks clear at first sight has many underlying uncertainties. The debate raised the issue of how habitual residence can be ascertained as a preliminary matter for purposes of jurisdiction, without requiring too cumbersome an investigation by the judge (with a waste of time as a result).

The third speaker, **Björn Laukemann** of the Max Planck Institute in Luxembourg, addressed the issue of the new Succession Regulation and the European Certificate of Succession. The debate on the subject pointed out the problem of EU certificates that remain valid for only six months, while some national certificates, which will co-exist with the EU certificates, are eternally valid. Another question related to this co-existence is the issue of contradictory certificates (EU and national).

The second track of the fourth section addressed some issues relating to collective redress, especially in the light of the Commission's Recommendation of 11 June 2013. **Eva Storskrubb**, from Roschier, assessed the potential impact of the Recommendation highlighting that, although it is non-binding, its rather prescriptive formulation and the Commission's commitment to review its implementation by Member States may entail significant changes in the domestic regulation of collective actions. **Rebecca Money-Kyrle**, from the University of Oxford, addressed some possible consequences of the Recommendations' approach to legal standing. She pointed out that the basic principles set out in the text may force to do away with existing domestic procedures which are efficient.

Moreover, they fail to establish satisfactory rules as regards commonality criteria or cross-border cases. **Laura Ervo**, from Örebro University, provided several arguments to support an opt-out approach to collective redress, hence critically assessing the Commission's Recommendation in this respect. She drew from models provided by Scandinavian legislation, especially the Danish authority-driven system, to support the idea that only opt-out can guarantee access to justice for all damaged parties. Finally, **Stefaan Voet**, from Ghent University, dealt with different systems of funding of collective actions. He evaluated their compatibility with the principles laid down in the Recommendation on lawyers' remuneration and third-party funding, critically assessing the latter for being sometimes too strict.

Under the heading *The Quest for Mutual Recognition,* with Dean **Torbjörn Andersson** as chairman, the first panel of Friday morning discussed several issues related to mutual trust and mutual recognition. **Marie Linton**, from the Uppsala University, addressed the balance between efficiency and procedural human rights in civil justice, particularly in the field covered by the Brussels I Regulation and under the future Brussels I bis Regulation. **Marta Requejo Isidro**, MPI Luxembourg, presented the ECtHR decision of 18 June 2013, *Povse*, pointing out questions that remain open after it. As for the most important, i.e., its possible influence on the abolition of exequatur in civil and commercial matters, Prof. Requejo adopted a somewhat skeptical position on a wide reach of the ECtHR decision, both in the light of the features characterising the Brussels I bis Regulation (although it may still be disputable to what extent there is room for discretion at the requested State), and the reasoning of the Court itself. Finally, **Eva Storskrubb**, Senior Associate, Roschier (Stockholm), dealt with the evolution of mutual recognition as part of a regulatory strategy comparing its Internal Market historical context with the current civil justice context.

The conference ended with a presentation of Future Measures and Challenges by Mr. **Jacek Garstka**, Legislative Officer, DG Justice, European Commission, and **Signe Öhman**, Legal Counsellor, Permanent Representation of Sweden, Brussels. Announcements were made regarding the immediate release of several Commission's Reports – among others, on the Regulation (EC) No 861/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 establishing a European Small Claims Procedure; on Regulation (EC) No 864/2007 of the European

Parliament and of the Council of 11 July 2007 on the Law Applicable to Non-Contractual Obligations (Rome II), and on the Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents), and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1348/2000. Mr. Garstka also referred to future areas of concern for the Commission, such as justice as a means to enhance economic growth, the legal framework of insurance contracts, and the area of insurance law. Ms. Öhman recalled the forthcoming end of the Stockholm program, and ventured an opinion on the follow up. She also pointed out some topics on the Council agenda -data protection, the rights of citizens, judicial networking… This panel was chaired by **Prof. Antonina Bakardjieva-Engelbrekt**, Stockholm University, who pronounced the closing remarks.

The ELI-UNIDROIT Project: From Transnational Principles to European Rules of Civil Procedure – 1st Exploratory Workshop

By Matthias Weller

Matthias Weller holds the Chair for Civil Law, Civil Procedure and Private International Law at EBS University for Economics and Law, Wiesbaden, Germany.

On 18 and 19 October 2013, the European Law Institute (ELI) and the International Institute for the Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT) invited to a "First Explanatory Workshop" on the joint project „European Rules of Civil Procedure". This workshop intended to develop possible answers to the fundamental questions of why and how such a project could be put on the agenda and what it could possibly entail. In addition to these general questions on

conception, methodology and scope in the first part of the workshop, the second part dealt with a series of special problems and topics in civil procedure that might be considered as promising issues on the agenda. The idea was to see whether the Principles of Transnational Civil Procedure adopted in 2004 by the American Law Institute (ALI) and UNIDROIT could and/or should be adapted to the European legal context and whether European Rules of Civil Procedure could and/or should be developed.

The ALI/UNIDROIT Principles, developed from a universal perspective, were accompanied by Rules of Transnational Civil Procedure providing for a higher degree of precision and for suggestions on how the Principles could work. These Rules were never formally adopted either by ALI or by UNIDROIT but express the Reporters' views on how the Principles could be implemented, subject to adaptation under a certain legal order, as the case may be. Evidently, this structure provides for a plausible starting point for thinking about European(isation of) Rules of Civil Procedure that would have to take account of e.g. the European Convention on Human Rights as well as the European acquis of civil procedure.

The first public session was chaired by Professor Loïc Cadiet, University of Paris 1 and President of the International Association of Procedural Law. In opening the session, Cadiet drew the attention to the fact that European Rules of Civil Procedure could potentially contribute to reinforce the mutual trust of the Member States in the respective judiciary systems of other Member States. Indeed, a set of principles, possibly accompanied by rules making certain decisions on particularly important issues, could provide for a common standard to which a judicial system could be measured. In the following, José Angelo Estrella Faria, Secretary General of UNIDROIT, and Diana Wallis, President of the ELI, addressed the audience with introductory notes. Professors Geoffrey Hazard, University of Pennsylvania Law School and former director of the ALI, and Antonio Gidi, University of Houston Law Center and Associate Reporter and Secretary to the ALI / UNIDROIT project on Principles and Rules of Transnational Civil Procedure, presented their views and experiences with elaborating and "selling" the 2004 ALI/UNIDROIT Principles. Hazard also reported from the experiences with the introduction of US Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that resulted in "one generation of discontent" and a variety of problems still unresolved – a lesson that should limit the expectations to a realistic degree when

it comes to unifying rules on universal problems in civil litigation such as the judge's role, professional privileges, parallel litigation, group litigation and the like. Gidi underlined the necessity of taking certain decision on the scope such as covering only transnational litigation or including domestic litigation or covering only commercial litigation or including b-to-c litigation. His general experience is that the broader the scope the bigger the objections. Therefore, Gidi suggested excluding e.g. group litigation and other particularly contentious areas. In sum, Gidi appeared to be rather optimistic because there might be a broader consensus on core principles in the European legal cultures than there is worldwide.

In the discussion, Professor Thomas Pfeiffer, University of Heidelberg, suggested that the experiences from drafting European rules on contract law should be taken into account – both top-down and bottom-up input, both input from the national legal orders involved and from the acquis in EU law – as well as the guidance from influential rules on international arbitral proceedings such as e.g. on taking evidence or on dealing with conflict of interests.

Professor Catherine Kessedjian, University of Paris 2, agreed with the view that model rules could considerably help building (rather than "re-" inforcing) mutual trust.

The author of these lines suggested that the parallel agenda of the European Commission on formulating minimum standards (inter alia) for civil procedure should be taken into account because the European Commission, in its Action Plan on the Stockholm Programme (Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions – Delivering an area of freedom, security and justice for Europe's citizens – Action Plan Implementing the Stockholm Programme, COM/2010/0171 final), foresees at para. 4:

> *Strengthening confidence in the European judicial area: The European judicial area and the proper functioning of the single market are built on the cornerstone principle of mutual recognition. This can only function effectively on the basis of mutual trust among judges, legal professionals, businesses and citizens. Mutual trust requires minimum standards and a reinforced understanding of the different legal traditions and methods.*

And in the Annex the Commission announced for 2013 a Green paper on the

minimum standards for civil procedures and necessary follow up and, for 2014, a legislative proposal aimed at improving the consistency of existing Union legislation in the field of civil procedural law.

Interestingly, in its latest „Discussion Paper 1: EU Civil Law“ for the *Assises de la Justice* to be held on 21 and 22 November 2013 in Brussels, the Commission, on page 3, after underlining the necessity to reinforce mutual trust through procedural law integration, summarises its view to the future as follows:

> *The step-by-step progress being made in EU civil procedural law may call for a codification of these rules in the interests of legal certainty.*

In the second public session, Alexandra Prechal, judge of the Court of Justice of the European Union from the Netherlands, presented a series of cases connected to constitutional aspects of civil procedure. Professor Burkhard Hess, Director of the Max-Planck-Institute Luxembourg for International, European and Regulatory Procedural Law presented core concepts and trends in the European acquis of civil procedure. He suggested thinking of a “Brussels 0-Regulation” for civil procedure containing general principles and rules parallel to the discussion about a “Rome 0-Regulation” containing similarly general provisions for the European conflicts of law rules. Hess further reminded the audience of the great influence that special fields of European procedural law such as e.g. rules on ADR, IP litigation or cartel damages litigation do and should have on the building of general rules under an acquis perspective. Hess also drew attention to the potentially growing importance of the Judicial Scoreboard for evaluating Member States’ jurisdictions. Finally, Michael Shotter, European Commission, member of Commissioner Viviane Reding’s Cabinet, closed the public part of the conference with a report on the agenda of the European Commission in the field of civil procedure. He once more underlined the role of the Judicial Scoreboard as a tool for verifying the legitimacy of mutual trust as the essential principle of the architecture of EU civil procedure.

In the final discussion, Diana Wallis noted that ADR may have a considerable influence on the development of civil procedure because the more ADR becomes successful the more it takes out small claims from mainstream justice and rule-building. Wallis articulated the concern of special forms of “ebay-justice” that may not be desirable in all its facets.

In the closed expert workshops following the public part of the workshop a number of issues were addressed by presentations such as the possible structure of the proceedings (Xandra Kramer, Erasmus University Rotterdam), multiple claims and parties (Ianika Tzankova, Tilburg University/BarentsKrans), access to information and evidence (Nicolò Trocker, University of Florence), due notice and proceedings (Eva Storskrubb, Senior Associate, Roschier, Stockholm), obligations of the parties and lawyers (C. H. Remco van Rhee, University of Maastricht), provisional and protective measures (Gilles Cuniberti, University of Luxembourg), costs (Neil H. Andrews, University of Cambridge), lis pendens and res iudicata (Frédérique Ferrand, University Jean Moulin Lyon 3), transparency of assets and enforcement (Miklos Kengyel, University of Pécs), followed by closing remarks by Rolf Stürner, University of Freiburg.

The workshop took place at the impressive Palace of Justice in its neo-renaissance style at Schmerlingplatz in Vienna, the building in which, inter alia, the Supreme Court of Austria resides. According to its website, "in March 1873 Emperor Franz Josef I chose the site for a Palace of Justice, and by Imperial Ruling in September 1874, he resolved to construct it in Vienna, the capital and imperial residence, ‚in permanent solicitude for the needs of the administration of justice and the population in its quest for justice'. The 1st exploratory workshop on the ELI-UNIDROIT Project on European Rules of Civil Procedure certainly furthered these aims excellently.

Third Issue of 2013's Revue Critique Droit International Privé

The last issue of the *Revue critique de droit international privé* is out. It contains three articles and several casenotes.

In the first article, Eric Agostini (University of Bordeaux) revisits the doctrine of *renvoi* (*Le mécanisme du renvoi*). The English abstract reads:

> *The mechanism known as renvoi supposes, as a prerequisite, that the forum's*

choice of law rule, which refers to a foreign law with a different view on the determination of the applicable law, takes such a view into account for one reason or another. It then rests upon a debatable assumption that the diverging choice of law rules which are called upon to fit together are of a similar nature and that each one targets the totality of the conflict.

In the second article, Léna Gannage (Paris II University) comments on two judgments of the French supreme court which declared adoption by homosexuals contrary to French public policy and which might have lost their relevance when France adopted a law allowing gay marriage a few months later (*Deux arrêts mort-nés. A propos des décisions rendues par la première chambre civile le 7 juin 2012*)

Finally, in the last article, Horatia Muir Watt (Sciences Po Law School) discusses the *Kiobel* decision of the US Supreme Court (*L'A*lien Tort Statute *devant la Cour Suprême des Etats-Unis. Territorialité, diplomatie judiciaire ou économie politique ?*)