

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xiii

1. Introduction: The Scope and the Criteria	1
I. Background and Principal Objective	1
II. The Techniques.....	1
III. Description of the Project and Methodology	3
IV. Criteria for Evaluation of Mechanisms	4
V. General Outline of this Book.....	6
VI. Major Findings	7
A. Empirical Findings	7
B. Changes in the Dispute Resolution Landscape	7
C. Fundamental Goals of Redress.....	8
D. The Objectives for Market Regulation.....	9
2. European Policy and Mechanisms for Collective Redress	11
I. Diverse Approaches and Piecemeal Legislation	11
II. The Public–Private Split.....	12
III. Objectives and Outcomes Replace Mechanisms.....	15
IV. Consumer Enforcement.....	15
A. The CPC Regulation	16
B. The Injunctions Directive	18
C. Small Claims	19
D. Consumer ADR.....	19
V. Consumer Collective Redress: Policy Debates	20
VI. Commission’s Recommendation on Collective Redress Mechanisms.....	23
A. Principles Common to Injunctive and Compensatory Collective Redress	25
B. Specific Principles Relating to Injunctive Collective Redress	28
C. Specific Principles Relating to Compensatory Collective Redress	28
D. Registry of Collective Redress Actions.....	30
E. Supervision and 2018 Report.....	30
VII. The Political and Technical Conundrum	32
VIII. Business Concerns on Ineffective Safeguards	32
IX. Consumer Concerns from Business Scandals.....	33
X. Proposals in 2016/17	34

XI.	Competition Damages	35
A.	<i>Courage</i>	36
B.	Directive on Antitrust Damages Actions	36
XII.	Data Protection.....	39
XIII.	Investors	40
XIV.	Conclusions	40
3.	Collective Actions	43
I.	Introduction	43
II.	Belgium	44
A.	Overview	44
B.	Case Studies	46
III.	Bulgaria.....	48
IV.	England and Wales	50
A.	Representative Action	50
B.	Group Litigation Order (GLO).....	50
C.	Case Studies: GLO	53
D.	The Competition Damages Class Action.....	58
E.	Early Competition Damages Cases.....	60
F.	Cases under the 2015 Competition Damages Action	63
V.	Finland	66
VI.	France.....	68
A.	The <i>Action de Groupe</i>	68
B.	Case Studies: <i>Action de Groupe</i>	71
C.	The <i>Action en Représentation Conjoint</i>	75
VII.	Germany	76
A.	Representative Actions for Cease and Desist Orders	76
B.	Actions for Skimming-off Illegally Gained Profits	77
C.	Case Studies: Actions for Skimming-off Illegally Gained Profits.....	77
D.	Test Case Proceedings by Consumer Associations.....	83
E.	Capital Market Test Case Proceedings (KapMuG).....	83
F.	Case Studies: Capital Market Test Case Proceedings (KapMuG).....	84
VIII.	Italy.....	89
A.	Class Actions	89
B.	Case Studies: Class Actions	92
C.	Representative Actions.....	120
IX.	Lithuania.....	121
A.	Representative Action Aiming to Protect the Public Interest	121
B.	Group Actions.....	122
X.	The Netherlands	125
XI.	Poland	128
A.	Polish Class Actions Act.....	128
B.	Scope	129
C.	Standardisation Requirement for Monetary Claims.....	131
D.	Contingency Fees.....	133
E.	Other Costs and Funding Issues	134

F. Security for Costs	134
G. Proceedings.....	135
H. Statistical Information	137
XII. Sweden	138
A. Group Actions	138
B. Case Studies: Group Actions.....	140
4. Criminal Compensation: Stand-alone and Consecutive Piggy-back	145
I. Belgium.....	145
A. <i>Partie Civile</i> Technique.....	145
B. Special Masters	147
II. United Kingdom	149
A. Compensation Orders in Criminal Proceedings	149
B. Disgorgement of Profits.....	149
5. Regulatory Redress	153
I. Concept.....	153
II. The Range of Mechanisms of Regulatory Redress	153
A. Influence	154
B. Approval	155
C. Coercion	156
III. Examples of the Powers	158
A. Belgium.....	158
B. Denmark.....	160
i. The ‘Opt-out’ Class Action	160
ii. Case Studies.....	161
C. Finland.....	166
D. Italy	168
i. The Italian Competition Authority.....	168
ii. The Italian Regulatory Authority for Electricity Gas and Water	170
iii. Institution for the Supervision of Insurance.....	174
iv. The Italian Data Protection Authority.....	174
v. The Italian Central Bank	175
vi. Evaluation.....	176
E. United Kingdom.....	177
i. Development of Regulatory Redress.....	177
ii. The 2015 Consumer Redress Powers	179
iii. Redress Powers in Selected Sectors	182
a. Financial Services.....	182
b. Communications	195
c. Gas and Electricity	197
d. Water.....	205
e. Railways	206
f. Environmental Protection	207
g. Gambling.....	208
h. Competition	208

6.	Ombudsmen	211
I.	Typology	211
II.	National Ombudsmen Schemes	212
A.	Belgium	212
i.	Consumer Mediation Service	212
ii.	Ombudsmen	216
iii.	Belmed	231
B.	France	233
i.	Compensation Schemes	237
C.	Italy	240
D.	Sweden	241
i.	The Group Procedure for Consumer Disputes	241
ii.	Case Studies	242
E.	The Netherlands	246
F.	United Kingdom	247
i.	The Landscape of Consumer Ombudsmen	247
ii.	The Financial Ombudsman Service	248
iii.	Integrated Voluntary, Regulatory and Ombudsman Redress: PPI	252
iv.	Ombudsman Services: Energy, Communications, Property and Others	258
7.	Reassessing the Objectives	261
I.	The Primary Objectives	261
A.	Subsidiary Process Objectives	261
II.	Delivering Compensation	262
A.	Social Solidarity and Risk Spreading	263
B.	Justifications for Tort Liability	265
III.	Affecting Future Behaviour	267
A.	Deterrence in Traditional Legal Theory of Individual Actions and Enforcement	268
B.	The Economic Theory of Deterrence	271
C.	Criticisms of Economic Analysis of Liability Law	272
D.	Adding the Time Dimension	273
E.	Regulators' Abandonment of Deterrence for Supportive Responsive Policies on Achieving Compliance	274
F.	Affecting Corporate Behaviour	276
G.	Behavioural Science on How People Make Decisions	276
H.	Conclusions on Deterrence	278
IV.	Empirical Evidence on the Failure of the US Class Action as a Regulatory Mechanism	278
V.	The Objectives Restated: Multi-functionalism	281
8.	Conclusions	283
I.	Overview of the Mechanisms	283
A.	Collective Actions	283
i.	Italy	285

ii.	Poland	286
iii.	England and Wales	286
a.	Examples of Cases	287
b.	Assessment	288
B.	<i>Partie Civile</i>	289
i.	Examples of Cases	289
ii.	Assessment	289
C.	Regulatory Redress	289
i.	Examples of Cases	290
ii.	Assessment	291
D.	Consumer Ombudsmen	292
i.	Examples of Cases	293
ii.	Assessment	293
II.	Applying the Criteria	293
A.	Criteria 1: Advice	294
B.	Criteria 2: Identification of Infringement and Harm	294
C.	Criteria 3: Identification of People Harmed and Due Redress	295
D.	Criteria 4: Access	295
E.	Criteria 5: Cost to Access	295
F.	Criteria 6: Triage	296
G.	Criteria 7: Duration	296
H.	Criteria 8: Costs	296
I.	Criteria 9: Outcomes	296
J.	Criteria 10: Compensation for Loss: Making Whole	297
K.	Criteria 11: Changes in Behaviour	297
L.	Summary	298
III.	Empirical Conclusions on the Mechanisms	298
IV.	Implications of the Findings	299
A.	Changes in the Dispute Resolution Landscape: A Shift to New Technologies	299
B.	Redress as an Integral Function in Control of Markets	300
C.	The Objectives for Market Regulation	301
D.	A Shift in Intermediaries	301
E.	Shifting from Old to New Technology	303
F.	The Need for Independent Intermediaries	304
G.	What Traditional Redress Systems Will Fail to Achieve	306
H.	The Need to Re-examine Mechanisms for Controlling Market Behaviour (Enforcement)	307
I.	Restatement of the Fundamental Goals of Redress Systems	308
J.	Facilitating Settlement: The Requirement for Structures to be Available	310
K.	The Requirement to Base Policy on an Examination of all the Options, and on Empirical Evidence	311
L.	Summary of Implications for Policy on Collective Redress	311

xii *Table of Contents*

Annex.....313

 I. Damages Cases313

 A. Collective Private Litigation.....313

 B. Civil Piggy-back on Criminal328

 C. Regulatory Redress329

 D. Ombuds.....334

 II. Cases Involving Injunctions/Market Behaviour (Not Compensation)336

 III. Cases Identified by BEUC and COJEF339

Index343