

Which?

CESL: Good choice for the consumer?

The Right of Withdrawal
Chris Warner
24 Sep 2012

Which? is....

- the largest consumer organisation in Europe with 1.3 million subscribers
- not-for-profit and independent
- completely self-funded - no advertisers, shareholders or Government funding
- a leading member of BEUC
- there to make things better for consumers:
 - Its advice helps them make informed decisions.
 - Its campaigns makes people's lives fairer, simpler and safer.
 - Its services and products put consumers' needs first to bring them better value

Overview

- Significant and novel piece of legislation
 - Far-reaching consequences for business and consumers
- IMCO is focusing on the right question
- Which? is fully supportive of measures to improve the single market for consumers but it does not support CESL
 - No real evidence contract law is a barrier to cross border trade or that CESL will deliver any meaningful change
 - But it is likely to
 - Reduce consumer protection
 - Increase complexity and confusion

Time to look at the details?

- Many unanswered questions of principle
 - Is there a need for CESL?
 - Will it improve cross border trade?
 - Can it achieve its aims?
 - Is an optional instrument appropriate?
- These should be properly considered before a detailed analysis
 - Which? welcomes the IMCO impact assessment
- But a look at the details can help answer these questions
 - The Right of Withdrawal is a good example

The Right of Withdrawal - what is it?

- Applies only to distance and off-premises contracts
- It gives consumer the right to change their mind and withdraw from contract
- Right lasts 14 days from receipt of goods
- Consumer has 14 days from withdrawal to return goods
- Trader has 14 days to refund consumer total purchase cost (incl. delivery)
- Contract treated as it never existed

The Right of Withdrawal - is CESL needed?

- No!
- Right almost exactly the same as under the Consumer Rights Directive
- CRD = max harmonisation
- And some consumers will be less protected under CESL

CESL offers lower Consumer Protection

- Removes ban on payments during the withdrawal period
 - Impact on off-premises contracts in France
- CESL provides a more limited right to withdraw from off-premises contracts in 18 member States:
 - in Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg and Slovakia the right will be lost completely for all contracts worth <€50
 - In Austria, Germany, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland, Sweden, Slovenia the right will be lost completely for some contracts worth <€50

Can consumers avoid the reduction in protection?

- Not always:
 - Trader chooses whether CESL or national laws apply (not the consumer)
 - Consumer can only choose national laws by choosing a trader who is using them
 - = Problem if all traders selling the same good use CESL
- But how will consumer be able to make informed choice?
 - Proposed CESL factsheet will not include this detail
 - Unlikely these differences will be flagged by trader
- And as a matter of principle, the burden of choice should not be on the consumer

Will CESL reduce costs for business in relation to RoW?

- No – costs are likely to increase
- Although wording is very similar, it's not the same
 - Different interpretations over time?
 - Art 4, Annex 1 : CESL must be interpreted autonomously
- So, need to understand 2 parallel regimes
 - CESL and the Consumer Rights Directive
 - Even if not using CESL (to make sure right decision)
- Coherent development of CESL and CRD by legislators
 - Simultaneous reviews?

Next steps for IMCO?

- Continue to focus on the same question: will consumers benefit?
- Defend the Consumer Rights Directive:
 - It was successful and needs time to develop
- Turn CESL into an instrument that
 - Is really needed;
 - Benefits consumers; and
 - Is useful to business.
- For example:
 - A model contract / code of conduct
 - Focus on 'non-optional' harmonisation where needed within the Consumer Acquis

Thank You.