

Civil and commercial judicial cooperation: converting the Rome Convention on the law applicable to contractual obligations into a Community Regulation, Rome I

2005/0261(COD) - 19/04/2007

The Council reached an agreement on a number of issues concerning this proposal, among which the following should be highlighted:

Principle of choice of law by the parties to the contract (Article 3): as in the Rome Convention, the basic rule for the law applicable to a contract is the choice of the law of a country by the parties. This rule respects party autonomy and is particularly appropriate in the area of contractual obligations which are created and governed by the parties to the contract (Article 3). However, where all other elements relevant to the situation are located in a country other than the country whose law has been chosen, the choice of law does not allow parties to avoid the application of provisions of the law of that country which cannot be derogated from by agreement (Article 3(4)). Concerning rules of Community law which cannot be derogated from by agreement, the Commission proposed that those rules should prevail wherever they would be applicable to the case. However, since the majority of delegations took the view that it would be appropriate to treat rules of national law and of Community law which cannot be derogated from by agreement on an equal footing, as in the Council Common position on the Rome II-Regulation, the Council agreed to follow this approach.

Law applicable in the absence of choice (Article 4): in the absence of a choice of law by the parties, Article 4 provides essentially for two connecting factors: the habitual residence of the party who is required to effect the characteristic performance, if such performance can be determined (Article 4(1) and (2)), or otherwise the closest connection of the contract with a specific country (Article 4(4)).

Delegations agreed that in order to achieve more legal certainty, some of the most typical contracts should be explicitly mentioned in Article 4(1). Where the contract does not fall under Article 4(1), in particular if it does not fall within the scope of one of the typical contracts listed in that paragraph, the court has to apply Article 4(2). Member States also recognised the need for an "escape clause" allowing for flexibility where the connecting factors in Article 4(1) or (2) would exceptionally lead to an unsatisfactory result because it is clear from all the circumstances of the case that the contract is manifestly more closely connected with another country.

Individual employment contracts (Article 6): delegations agreed that, as in the Rome Convention, a special rule should provide for the appropriate connecting factors concerning individual contracts of employment in the absence of a choice of law. However, where a choice of law is made by the parties, the employee should not lose the protection given to him by the rules of the law of the country whose law would have been applicable in the absence of the choice and which cannot be derogated from by agreement. The Council agreed on a provision on individual employment contracts which aims at balancing the interests of employees and those of employers.