Research Partnership Platform 8th meeting

Wednesday, 5 July 2017 Room XVII, Palais des Nations, Geneva

Consumer Dispute Resolution in the Financial Services Sector

Presentation by Dr. Iris Benohr Queen Mary University of London United Kingdom

This material has been reproduced in the language and form as it was provided. The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of UNCTAD.

Consumer Dispute Resolution in the Financial Services Sector

Dr. Iris Benohr, Queen Mary University of London

UNCTAD Research Partnership Platform, July 2017

Structure

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Access to justice in the financial services sector
- 3. International and European framework
- 4. Barriers to consumer redress
- 5. Mass action example in the UK
- 6. Conclusions

Introduction

- Context
- Different means of redress
- High number of collective actions claims
- EU Study and data

EU study (2008) Oxford Economics

• Highest numbers of cases per country including financial services



Figure 1: Collective redress cases per country

Number of cases by economic sector



Sectors in which it is most difficult to obtain redress (non-business stakeholder opinion) (source Civic Consulting)



International recommendations

- World Bank best practices on financial consumer protection
- UN Guidelines for Consumer Protection
- OECD Recommendation on Consumer Dispute Resolution
- Commission Recommendation on collective redress mechanisms







EU approach (2013): Recommendation on Collective Redress



European Commission

- Member States should introduce collective redress mechanisms
- Sets out a number of common European principles for such mechanisms
- > Procedures should be fair, equitable, timely and not prohibitively expensive
- > Collective redress systems should be based on the **"opt-in" principle**
- Procedural safeguards to avoid abuse of collective redress systems (e.g. MS should not permit contingency fees risks)
- > Alternative Dispute Resolution

EU Initiative on Consumer ADR (2013)

• EU ADR Directive

- MS have to make ADR schemes available to consumers (2015)
- Sets consistent standards for all ADR providers
- The UK has introduced new legislation, obliging traders to inform consumers whether they are willing to use an ADR scheme and which one they will use

• Regulation on Online Dispute Resolution (ODR)

- > EU-wide online dispute resolution platform for disputes arising from online transactions
- > The platform links national ADR entities, operates in EU languages, is free of charge
- Consumers are able to submit a complaint through the ODR platform, which notifies the trader

Obstacles to redress in financial services

- Key obstacles (Civic Consulting study):
- Cost of litigation
- Length of judicial proceedings
- Lack of awareness among consumers and lack of experience by judges
- Limited resources of consumer organisations to bring claims
- No collective redress mechanisms
- No relevant/adequate ADR scheme available for mass issues

Key areas of infringement

- Overcharges collected by banks
- Unfair terms in contracts, imposing extra costs or giving companies strong rights and little liability
- Misleading information and fraud
- Fees for unsolicited financial services

Example of a major mass claim: Payment Protection Insurance (PPI)



- PPI mis-selling in several EU countries, leading to consumer detriment and complaints (e.g. UK, France, Spain, Netherlands, Ireland).
- PPI: insurance products providing coverage to buyers of financial products (loans and mortgages), covering for inability to make payment. The risks covered by the policy usually are accidents, sickness and unemployment.
- Consumers received misleading information (on *cover, cost* and *necessity* of the policy) distorting their choice.

The resolution of PPI cases in the UK

- Individual redress and collective redress
- Financial Services Ombudsman (FOS): complaints and mass settlement
- The Financial Services Authority conducted enforcement cases and imposed fines on companies.
- Firms paid out compensation to consumers on miss-sold policies.

Conclusions

- Consumers face barriers to enforce their rights in courts
- Difficulties to enforce small claims and cross-border CR claims
- Efficient and cost-effective collective redress and ADR schemes
- Binding and independent ADR schemes