

of the world as we can see from experiences with law school clinical programs in the United States of America (where clinical legal education has a long tradition and importance), Latin America and Caribbean and in the European context. It can be concluded that the lessons learned from clinical legal education in different regions are closely linked to the places of origins of the refugees and characteristics of the refugee influx. Section B presents further examples on how to teach using simulations such as intensive simulation (complex role-play) that enable students to explore and apply theoretical ideas (and theoretical knowledge obtained earlier) through imitation of real-life scenarios or migrants and refugees. Another simulation introduced is live action role-play (LARP) using one particular example from the Czech Republic simulating refugee camp in which students play roles of asylum seekers but also those who may intervene the situation. Experience with moot courts must of course not be missing from the list of simulation models. This section is then concluded by a very timely contribution on online learning, especially in the context of pandemic in 2020/2021.

Part 4 then presents the lessons learned from what has been introduced in previous parts of the book and discusses possible ways forward. This includes a slightly provoking contribution on how to “build a boat”, i.e. what are the challenges, problems and strategies when teaching refugee law. Another chapter is dedicated to clinical legal education and summarizes what was said in previous parts of the book and concludes that when it comes to asylum and migration law context, teaching and learning through clinical approach is a good way forward. And the last chapter describes set of interlinked courses on refugee and migration law forming a specialization module for students combining different methods of teaching.

The editors have done a very good job in putting together contributions from individual authors (coming not only from different professional backgrounds but also from different parts of the world) while maintaining a consistency and good quality of each of the contributions (which is always a hard task to do). The book introduces a range of workable, sustainable, and highly practical methods for learning and teaching of migration and asylum law that can be used not only by teachers and students but also by anyone who is active in the field of migration be it advocate, NGO worker or social services worker. What was clearly shown in the book is that studying and teaching law affecting migrants is a perfect ground for cross-subject study and cooperation activities overlapping with other areas of law and legal education.

Eliška Flídrová*

Prague Law Working Papers Series No III/2022 – New issue of Charles University in Prague Faculty of Law Research Papers

The new issue of Prague Law Faculty's open-source electronic periodical offers a set of working papers on various topics. The following provides a general outline of their content. Their full versions can be downloaded free of charge from <http://www.prf.cuni.cz>

Filip Novotný and **Kateřina Novotná** contributed a paper titled **Antitrust Limitation Periods in the Czech Republic in the light of recent CJEU case-law**. Their contribution focuses on the issue of the limitation of liability in Czech competition law. Its main aim is to find an answer to the question of whether the Czech statute of limitations is regulated in compliance with EU competition law or not. In doing so, the recent case law of the CJEU on the practical application of antitrust limitation periods, in particular the Judgements in Cases C 308/19 and C 450/19, is also being considered. The authors specifically look at whether the starting point of the limitation period in Czech law as inter-

* JUDr. Eliška Flídrová, Ph.D., Assistant Professor at Public International Law Department of Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic. ORCID: 0000-0002-2573-6394.

preted by the Czech Office for the Protection of Competition (OPC) and Czech administrative courts is laid down in accordance with EU law and the case law of the CJEU. Further, the authors assess whether the grounds for suspending and interrupting the limitation period in Czech law are determined in accordance with EU law and whether the grounds for suspending and interrupting the limitation period are interpreted by the OPC and administrative courts in accordance with EU law and the relevant case law of the CJEU. The authors conclude that the current and previous legal regulation of the relevant statute of limitation in Czech competition law complies with the requirements of the relevant CJEU case law, in particular with its *Whiteland* and *Kilpailu* judgments.

Tereza Kunertová asked the following question in the title of her paper: **Should the MiFID II be Aspiration or a mere Inspiration for the EU Regulation of Insurance Distribution?** Her paper examines the increasing influence of capital markets on the insurance legislation within the field of financial services and their distribution. Acknowledging the trend, the author poses herself a question whether the MiFID II regulation should serve as a mere inspiration for the regulation of insurance distribution or whether it should be the actual aspiration and thus a goal to achieve. It is not easy to derive simple conclusion, for which the author needs to first cover the primal goal of insurance and briefly delve into the development of insurance distribution in the European Union. The aim of the paper, however, is not to provide a complex research and comprehensive understanding of all insurance and capital market peculiarities but more to peak into the growing idea in Brussels on a simple cross transferability of regulatory aspects among different branches within one field. The trend to be so visible in many other areas and industries as well.

Miroslav Jakob treated in his contribution the topic of **Benefits and Limitations of a Behaviourally Informed Regulatory Framework for Digital Markets**. His paper makes a case for a regulatory framework for digital markets, with an individualised approach to analysis (and potential prohibition) of the behaviour of an individual addressee with set ex ante rules. It builds on discussions of two modern day trends in competition law and regulation: competition in digital markets and the question of a behaviourally informed approach to law and regulation. While the former is the natural result of the growth of the digital economy, it turned out to be a formidable challenge for both competition authorities and, later on, legislators. The latter has been a topic discussed in academic literature, an approach mentioned in several recent communications of the European Commission, and arguably a fact of life in recent competition enforcement. The contribution argues that introducing new regulation may contribute to a decrease in the uncertainty of enforcement and help solve certain issues related to the difficulty in finding clear cut legal tests for some conducts on the digital markets. In cases where regulation interferes with cases of behavioural exploitation, its benefits could be jeopardised by introducing ex ante rules that do not allow an individualised approach. For that reason, it is argued that rules on conduct that can foreseeably entail behavioural exploitation allow for specification by way of decision or some other suitable form of individualisation.

Xin Li's article bears the title **Critical Comparison of the Impact of Paris Agreement on Chinese and German Domestic Laws**. The author argues that China and Germany, two important countries in climate change around the world, have seen their environmental legal systems change to some extent after the Paris Treaty, especially after the German constitutional Court ruled in 2021 that the German climate protection law was unconstitutional. The article discusses then the impact of the Paris agreement on the Chinese and German legal systems, focusing on the German and Chinese legal systems after the Paris agreement. In conclusion, it says that both China and Germany have made remarkable progress in as far as transposing the Paris agreement into domestic law is concerned, however, it is notable that the Paris agreement has had more positive impact on the domestic laws in Germany as compared to China.

Václav Šmejkal*

* Associate Professor, JUDr. Václav Šmejkal, Ph.D., Faculty of Law, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic. ORCID: 0000-0003-1403-9494.