*Appendix 3*

Dr Marcin Glicz, LL.M.
Management and Security Department
Institute of Law
Pomeranian University in Słupsk

**Summary**
**of scholarly work and achievements**

1. **Name and surname:** Marcin Glicz
2. **Academic diplomas and degrees with an indication of their names, place and year of award and title of PhD dissertation:**

   2007 – PhD in jurisprudence, Law and Administration Department, University of Gdańsk, PhD dissertation entitled *Civil Liability for Breach of Information Obligations on the Capital Market* written under the supervision of Prof. zw. dr hab. Zdzisław Brodecki;

   2002 – academic degree *magister legum* (LL.M.) Faculty of Law University of Cologne (*summa cum laudae*);

   2000 – MA in Law, Law and Administration Department, University of Gdańsk.

3. **History of employment in research institutions**

   1 March 2019 – present – assistant professor, Law Unit in the Management and Security Department, Pomeranian University in Słupsk;

   1 October 2015 – 28 February 2019 – assistant professor at the Chair of Civil Law, Law and Administration Department, University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn;

1 October 2007 – 30 September 2015 – assistant professor at the Chair of Commercial law and International Private Law, Law and Administration Department, University of Gdańsk;

1 October 2007 – 30 September 2017 – senior lecturer, Institute of Economics, State Vocational College in Elbląg;

18 February 2002 – 30 September 2007 – assistant at the Chair of Commercial Law and International Private Law, Law and Administration Department, University of Gdańsk.

4. **Indication of the achievement under Article 16 paragraph 2 of the Act on Academic Degrees and Academic Title and Degrees and Titles in Arts of 14 March 2003 (Journal of Laws 2016, item 882 as amended in Journal of Laws of 2016, item 1311):**

   a) **title of academic achievement**

   Authorship of monograph entitled: *Public Company and Joint-Stock Company. A Typological Analysis*

   b) **author, title of publication, year of publication, name of publishing house, reviewers**

   Marcin Glicz, *Public Company and Joint-Stock Company. Typological Analysis*, wydawnictwo C.H. Beck, Warszawa 2018, reviewed by dr hab. Piotr Zapadka, prof. UKSW;

   c) **statement of the publication's research objective and results achieved, with a discussion of their possible usefulness**

The monograph entitled "*Public Company and Joint-Stock Company. A Typological Analysis*" listed under academic achievements marks the high point of my many years' research on the question of differentiation between a public company and a joint-stock company. The dissertation's fundamental achievement in the field of legal theory was to conduct a detailed and unique survey of the various areas of classification, organization and systematization of norms applicable to a public company, and to lay down accordingly the criteria for a typological

differentiation between a public company and a joint-stock company. These various areas relate to the operation and organization of a company and protecting its shareholders.

As the considerations presented there are of paramount importance for legal theory and practice, this survey marks another step forward in the research on social relations, thereby contributing to the development of private law, especially as a result of controversies as to the interpretation of the applicable laws. The argument presented in the monograph is relevant to the discussion of the organizational and economic aspects of the operation of public companies. As the work indicates the position of a public company amongst the various types of commercial companies, it should benefit the legislative process relating to a public company's internal and external relations.

The work presents a multi-faceted discussion of the various areas of differentiation between a public company and a joint-stock company. The research is driven by four main objectives relating to the subject in question. The first of these objectives is to determine the legal paradigm underlying the capital market as a set of theoretical assumptions necessary for a formal analysis of a legal institution. The second objective is to analyse the differentiation of a public company from a joint-stock company in light of Polish law and Polish and foreign doctrine of commercial law, with reference to historical-legal factors. The third objective is to reconstruct the normative areas of differentiation between a public company and a joint-stock company by singling out and putting into order the relevant regulations and to survey the degree of intensity of some of such differentiation's relational features. The fourth and final objective is to evaluate the public company's position within the system and to set the direction for change and improvement of the existing legal situation.

The resulting research has allowed formulating the thesis that a public company should be subject to the regulated market regime. This thesis seems to be the chief point differentiating a public company from a joint-stock company in terms of autonomous and integrated models of company regulation. As regards legal theory, the link between a company and the regulated market is provided by shares, a financial instrument acting as one of the market's organizing principles. This puts the company at the centre of complex legal relations as a body corporate and share trader. However, the regulations are governed by other than a codical paradigm. For a public company to enter into such relations, it must be subject to a separate legal regime comprised of a number of normatively elaborate legal constructions having impact on the provisions of classical share law.

It has been proved that the public company's regulation through a separate paradigm as well as deregulation tendencies with respect to joint-stock companies, as observed in some legal systems, are shifting the focus of the company differentiation criterion based on the established structural and organizational company model. This means that the public company has outgrown the abstract organizational model of a joint-stock company as set out in the Commercial Companies Code. Far from being treated only as a form of organization under law, intended to fulfil specific objectives, it is also a specialized entity governed by a capital market regime whose normative foundations are embedded in an autonomous regulatory paradigm. The placement of a public company in the legal environment of norms relating to regulated market transactions is one of the key points of such a company's definition in most legal systems. Therefore, the idea of a public company is functionally determined by its close link with the principles of trading based on total and permanent transparency.

The work also shows that the Polish legislator's concept of dematerialization of shares as a criterion of differentiation between the public company and the model company is erroneous. The idea of linking a company to a regulated market is also found where a public company is held as a basic juridical model of a joint-stock company. For it seems that, in view of the historically evolved regulations on public companies, a non-public joint-stock company should remain the model construct. Adopting the opposite view would require a substantial transformation of the company system established through a long-standing evolution of the laws. Therefore, it appears much more pertinent to preserve the regulatory separation of the public company and the model joint-stock company.

Another conclusion with respect to the public company's information model is its strong focus on the needs of transaction parties as subjects linked to a public company by a relation of informational imbalance. The subjective aspect of information comprises an important component of the information model. However, this does not mean that a public company's information model protects only individual interests. The public company's information model also features corporate relations arising from components belonging originally to joint-stock company law. A shared feature of the information regime of the model company and the public company is the need to possess knowledge in order to make decisions relating either to individual corporate powers or superindividual market player interests. However, the set of norms comprising the public company's information regime contains distinctive substantive and formal points that set it apart from the joint-stock company.

Research reveals potential room for conflict between a company's corporate and transactional components. Such conflict may emerge as a public company's centralized corporate relations, whose subjects are the company and its shareholder, turn into decentralized relations driven by market mechanics. However, the conflict in question does not appear to prove the error of the model construction; nor is it an attempt to eliminate some of that model's components but rather to relativize them to the extent necessary to maintain its integrity and ensure its overall effective operation. It is also noteworthy that the point of difference between the public company and the model joint-stock company lies not in the former's structure but its functional character. The substantive unity of the norms, the praxeological correlation of the conduct prescribed by them and a common axiological justification are among characteristic features here. At the same time, they form a set of identifying marks of a distinct functional type. In a typological context, a public company – unlike the model company – operates in total and permanent transparency based on the regulated market regime.

The later part of my work analyses the regulations comprising the second area of differentiation between the public company and the joint-stock company, proving their close link with such characteristic features as shareholder dispersion and relativism of company membership, both of them a result of the corporate model being overlaid with investor relations and non-codical regulations on transactional relations. In legislating separate norms for the public company, it was the legislator's intention to maintain the original functions of the annual general meeting by encouraging geographically dispersed shareholders to participate and exercise their voting rights. For these aims to be achieved, the normative rules for convening a annual general meeting would have to change. The annual general meeting is an event that at the time of its announcement involves a number of informative acts.

An essential component of public company distinctiveness is its modified rules of entitlement. The modification relates to the differentiation of the legal status of acts appearing in documentary form and dematerialized acts. The first instance preserves the principle whereby the right to participate in the annual general meeting is determined based on a record in the share register or submission of bearer's documents to the company, while in the second instance, the legislator prescribes a multi-stage proceeding to take account of the institutional composition of a legal transaction. It has been noted in particular that a public company's annual general meeting is a forum not only for shareholders to convene in order to express their intent, but also for investors operating on capital markets and having various reasons for investing in

the company. In a typological perspective, the systemic role of the public company's annual general meeting as a decision-making body is limited, the reason for this being that share law, in its model form, assumes membership to consist of property and personal rights. The classic model of a joint-stock company attributes essential importance to internal law, or the organization of an asset-owning legal person striving to realize its interests and impact its actions through participation in an annual general meeting that takes place at a specific time and location.

Research shows that assessing the effectiveness of normative modifications, especially with respect to the role attributed to them, is an integral part of the operation of a public company. Modifications in the sphere of the public company's corporate constitution, implemented to comply with EU regulations, are not always as effective as required.

A confrontation of the modified sphere of corporate constitution of a public company with the paradigm of capital market law produces the following conclusions. On one hand, shareholder inactivity in a situation where numerous instruments are available to boost activity means that rational apathy ceases to be rational. On the other hand, the actions of small shareholders may appear irrational from the standpoint of company interests, as a result of a dichotomy between substantive and formal rights, which has emerged through the operation of the public company's regime of rights. It has been shown that a larger number of more dispersed shareholders has led to a greater separation of proprietary and managerial functions than is the case with the model company, a fact that strengthens the management board's position. Combined with the public company's complex organization, this speaks for strengthening the collegiate nature of the supervisory board acting as an extension of the annual general meeting.

The publication holds that another regulatory area differentiating the public from the joint-stock company relates to the sphere of shareholder protection. In this sphere, the legislator provides a number of instruments, both internal (intra-corporate) and external (governed by the regulatory regime of the capital market). Another area in which a public company differs from a joint-stock company is represented by the transformations taking place within shareholder structure with the purchase of large packages of shares. Especially important in the context of shareholder protection are regulations on the abolition of share dematerialization, as they revoke the public company status. Due to its heavy impact on share trading, this process implies the need for stricter regulation. While regulations on the abolition of dematerialization are designed to protect the soundness of legal transactions, shareholders are protected by the intra-

corporate model. The norms belonging to the corporate sphere serve in this case to protect against the abuse of minority shareholder rights by the capital market. As dematerialization produces important consequences, it requires a resolution by the annual general meeting which lies at the core of the share dematerialization procedure for a public company.

My analysis of the individual areas of differentiation between the public company and the model company shows the existence of legal norms regulating the conduct intended to achieve specific goals and realize values comprising the paradigm of capital market law. The legislator has not yet taken any steps to lay down laws on public companies, completely separate from the model company law. Both companies are governed by the same regulatory structure, i.e. the Commercial Companies Code, but one of them is subject to additional regulations laid down in the Code and in specific laws. These regulations stem from different stages in the evolution of laws, resulting in a large number of specific provisions in the Commercial Companies Code, relating to the public company. Thus, we witness a sort of regulatory extrapolation whereby the legislator uses a regulatory paradigm unknown in share law to override its classic constructions and to introduce a solution hitherto not found in the Commercial Companies Code. As a consequence, the provisions on the joint-stock company laid down in the Commercial Companies Code are interpreted with respect to a public company by a functional reference to the capital market, especially in the context of shareholders having the status of investors and the replacement of certain protective mechanisms under corporate law by capital market laws.

In my work, I propose the thesis that the defective definition of the public company as set out in the act on public offering and terms of trading in financial instruments and on public companies contradicts the dogmatic validity of viewing the public company as an entity involved in a specific area of legal transactions, which undermines the normative purpose of provisions both in the Commercial Companies Code and in particular acts. The extension of subject-matter areas in which a public company is differentiated, as a result of the increasing number of regulations in the Commercial Companies Code questions the classification of commercial companies set out in that Code. On the other hand, the first step to a gradual deconstruction of the dogmatic systematics of company law would be for the Commercial Companies Code to incorporate framework regulations for a typologically separate company, i.e. the public company.

The publication closes with a postulate to preserve the public company's distinctness by transferring the relevant legislation out of the Commercial Companies Code and into the act on

public offering and terms of trading in financial instruments and on public companies. This is in line with the overall company type profile as shown by various points of difference between a public company and a model joint-stock company. The line of demarcation separating the public company as a particular type of joint-stock company and the model company shifts away from the Commercial Companies Code and into the domain of specific legislative acts. Such a drawing of the line of demarcation will allow for a better utilization of the capital market law paradigm, while also singling out a body of regulations that may prove useful for a coordinated legislative and executive policy with respect to public companies. The opinion expressed in my work does not alter the classification of a public company as a joint-stock company.

## 5. A discussion of other achievements in scientific research

My other achievements in scientific research after the award of a doctoral degree in law covered problems in **commercial law** and **international private law**, resulting in a total of 47 scholarly publications. The remaining output includes 4 articles on systemic problems (as author), six commentaries (as co-author and one as editor), 18 book chapters (as author and one as co-author), 10 articles in Polish and foreign journals (as author), 2 various publications (as co-author), 6 glosses (as author), and one legal opinion. Before earning my PhD, I published 4 articles including Przegląd Prawa Handlowego and Przegląd Ustawodawstwa Gospodarczego, one publication as book chapter and one gloss. My research activities after I earned my doctoral degree covered various problems relating to business law, commercial agreements and law on securities.

**As regards the law on securities,** the bulk of my research efforts focused on themes related to the capital market. I discussed the subject in self-contained writings and contributed to collections of essays. In the commentary *Capital Market Law. Commentary* by M. Wierzbowski, L. Sobolewski, P. Wajda (eds.) Warszawa 2012, which I co-authored, I presented a thorough analysis and interpretation of the provisions on confidential information under Articles 154-161 of the Financial Instrument Trading Act. I extensively examined the attributes of confidential information and the obligations required of certain entities with respect to its circulation. At the heart of this was the changing interpretation of some of the regulations on confidential information, arising from EUCJ case law and EU legislation. Thanks to my careful tracking of legislative trends in the EU, I could write *Europeanization of Confidential*

*Information Law on the Capital Markets– New Trends* (in:) J. Gliniecka, E. Juchniewicz, T. Sowiński, M. Wróblewska (eds.) *Law And Finance The Financial Law Towards Challenges of the 21st Century*, Warszawa 2013. I proposed to tighten the existing regulations. My views on the information regime of the capital market were also heard at the conference Impact of Europeanization of Law on Institutions of Commercial Law, 9th Country-Wide Congress of Commercial Law Departments, 26-28 September 2013, where I presented a paper on *Factual states protracted in time vs. information obligations of a public company*, in which I held that interpretative uncertainty as to delimiting precise information in factual states protracted in time justify delays in its disclosure by issuers. In subsequent editions of *Capital Market Law. Commentary* M. Wierzbowski, L. Sobolewski, P. Wajda, ed 2 Warszawa 2015, ed 3 Warszawa 2019, I reviewed my earlier research results against the emerging regulatory trends, by presenting the evolution of information regime harmonization up to the repeal of national regulations and adoption of a harmonized legal regime as set out in the Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council (EU) No. 596/2014 on abuses on the market of 16 April 2014.

I also examined a selection of EUCJ case law in a gloss to *CJ judgment of 28 June 2012 r., C-19/11,* published in Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze – Przegląd Orzecznictwa 2012, issue 4 and gloss to *CJ judgment of 11 March 2015., C- 628/13*, Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze – Przegląd Orzecznictwa 2015, issue 2. The analyses concluded with the thesis that the legislator recognizes characteristic relations existing on the financial market in relations to the information imbalance and makes successive efforts to level out the imbalance by legal measures with different methods of regulating contradictory interests. The endless need to strike a balance between the interest of various market players was discussed in *Public company interests and the obligation to disclose confidential information in:* A. Olejniczak, T. Sójka, *Societas et Obligationes – Tradycja, Współczesność, Przyszłość, Jubilee Book for Professor Jacek Napierała,* Poznań 2018.

My publications on securities also include texts dealing with the problem of conflict of laws. *Lex Cartae Sitae in Trading in Dematerialized Securities* (in:) J. Poczobut (eds.) *Contemporary Challenges for International Private Law*, Warszawa 2013 proposes that the *situs certae* criterion, or the document's physical location, should be instrumental in determining the status of securities. However, international trade in securities as it is known today, with its extensive infrastructure and remote account access, and dematerialization makes it difficult to determine

the law applicable to securities. Those difficulties result in relativization of rules for linking legal relations of international trade in securities to the applicable law area.

Conflict of laws formed the centrepiece of *Private Law System. International Private Law*, vol. 20B (ed. M. Pazdan), Warszawa 2015. The most important research results in this publication were grouped by normative perspectives from which securities are treated. Problems arising on attempting a qualification require reference to functional arguments in order to allow considering the purpose of a legal institution in isolation from substantive law (*lex fori*). This thesis was constructed based on comparative law research that showed a distinct divide in the juridical construction of securities in various legal systems combining elements of the law of real rights and law of obligations. The scope of a conflict-of-law norm is determined therefore mainly by functional features. The importance of the place criterion was stressed in the context of the status of securities. As to the place of keeping an account in a security clearing system, the book advocates the model with an account documenting the purchase as a criterion of sufficient connection. A critical assessment of made of the idea of admissibility of selecting a jurisdiction as a reliable determinant of the law applicable to relations under the law of real rights in international financial instrument trading.

The discussion of international trade in securities was continued and developed by further contributions contained in S. Włodyka, A. Szumański, *The System of Commercial Law*, vol. 4, ed.2 (ed. M. Stec), Warszawa 2016, which focused in large part on regulations under unified substantive law and dealt with functional and formal questions related to cross-border trade in financial instruments. The work paid special attention to security deposits in international trade in countries whose legal regulation have a particular impact on the international financial market. The detailed investigations culminated in the crowning conclusion that the diverse legal nature of securities deposited in accounts in individual legal systems does not prevent direct international transactions, but may affect legal certainty.

Measures aiming to harmonize the legal regime governing securities deposited in accounts in the sphere of substantive law pose a much greater challenge for the legislator than the harmonization of devices regulating the financial market, taking place within the sphere of public law. The diversity of legal provisions governing financial instruments kept in accounts stems from established models of regulation current in the individual countries, so it is impossible to enforce a uniform legal framework with respect to all financial transactions

worldwide. There are views supporting a functional convergence as part of harmonizing trends in the international law of financial instrument trading.

In my research on securities, I have also studied bills of exchange, traded in Poland and internationally. In the publication *The International Bill of Exchange According to UNCITRAL and Polish Legal Regulations* (in:) J. Mojak, J. Widło, A. Żywicka (eds), *The Evolution of Institutions of Polish Securities Law. The 80th Anniversary of Bill of Exchange Law of 28 April 1936*, Lublin 2016 shows in particular that it is unlikely to achieve harmonized regulations with respect to internationally traded bills of exchange. This is the consequence of each individual country having its own well-established tradition of regulating trade in bills of exchange. In the gloss to Supreme Court resolution of 26 April 2007, *III CZP 19/07* Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze – Przegląd Orzecznictwa 2007, No. 4, I analyzed the question of seeking claims arising out of a bill of exchange. In my approval of the resolution, I opined that an endorsee authorized by a power of attorney to collect a bill of exchange remains a creditor as long as he is in possession of the bill and in a position to exercise the rights thereunder. The claim that, until his power of attorney is revoked by strike-off, the only entitled party is the endorser stands in contradiction to the nature of the power of attorney.

A substantial portion of my publications is concerned with insurance law. Publications covering this area of research include *Law of Business Insurance*, Brodecki, M. Serwach, M. Glicz, ed. 2, Warszawa 2010 discussing provisions on the operation of the insurance market. In the part of the commentary dealing with foreign enterprises conducting business in Poland as insurance agencies, I analysed the legal organization of a foreign insurance company's major branch office and its status under Polish law which is independent of its internal ties with its headquarters abroad. Foreign insurance entrepreneur activity is a theme which I also discussed in a commentary to another legislative act, i.e. *Insurance and Reinsurance Business Act* P. Wajda, M. Szczepańska (eds.) Warszawa 2017. There, I compared the previous and current legal regimes implementing EU regulations, noting that the legal nature of a division (branch) is based on the subject-matter (functional) criterion, which means that the key factor is the entrepreneur's scope of activities rather than its structure. At the same time, I pointed out that a broad functional criterion for singling out a division of a foreign insurance and reinsurance enterprise is typical of regulations on divisions of insurance and reinsurance businesses having its seat in European Union member states. A foreign insurance business / reinsurance business and their headquarters share a vertical rather than horizontal relation. The headquarters is a form

of legal organization specified by regulations, whereby proceeding to conduct and conducting insurance and reinsurance activities outside the country of registered office is prohibited.

The area of research on insurance also includes a cycle of publications on insurance for civil liability the members of governing bodies in companies. In the first text entitled *The Obligation to Declare Risk in Civil Liability Insurance for Companies' Governing Bodies* in: B. Gnela, M. Szaraniec (ed.), *Information in business insurance law*, Warszawa 2015, I presented the view that the exclusion of the effects of the obligation to declare risk to some persons requires the inclusion of specific provisions in an insurance agreement. The language of such provisions establishing a separation of the effects of a breach of the obligation to declare risk requires taking into account the company's interest that is also to be included in insurance coverage.

In the subsequent two works, I discussed the influence of an insurance agreement on the effectiveness of the liability of a company's governing bodies for damage incurred through an action or omission that is unlawful or inconsistent with the company's articles of association. The issue of insurance was presented from the perspective of the importance of the civil liability of company owners in balancing the company's corporate relations. The pivotal thesis presented in the publication *Liability in Damages of Members of Governing Bodies of Companies from the Perspective of Insurance Coverage* in: K. Bilewska (ed.) *The Effectiveness of Management and Supervision in a Commercial Company. In Search of an Optimum Model of Company Constitution*, Warszawa 2018 is the claim that the juridical construction of civil liability insurance for the members of a company's governing bodies is the reason for the conflicts of interest that jeopardizes the functions attributed by the legislator to the obligation to remedy damage. The problem of relativized functions of liability in damages lying with a company's governing bodies is elaborated in a publication discussing the construction of instruments intended to assist preventive measures. The main accomplishment of the publication entitled *The Clause of Equity in Civil Liability Insurance for the Members of Governing Bodies of a Joint-Stock Company* in: E. Bagińska, W. Mogilski, M. Wałachowska, M.P. Ziemiak (ed.) *Towards Good Insurance Law. Jubilee Book for Professor Eugeniusz Kowalewski*, Toruń 2019 is the thesis that it is not necessary to take legislative measures to enforce the application of equity clauses. The thesis is supported by research in comparative law. My own contribution to the debate on liability from the perspective of insurances was published in the paper entitled *Selected Questions in the Constuction of Civil Liability Insurance for the Governing Bodies of a Company*, which I presented at Nicholas Copernicus

University in Toruń, at the conference "Toruńskie spotkania z prawem handlowym" (*Encounters with Commercial Law*) in 2018. In it, I emphasized the need to consider the separation of insurance policyholders in light of the emerging conflict of interest between the management board and the supervisory board.

In the research area relating to **business law and commercial companies law**, my especially noteworthy publications concern the shareholder status in companies with public authority holdings. This question was discussed with respect to the freedom of capital flow in the European Union. In the publication entitled *The Golden Share* in: Z. Brodecki (ed.) *Europe of Entrepreneurs*, Warszawa 2011, I presented the EU and Polish perspectives on legal constructs allowing public authorities to have an impact on the constitution and operation of companies, as well as an evaluation of these constructs with respect to the freedom of capital flow. The research on the ways in which the state interferes with the constitution and operation of companies, both through provisions under company law and non-corporate instruments, is continued and extended in the article entitled *Shareholder Status and State Powers,* Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze, vol. XXII, 2009. The paper argues the state is privileged in corporate relations due to its legislative and corrective functions. These measures grant the state privileges exceeding the traditional legal framework of a company. Such a solution is clearly in breach of the traditionally acceptable ways for the state to impact the economy, and leads to an amassment of state powers when this is required by overriding interests. The problem of state privilege in the context of companies was also addressed in the *Gloss to the Court of Justice judgment of in the matters of C-463/04 and C464/04* of *6 December 2007* Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze – Przegląd Orzecznictwa 2008, No. 2. There, I took an approving view of the judgment, indicating that an assessment of compliance of domestic laws with the principle of freedom of capital flow should take into account not only provisions granting direct authority to the state but also domestic regulations having the effect of placing the state in a privileged position relative to other company shareholders. The importance of freedom of capital flow for the EU capital market was discussed in the publication *Freedom of Capital Flow and Integrated Capital Market*, Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze, vol. XXV, 2011, where I proposed the thesis that freedom of capital flow applied in simultaneously with freedom of business and freedom of services forms the European financial space with a global dimension, open to third party states. This is a constitutive component for the internal market and a basis upon which to establish a uniform capital market underlying the economic system of the European Union.

In my research relating to **transport law,** I discussed transport organization as well as the rights and obligations of parties to a contract of carriage in various transport modes. Noteworthy in that area are my publications on transport safety, including texts prepared as part of the Integrated Transport System Safety project. In the paper *Legal Implications of Safety System Integration in Transport* in: R. Krystek (ed.) *The Integrated Transport Safety System, vol. II, Conditions for Growth of the Integration of Transport Safety Systems*, Warszawa 2009, I presented transport safety as a legal issue. I also proposed a postulate for system integration based on service provider structure. The existing structure is founded upon the modal criterion, resulting in a dispersal of regulations and responsibilities. The publication *Legal Aspects of Implementing the Integrated Transport Safety System* in: R. Krystek (ed.) *Integrated Transport Safety System,* vol. III, *The Concept of an Integrated Transport Safety System in Poland*, Warszawa 2010, pp. 153-164, contains *de lege ferenda* proposals with respect to implementing and integrating specific elements of the system. My research on transport safety also the (co-authored) publication *The Current Legal Status of Roadside Advertisements and Proposals for Change*, Transport Miejski i Regionalny 2013, R. 31, No. 12 where I surveyed the case law and applicable regulations on road transport.

My work on transport law also includes publications concerning relations under civil law with respect to providing carriage services. The paper covering that area is *Protection of Passenger Rights in Air Transport in CJEU case law* in: E. Jaremczuk (ed.) *Inspirations for Aviation: Technical, Historical, Social and Legal Aspects*, Elbląg 2014, where I formulate the thesis on the multiplicity and complexity of legal facts that may constitute a breach in air-borne passenger transport. As for carrier liability, the most noteworthy publications include the gloss to Supreme Court resolution *of* 13 December 2007, *III CZP 100/07,* Gdańskie Studia Prawnicze-Przegląd Orzecznictwa 2008, No. 4, written in approval of the Supreme Court's qualification of specific events as force majeure exonerating circumstances for the delivery carrier. The text also compares this qualification with international regulations.

In all my areas of research, I try to present all the problems from the perspective of comparative law. This comes as a natural consequence of these problems' link with market economy. This is why I place so much value on comparing Polish regulations with international ones.

I have also published my work abroad, for example *Handelsregisterpublizität nach polnischem Recht,* Wirtschaft und Recht in Osteuropa, 2010, no. 1, where I discuss the principle of openness of the register of entrepreneurs; also noteworthy in this context is the co-authored paper:

M. Balwicka-Szczyrba, A. Sylwestrzak, M. Glicz, *Supporting Elderly Persons in Polish Family and Succesion Law*, in: M. Brinig (ed.) *International Survey of Family Law 2018*, Cambridge, Antwerp, Chicago 2018, where I presented Polish conflict-of-law regulations with opinions from the literature regarding measures to protect the elderly.

I closely follow the work of the EU legislator and foreign law doctrine in all areas relevant to my research work. I am a member of the European Law Institute, where I am part of the special working group Business Finance Law. In the association *Friends of the Hamburg Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law* I take part in the annual conferences in Hamburg on commercial and civil law and conflict of laws organized by the Institute.

A complete list of all my publications and other achievements, including papers presented at conferences can be found in Appendix 4 *A list of published scholarly works and indication of didactic achievements, cooperative projects and popular science.*

.....

*Dr Marcin Glicz, LL.M.*