



Association of the Councils of State and Supreme Administrative Jurisdictions of the European Union i.n.p.a.

Association des Conseils d'Etat et des Juridictions administratives suprêmes de l'Union européenne a.i.s.b.l.

ACA-Europe



NACZELNY SĄD ADMINISTRACYJNY

With the collaboration of the Supreme Administrative Court of Poland

And the support of the task group "Access to national Case law" of the Council of the European Union

**European Case Law Identifier (ECLI)
and meta-data: harmonisation of case
law identification in the European
Union**

Questionnaire

Warsaw

30 September 2011

(Simultaneous interpretation English/French/Polish)

Conference organised with the support of the European Commission



Member State: Czech Republic

Court: Supreme Administrative Court

Last Name: Walach

First Name: Adam

Title: Mgr.

E-mail address: adam.walach@nssoud.cz

1. Are you aware of the ECLI system? If yes, how did you hear about it?

No, I was not aware of the ECLI system until I heard about it in connection with present questionnaire. Meanwhile I have got some information from the national coordinating authority.

2. After reading the text of the [Council conclusions](#), are there items you do not understand or on which you would like further information? If so, please specify.

I would like to have information about how the complete file number of our court (e. g. 1 As 16/2010, which 1 stands for the number of a chamber) can be contained in the new ECLI or if it is even possible. There is a need to distinguish the chamber (1), the area of subject-matter (As) and the number of the case on the court (16), and of course the year of the registration in the court registry (but this is clear to me).

3. Are there any barriers to the implementation of such a system in your court (or the courts of your Member State)?

Technical? Other? Please specify.

I am not aware of any problems or barriers.

4. What adaptations are needed in your court (or the courts of your Member State) to implement the ECLI system requirements?

The internal system of case-law evidence shall be adapted to enable reading of the ECLI code, since our internal system knows only file numbers of the decisions and our specific “filing number” for internal needs of the database and for the process of creation of the Court Reports (e.g. Ej 51/2009, not for public).

5. What meta-data (a) required or b) optional) for ECLI are already in place in your court (or the courts of your Member State)?

Our meta-data contain: the name of the court, the date of the decision, the file number (which also identifies the number of the chamber), the name of the party, the form of the decision. The decisions with recitals of law are also filed under the key words. This meta-data apply only to the decisions of our Court and to the administrative chambers of regional courts (1st instance courts in administrative matters).

6. Are there any obstacles for your court (or the courts of your Member State) to extend the available metadata?

I am not aware of any obstacles, nevertheless the extension of available meta-data would take additional financial expenses.

7. Is there a national coordinating authority in your Member State? If yes, please provide coordinating entity's name and contact details.

If not, which organisation do you think should play this role?

The coordinating authority in our country is the Ministry of Justice.

8. Do judicial institutions in your Member State cooperate on implementation of ECLI standard metadata? Please specify, especially if you have examples of good practice.

I don't know any examples of coordination between judicial institutions in this area. But there is a coordination between Supreme and Supreme Administrative Court to enable mutual access to internal databases of case-law. This two Courts have similar meta-data, although Supreme Administrative Court has better developed internal database of case-law.

9. Are there interoperability problems between ECLI and standard metadata on the one hand and European or national semantic web initiatives on the other hand?

I am not aware of the interoperability problems. The only problem can be to adapt the current meta-data to the ECLI standards (but this is only the question of technical performance).

10. In your Member State, are there already plans to implement ECLI? Please tick the relevant box.

Implementation already underway (see next questions)

Implementation to start in the short-term (within 1 year)

Implementation to start in the medium-term (2-5 years)

Implementation to start in the long-term (> 5 years)

No specific plan

Additional comments:

The Ministry of Justice is in present times (6th June 2011) deciding whether to join and introduce the ECLI system to the Czech courts. If the Ministry approves the accession to the system, it will build a team of national experts comprising representatives of the individual courts (Supreme Court, Supreme Administrative Court, Constitutional Court).

11. Are you planning to apply ECLI to all case law, retroactive / legacy, or will you limit its use to the new case law?

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

12. In case your court (or the courts of your Member State) is already implementing ECLI, to share information on best practices, please provide additional information on:

Preparations undertaken:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

Timetable:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

Financial costs:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

Other resources:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

Difficulties encountered:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

Other information:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.