



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: SLOVENIA

Court: SUPREME COURT

Last Name: STROJIN

First Name: GREGOR

Title: Head of Public Affairs Office

E-mail address: gregor.strojin@sodisce.si

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

Yes. Through European Commission.

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.

No

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.

None major (so far).

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

Minor modifications of the existing case law databases in order to create the ECLI from the existing metadata, or to adapt the existing metadata to the required/optional structure. Most modifications can be automated.

Manual re-classification is required for the existing subject categories (ca. 150 fixed first level categories) in order for them to fit within the 13 categories defined by the Council Conclusions.

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)?

Most are already in place and can be either used directly or deduced from the existing metadata, except for optional metadata 2.3(a) - title, and 2.3(e) – contributor, which are non-existent in the published case law.

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

Extending the available metadata is a problem for already existing documents, if their metadata is non-existent (e.g. 2.3(e)), as it would require new manual input from the original (physical) court decisions, some of which are already in historical archives.

Physical embodiments of the judgements (which also means decisions, which are not published in case law databases, e.g. first level decisions) do not include metadata as such, as metadata is added to documents during their entry into databases. ECLI is planned to be, however, included on all decisions (i.e., also first level decisions) from 2012 onwards.

Extending the (currently unavailable) metadata to new cases would require changes in the legislation and in the methods of their preparation for publishing.

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?

Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia, Registry Department, Tavcarjeva 9, SI-1000 Ljubljana

Gregor Strojín, gregor.strojin@sodisce.si, +386 1 366 4256

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.

Implementation of ECLI has only started. Slovenia has a system of case law databases which has been informatized since 1987, which connects all appellate courts and Supreme Court (http://www.sodisce.si/znanje/sodna_praksa/) and already includes all metadata which is set out as ECLI standard. It needs to be noted, that first level decisions were not considered case law as such, and are not published in case law databases. We are, however, considering the use of ECLI on first level decisions as well.

In the next phase we plan to propose the expansion of ECLI to first level courts, and to other institutions, such as Constitutional Court and Court of Auditors.

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?

Yes.

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:

/

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

We are planning to apply ECLI to all case law, new as well as legacy.

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:

Analysis of the requirements, Analysis of the existing metadata, Preparation of database modifications, TO BE DONE: Database modifications, Testing, Implementation of ECLI in the existing web services, Preparation of sitemaps

Timetable:

Implementation by December 2011

Financial costs:

Internal costs N/A, External costs est. 20.000 EUR

Other resources:

External preparation of the new databases, implementation of ECLI data on case law websites

Difficulties encountered:

N/A yet. To be reported on at a later stage.

Other information:

/