



INTRODUCTION

As was decided at the ACA-Europe General Assembly, a working group was launched to contribute to the EU Justice Scoreboard 2019. The topic for this year is: “Qualitative and Quantitative Review of the 2019 seminars.”

In the agenda of the General Assembly it was explained that “the three 2019 seminars deal directly with the working methods of judicial officials and the functions of (supreme) administrative courts. It would appear vitally important to understand these working methods and these functions, so that their efficacy can be evaluated. In view of these, the three 2019 seminars enabled, and indeed still enable, research to be carried out into certain key aspects of the judicial work of ACA members. The seminars examined questions relating to working methods, such as the preparation of hearings, deliberations, or the use of support staff. The focus was also on the functions of supreme administrative courts, the possible forms of decisions, systems relating to work load and filtering, the structure of administrative justice, as well as its cost, and the cost of and access to justice or exclusion from access to justice.

From the questionnaires produced to facilitate preparations for the seminars, only a few statistical data were gathered. However, it became clear in the course of the seminars that numerous aspects of our daily routine must be considered in the light of statistical data. For example, the work load of a court may only be measured if one also knows the jurisdiction of the court, the number of judges, the number of inhabitants of the member State, etc. Some information may only be fully understood when considered alongside these data.

Under these circumstances, cross-sectional analysis should be based upon the results and insights obtained from the 2019 seminars, with the added factor of data that proved essential for the understanding of the judicial work of a judge.”

PRACTICAL REMARKS

1. If you use the pdf version to prepare your answers before entering them online, please note that only sections A, O, P, Q, R, S, T and U have to be completed by everyone. Whether you need to fill in the other sections (C, D, E, F and G) or (H, I, J, K, L, M and N), depends on your answer to the question in section B concerning the existence of a filter procedure.

2. If certain numerical data are not available, please skip the question and mention this in the next "additional comment and/or explanation" box.



Section A: Scope of jurisdiction

A1. Acting as a Supreme Administrative (not Constitutional) Court, following your own classification, and on a numerical basis, give your top 5 areas of competence for 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1	<input type="text"/>
2	<input type="text"/>
3	<input type="text"/>
4	<input type="text"/>
5	<input type="text"/>

A2. Are you competent in migration (international protection, citizenship, migration, family reunification, visas, ...)?

The competences listed in brackets are only given as examples, but the list is not exhaustive: your concrete jurisdiction in this area of law may be broader or less broad.

Yes

No

A3. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent out of the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A4. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A5. Are you competent in public procurement?

Yes

No



A6. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent out of the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A7. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A8. Are you competent in public employment (civil servants)?

Yes

No

A9. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent out of the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A10. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A11. Are you competent in urban planning and environmental disputes (town and city planning, environmental and/or building permits, environmental law, climate law, ...)?

The competences listed in brackets are only given as examples, but the list is not exhaustive: your concrete jurisdiction in this area of law may be broader or less broad.

Yes

No



A12. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent in the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A13. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A14. Are you competent in social welfare?

Yes

No

A15. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1-10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent in the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018).

1

2

3

4

5

A16. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A17. Are you competent in professional regulation (e.g. architects, advocates, pharmacies, ...)?

The competences listed in brackets are only given as examples, but the list is not exhaustive: your concrete jurisdiction in this area of law may be broader or less broad.

Yes

No



A18. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent in the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1
2
3
4
5

A19. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse
to annul
to vary

A20. Are you competent in market regulation (e.g. competition law, consumer law, ...)?

The competences listed in brackets are only given as examples, but the list is not exhaustive: your concrete jurisdiction in this area of law may be broader or less broad.

Yes
No

A21. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent in the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1
2
3
4
5

A22. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse
to annul
to vary

A23. Are you competent in tax & finances?

Yes
No



A24. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent out of the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A25. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A26. Are you competent in local & regional administration?

Yes

No

A27. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent out of the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A28. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

A29. Are you competent in education (primary school, high school, university, ...)?

The competences listed in brackets are only given as examples, but the list is not exhaustive: your concrete jurisdiction in this area of law may be broader or less broad.

Yes

No



A30. Please indicate, on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = 1 - 10%, 2 = 11 - 20%, 3 = 21 - 30%, ...), the estimated percentage which cases in this area of law represent out of the total number of cases in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

1

2

3

4

5

A31. Please indicate the main competence in this area of law:

to reverse

to annul

to vary

Section B: The existence of a filtering process

B1. My institution...

Filtering process for admission: filter mechanisms through which Supreme Administrative Courts and Councils of State control which cases are adjudicated by them, including 'leave of appeal', by which a party must first obtain the leave of the Supreme Administrative Court before bringing a case/an appeal.

does not operate a filtering process for admission to its court of last resort.

always operates a filtering process for admission to its court of last resort.

sometimes operates a filtering process for admission to its court of last resort and sometimes not.

Section C: Case load and number of judges for the judicial body

C1. Provide the number of cases pending at the Supreme administrative level on 31 December 2018:

total number of cases	<input type="text"/>
VAT cases	<input type="text"/>
building permit cases	<input type="text"/>
public procurement cases	<input type="text"/>
migration cases	<input type="text"/>



C2. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

C3. Provide the number of cases closed at Supreme administrative level in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

total number of cases	
VAT cases	
building permit cases	
public procurement cases	
migration cases	

C4. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

C5. Provide the total number of judges in full-time equivalent (FTE), serving in your institution in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.5 signals is equivalent to a half-time worker. In the framework of the questionnaire, 1 FTE equals 1 judge working full-time (100%), 2 judges working half-time (50%), 3 judges working 1/3 (33%), but also 2 judges each working 40% and 1 judge working 20%, 4 judges working 25%, ...

Serving: not only appointed to the judiciary in your institution, but actively working and handling cases (e.g. a judge seconded to a ministerial cabinet, is not serving in your institution)

| | | | | | | | | |

C6. Does your institution have a system of "double examination", whereby some judges assess cases and draft reports which contain, in general, a summary of the facts of the case and the arguments of the parties as well as an examination of the merits of the case, and other judges deliver judgments?

Yes

No



C7. What percentage of the total number of judges were charged with drafting reports containing, in general, a summary of the facts of the case and the arguments of the parties as well as an examination of the merits of the case on 31 December 2018?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

C8. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

C9. In your institution do you have judges who are assigned to deciding cases involving only one or more specialized areas of law (hereinafter referred to as “specialist judges”)?

Yes

No

C10. How many judges in your institution are assigned to resolving cases in only one or more specialized areas of law?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

C11. Has your institution assigned specialist judges to resolve cases:

	Yes	No
VAT cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
building permit cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
public procurement cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
migration cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C12. How many specialist judges (in FTE) are assigned to resolve VAT cases on 31 December 2018?

Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.5 signals is equivalent to a half-time worker. In the framework of the questionnaire, 1 FTE equals 1 judge working full-time (100%), 2 judges working half-time (50%), 3 judges working 1/3 (33%), but also 2 judges each working 40% and 1 judge working 20%, 4 judges working 25%, ...

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

C13. Are these specialist judges assigned to resolve solely VAT cases?

Yes

No



C24. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

C25. If your institution has judges who are not solely assigned to resolving cases involving one specialized area of law, what was the average number of cases resolved by these judges (in FTE) in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018)?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

C26. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

C27. Does your Supreme Administrative Court have jurisdiction to make findings of fact in a case?

Yes

No

C28. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:



Section D: Additional judicial roles of judges

D1. In 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018), in what number of cases (per FTE) have judges been given ...

Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.5 signals is equivalent to a half-time worker. In the framework of the questionnaire, 1 FTE equals 1 judge working full-time (100%), 2 judges working half-time (50%), 3 judges working 1/3 (33%), but also 2 judges each working 40% and 1 judge working 20%, 4 judges working 25%, ...

an additional role as a judge rapporteur (case manager)

an additional role as a presiding judge in a panel

an additional role as a single judge

other responsibilities (e.g. sitting in an enlarged panel)

D2. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

Section E: Research and administrative assistance to the judges of the court

E1. Are there any officials in your institution who provide research assistance for judges?

Yes

No

E2. Provide the total number of legal assistants (in FTE) on 31 December 2018

Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.5 signals is equivalent to a half-time worker. In the framework of the questionnaire, 1 FTE equals 1 judge working full-time (100%), 2 judges working half-time (50%), 3 judges working 1/3 (33%), but also 2 judges each working 40% and 1 judge working 20%, 4 judges working 25%, ...

E3. Please choose which of the following applies:

Legal assistants are individually assigned to judges

Legal assistants are shared by judges



E4. Give the estimated ratio of legal assistants to judges. If one legal assistant provides assistance to more than one judge, e.g. one assistant to three judges, indicate 1/3, or if a team of 10 assistants support 50 judges, indicate 1/5:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

E5. Are all judges provided with the same level of assistance?

Yes

No

E6. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

E7. In respect of the type of judicial assistance identified below, in what estimated percentage of cases do your judges receive such assistance? (Please use one of the following parameters in each instance, 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%):

Preparation of pre-hearing documents, such as a memorandum to assist the judge prior to the hearing of a case

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Undertaking legal research to assist a judge to make a decision in a case

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Discussing aspects of a case with a judge orally or in writing

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Consideration and evaluation of the relevant law

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Undertaking comparative law analysis

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Preparing a draft section of the proposed judgment which does not include that section which will contain the decision

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Preparing sections of a proposed judgment which will include the proposed decision

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Proposing a suggested or preliminary decision for the judge(d) to consider

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

E8. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:



I2. Is a written determination on the filter application required *ex officio* in relation to:

	Yes	No
VAT cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
building permit cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
public procurement cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
migration cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I3. Is there a time limit within which a determination must be delivered on such an application?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

I4. What is the average time (in days) between an application for admission and the delivery of a determination on the filter application?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

I5. What estimated percentage of your institution's overall time in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018) was spent resolving filter applications?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

I6. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

I7. Does your institution provide a public oral hearing for filter applications in:

all cases	<input type="checkbox"/>
no cases	<input type="checkbox"/>
some cases	<input type="checkbox"/>



I8. What number of cases received a public oral filter hearing in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018)

VAT cases

building permit cases

public procurement cases

migration cases

I9. What is the average time allocated to a public oral hearing on a filter application (in minutes)?

0-5

6-15

15-30

31-60

61-120

+ 120

I10. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

Section J: Case load and number of judges for the judicial body

J1. Provide the number of cases pending at Supreme administrative level on 31 December 2018:

total number of cases

VAT cases

building permit cases

public procurement cases

migration cases



J2. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

J3. Provide the number of cases closed at Supreme administrative level in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

total number of cases	
VAT cases	
building permit cases	
public procurement cases	
migration cases	

J4. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

J5. Provide the total number of judges in full-time equivalent (FTE), serving in your institution in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.5 signals is equivalent to a half-time worker. In the framework of the questionnaire, 1 FTE equals 1 judge working full-time (100%), 2 judges working half-time (50%), 3 judges working 1/3 (33%), but also 2 judges each working 40% and 1 judge working 20%, 4 judges working 25%, ...

Serving: not only appointed to the judiciary in your institution, but actively working and handling cases (e.g. a judge seconded to a ministerial cabinet, is not serving in your institution)

| | | | | | | | | |

J6. Does your institution have a system of "double examination", whereby some judges assess cases and draft reports which contain, in general, a summary of the facts of the case and the arguments of the parties as well as an examination of the merits of the case, and other judges deliver judgments?

Yes

No



J7. What percentage of the total number of judges were charged with drafting reports containing, in general, a summary of the facts of the case and the arguments of the parties as well as an examination of the merits of the case on 31 December 2018?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

J8. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

J9. In your institution do you have judges who are assigned to deciding cases involving only one or more specialized areas of law (hereinafter referred to as “specialist judges”)?

Yes

No

J10. How many judges in your institution are assigned to resolving cases in only one or more specialized areas of law?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

J11. Has your institution assigned specialist judges to resolve cases:

	Yes	No
VAT cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
building permit cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
public procurement cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
migration cases	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

J12. How many specialist judges (in FTE) are assigned to resolve VAT cases on 31 December 2018?

Full-time equivalent (FTE) is a unit that indicates the workload of an employed person in a way that makes workloads comparable across various contexts. An FTE of 1.0 is equivalent to a full-time worker, while an FTE of 0.5 signals is equivalent to a half-time worker. In the framework of the questionnaire, 1 FTE equals 1 judge working full-time (100%), 2 judges working half-time (50%), 3 judges working 1/3 (33%), but also 2 judges each working 40% and 1 judge working 20%, 4 judges working 25%, ...

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

J13. Are these specialist judges assigned to resolve solely VAT cases?

Yes

No



J24. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

J25. If your institution has judges who are not solely assigned to resolving cases involving one specialized area of law, what was the average number of cases resolved by these judges (in FTE) in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018)?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

J26. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

J27. Does your Supreme Administrative Court have jurisdiction to make findings of fact in a case?

Yes

No

J28. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:



L4. Give the estimated ratio of legal assistants to judges. If one legal assistant provides assistance to more than one judge, e.g. one assistant to three judges, indicate 1/3, or if a team of 10 assistants support 50 judges, indicate 1/5:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

L5. Are all judges provided with the same level of assistance?

Yes

No

L6. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

L7. In respect of the type of judicial assistance identified below, in what estimated percentage of cases do your judges receive such assistance? (Please use one of the following parameters in each instance, 0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, 100%):

Preparation of pre-hearing documents, such as a memorandum to assist the judge prior to the hearing of a case	<input type="text"/>
Undertaking legal research to assist a judge to make a decision in a case	<input type="text"/>
Discussing aspects of a case with a judge orally or in writing	<input type="text"/>
Consideration and evaluation of the relevant law	<input type="text"/>
Undertaking comparative law analysis	<input type="text"/>
Preparing a draft section of the proposed judgment which does not include that section which will contain the decision	<input type="text"/>
Preparing sections of a proposed judgment which will include the proposed decision	<input type="text"/>
Proposing a suggested or preliminary decision for the judge(d) to consider	<input type="text"/>

L8. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:



N14. What was the average time (in days) in your institution (starting from the filing of the case) for closing cases at the supreme administrative level in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018):

for closing all cases

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

for closing VAT cases

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

for closing building permit cases

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

for closing public procurement cases

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

for closing migration cases

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

N15. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

--

Section O: Functions of Supreme Administrative Courts

O1. Does your administrative jurisdiction have different levels of instance?

Yes

No

O2. How many of the cases tried by your administrative jurisdiction were leave to appeal decisions?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

O3. On average, how many times a year does a judge have a public hearing?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

O4. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

--



O13. Is it possible for parties claiming violations of constitutional law to challenge the decisions of your Supreme Administrative Court before the constitutional court?

Yes

No

O14. What estimated percentage of the total number of cases closed by your Supreme Administrative Court in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018) were challenged before the constitutional court?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

O15. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

Section P: Access to Supreme Administrative Courts

P1. Do the parties have to be represented by a legal professional before the Supreme Administrative Court in VAT law cases?

Yes

No

Sometimes

P2. What was the estimated percentage of cases registered before your Supreme Administrative Court in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018) in which the parties (other than the administrative authorities) were not represented by a legal professional?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

P3. Do the parties have to be represented by a legal professional before the Supreme Administrative Court in building permit cases?

Yes

No

Sometimes



Section Q: Emergency procedure

Q1. Is there an emergency procedure before your Supreme Administrative Court?

Yes

No

Q2. Is there such a procedure before your Court, serving as a first instance Court?

NOT APPLICABLE (your Court doesn't serve as a first instance Court)

Yes

No

Not applicable

Q3. How many interim orders did your Supreme Administrative Court issue in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Interim orders are urgent measures. This term covers all sorts of measures of provisional protection granted by the Supreme administrative court (e.g. taking the form of suspending the execution of the administrative act, wholly or partially, ordering wholly or partially the restoration of the situation which existed at the time when the administrative act was taken or at any subsequent time, and imposing on the administration any appropriate obligation in accordance with the powers of the court, etc). Such measures are decided without prejudging any subsequent decisions on the admissibility or merits of the case in question.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Q4. Is there such a procedure before your Court, serving in other instances?

Yes

No

Q5. How many interim orders did your Supreme Administrative Court issue in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Interim orders are urgent measures. This term covers all sorts of measures of provisional protection granted by the Supreme administrative court (e.g. taking the form of suspending the execution of the administrative act, wholly or partially, ordering wholly or partially the restoration of the situation which existed at the time when the administrative act was taken or at any subsequent time, and imposing on the administration any appropriate obligation in accordance with the powers of the court, etc). Such measures are decided without prejudging any subsequent decisions on the admissibility or merits of the case in question.

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Section R: Fees and access to the Court

R1. Was access to the Supreme Administrative Court subject to a judicial (filing) fee in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Yes

No



R2. Was the amount of the fee the same in all areas of law?

Yes

No

R3. Was the amount of the fee flat or not flat (i.e.: it can differ) in VAT cases in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Flat

Not Flat

R4. Was the amount of the fee flat or not flat (i.e.: it can differ) in building permit law in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Flat

Not flat

R5. Was the amount of the fee flat or not flat (i.e.: it can differ) in public procurement law in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Flat

Not flat

R6. Was the amount of the fee flat or not flat (i.e.: it can differ) in migration law in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Flat

Not flat

R7. Was the amount of the fee mostly flat or not flat (i.e.: it can differ) in other areas of law in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Mostly flat

Mostly not flat

R8. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

R9. Were any petitioners exempt by law from the duty to pay the fee in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)

Yes

No

Sometimes



R10. In what estimated percentage of cases closed in your institution in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018), where petitioners exempt by law from the duty to pay the fee?

VAT cases	<input type="text"/>
building permit law cases	<input type="text"/>
public procurement law cases	<input type="text"/>
migration law cases	<input type="text"/>
cases in other areas of law	<input type="text"/>

R11. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

R12. Were any areas of dispute exempt by law from the duty to pay the fee in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018)?

Yes

No

Sometimes

R13. In what estimated percentage of cases closed in your institution in 2018 (between 1 January and 31 December 2018), was the dispute exempt by law from the duty to pay the fee?

VAT cases	<input type="text"/>
building permit law cases	<input type="text"/>
public procurement law cases	<input type="text"/>
migration law cases	<input type="text"/>
cases in other areas of law	<input type="text"/>

R14. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:



Section S: Cost of proceedings

S1. Does your Court have a discretion on how costs are awarded?

Yes

No

Sometimes

S2. Did your Court have this discretion on 31 December 2018?

Yes No

in VAT law

in building permit law

in public procurement law

in migration law

in other areas of law

S3. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

Section T: Representation

T1. Does your legal order provide a free legal aid for participants?

Yes

No

Sometimes

T2. Is legal aid always a matter for the Court to decide?

Yes

No



T10. What is the number of cases involving other areas of law closed in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018) in which free legal aid was provided?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

T11. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

--

T12. Does the panel (judge) who will preside over the case on the merits, also decide on whether free legal aid should be granted for the proceedings?

Yes

No

T13. What is the number of decisions on this matter in 2018 (between 1 January 2018 and 31 December 2018) in your institution?

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

T14. Please add your additional comment and/or explanation:

--