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

Europa

Member State: Norway

Court: The Supreme Court of Norway.

Last Name: Nygaard

First Name: Kjersti Buun

Title: Deputy Secretary-General

E-mail address: kbn@hoyesterett.no

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

No, not until the meeting in Madrid in May 2011 where Justice Liv Gjølstad, the Supreme Court of Norway, was present and after reading the report from Mr Marc von Opijnen.

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.

There are technical challenges and barriers to the implementation of such a system in the Supreme Court of Norway.

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

The Supreme Court of Norway needs to adapt a new way of identifying its decisions to implement the ECLI system requirements. The case handling system needs extensive adjustments to implement the ECLI sytem. The Supreme Court's decisions are published on the website of the Supreme Court , and this is hardly a database today that can be linked to a portal where the decisions are searchable. Therefore it is necessary with extensive technical adjustments both in the case handling sytem and in the database for publishing the Supreme Court decisions on internet. The Supreme Court's decisions are in addition to this published on Lovdata (a subscription based database), and also this database needs technical adjustments to adapt to the ECLI system requirements.

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)?

These meta-data are already in place in the decisions of the Supreme Court of Norway :

a) Nartional identifier, Case number, Date, Name of Court, Parties

b) Summary

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

To extend the available meta-data it will be necessary to adjust the case handling system. This raises technical challenges as well as it raises the question of how these technical adjustments can be financed.

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?

In Norway there is a Norwegian Courts Administration, which is a support and service agency for the courts. The e-mailaddress is : postmottak@domstoladministrasjonen.no.

The Norwegian Courts Administration has no competance to decide that the Supreme Court of Norway shall implement the ECLI system, but the NCA can be of help in solving the techical challenges in a possible future implementation of the ECLI system.

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.

No, I am not aware of examples of such cooperation.

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?

To my knowledge there are no interoperability problems.

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)

X No specific plan

Additional comments:

Cliquez ici pour taper du texte.

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

There are no specific plans to implement the ECLI for the time being.

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.