

Strasbourg, 31 October 2012

DH-GDR(2012)R2

STEERING COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
(CDDH)

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON THE REFORM OF THE COURT
(DH-GDR)

REPORT

2nd meeting

29-31 October 2012

At its 2nd meeting (29-31 October 2012), the DH-GDR, in particular:

- Adopted a draft CDDH Report on the measures taken by member States to implement relevant parts of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting (Addendum I);
- Adopted a draft CDDH Report containing elements to contribute to the evaluation of the effects of Protocol No. 14 and the implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations on the Court's situation, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting (Addendum II);
- Adopted draft Protocol No. 15 to the Convention (Addendum III) and Explanatory Report thereto (Addendum IV), for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting;
- Adopted draft Protocol No. 16 to the Convention (Addendum V) and instructed the Secretariat to update the draft Explanatory Report thereto, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting;
- Designated the members of its Drafting Group "C" (Armenia, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Norway, the Slovak Republic and Switzerland), elected Mr Martin KUIJER (The Netherlands) as Chairperson of the Group and gave guidance on its work;
- Designated an expert consultant (Mr Martin EATON) to draft a toolkit to inform public officials about the State's obligations under the Convention for its Drafting Group "D" and gave guidance on this work;
- appointed Ms Natalia SHAKURO (Ukraine) as its Gender Equality Rapporteur.

Item 1: Opening of the meeting, adoption of the agenda and order of business

1. The Committee of experts on the reform of the Court (DH-GDR) held its 2nd meeting, in plenary composition, in Strasbourg from 29-31 October 2012 with Mr Vit SCHORM (Czech Republic) in the chair. The list of participants appears at Appendix I. The agenda, as adopted, appears at Appendix II.

2. The Committee heard information from Mr Jörg POLAKIEWICZ, Head of the Human Rights Policy and Development Department, concerning notably (i) the recent exchange of views between the Committee of Ministers' Ad hoc Working Group on the reform of the European Court of Human Rights (GT-REF.ECHR) and Mr Derek WALTON, Chairperson of the CDDH, on the work of the CDDH and its subordinate bodies to implement terms of reference relating to Court reform, including follow-up to the Brighton Conference, and (ii) the European Programme for Human Rights Education for Legal Professionals (HELP), administered by the Unit on support to national implementation of the Convention.

Item 2: Work of Drafting Group "A" on the reform of the Court (GT-GDR-A)

3. Mrs Brigitte OHMS (Austria), Chairperson of the GT-GDR-A, presented the work of the Group and the two draft reports that it had produced.

2.1 Draft CDDH report on the measures taken by member States to implement relevant parts of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations

2.2 Draft CDDH report containing elements to contribute to the evaluation of the effects of Protocol No. 14 and the implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations on the Court's situation

4. The Committee examined and adopted the two draft reports as they appear at Addendum I and Addendum II respectively, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting.

Item 3: Work of Drafting Group "B" on the reform of the Court (GT-GDR-B)

5. Mr Rob LINHAM (United Kingdom), Chairperson of the GT-GDR-B, presented the work of the Group and the two draft protocols and their accompanying Explanatory Reports that it had produced.

3.1 Draft Protocol No. 15 to the Convention and draft Explanatory Report thereto

6. The Committee examined and adopted draft Protocol No. 15, as it appears in Addendum III, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting. In doing so, it decided to record the following matters in this meeting report:

- i. As regards Article 1 of the draft protocol (amending the Preamble of the Convention), the Committee recalled the instructions given by the CDDH (see doc. CDDH(2012)R75, para. 6.i.). It also considered that the additional text should be as brief as possible and not attempt to define the relevant terms. On this basis, after the Committee discussed the two options retained by the GT-GDR-B, the majority preferred the text found in Addendum III. It noted in particular that this could accommodate potentially conflicting positions, one to avoid that the Court be presented as the originator of the doctrine of the margin of appreciation, the other to refer to the role of the Court in relation to the margin of appreciation. It did not accept a proposal involving three paragraphs, and making reference to subsidiarity in the interpretation of the Convention and a margin of appreciation in executing Court judgments.
 - ii. As regards Article 2 (change to the age limit for judges), the majority preferred the approach found in Addendum III, as it ensured certainty by referring to a specific date that was known from the outset of the national selection procedure and was publicly available and verifiable. There was some interest in an approach that would refer to the date of the end of the previous judge's term of office, although it was noted that under Article 23(3) of the Convention, judges were considered to "hold office until replaced". A few experts supported an approach that referred to the 1st of January in the year in which the new judge's term of office began, so as not to refer to a date that formed part of the Parliamentary Assembly's procedure (that procedure not being prescribed by the Convention), although it was noted that this would still involve some degree of uncertainty.
 - iii. As regards Article 3 (removal of the right to object to relinquishment), two proposals were made to the Committee. The first was to require the Chamber to decide on admissibility before relinquishing; the Committee considered that this had already been incorporated as far as was possible in the approach developed by the GT-GDR-B. The second was to require the Court to consult the parties before deciding whether to relinquish; the Committee considered that this would delay the procedure and thus run contrary to the aim of the amendment, but agreed that reference could be made in the Explanatory Report to a preference for consultation (see below).
7. The Committee examined and adopted the draft Explanatory Report to Protocol No. 15, as it appears in Addendum IV, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting. It noted that it may be necessary to supplement paragraph 16 of the draft Explanatory Report if, by the time of its transmission to the Committee of Ministers, the Court has made the expected modification to Rule 72 of the Rules of Court on relinquishment.

3.2 Draft Protocol No. 16 to the Convention and draft Explanatory Report thereto

8. The Committee examined and adopted draft Protocol No. 16, as it appears in Addendum V, for transmission to the CDDH at its next meeting. In doing so, it decided to record the following matters in this meeting report:¹

- i. As regards the preamble, the Committee did not accept a proposal to add to the fourth paragraph a reference to dialogue between judges, considering that this aspect was already sufficiently covered by the existing text.
- ii. As regards Article 1, paragraph 1, the Committee did not accept a proposal to replace the first word with “High”, which had been presented to avoid what were felt by some to be excessively restrictive consequences for certain member States. The Committee recalled that only a very limited number of courts or tribunals in each State should have the possibility of requesting an advisory opinion, in order to ensure that there would not be an excessive number of such requests resulting in a burden on the Court. It agreed to expand the Explanatory Report on this point so as to explain (i) the intended significance of the word “Highest” (without “the”), (ii) that a particular court may qualify if it were the ‘highest’ for a specific category of case and (iii) that a ‘highest’ court need not be one to which recourse must have been made in order to satisfy the requirement of exhaustion of domestic remedies under Article 35(1) of the Convention.
- iii. As regards Article 1, paragraph 3, the Committee did not accept a proposal to require the requesting court or tribunal to present any analysis it may have made of the questions raised, as this was felt to be sufficiently covered by the existing text. It decided to reflect the proposal instead in the draft Explanatory Report.
- iv. As regards Article 1, the Committee did not accept a proposal to add a final paragraph setting a deadline by which the requesting court or tribunal could withdraw its request. It considered that the date of the Grand Chamber panel’s acceptance would be too soon (since the panel currently meets monthly) and that of the announcement of pronouncement of the advisory opinion too late. The Committee discussed the final sentence of Article 37(1) of the Convention, by which the Court could continue examination of an application under Article 33 or 34 of the Convention under certain circumstances despite the conditions for striking out of that application being met.
- v. As regards Article 2, paragraph 2, the Committee did not accept proposals to require the Court (i) to notify all High Contracting Parties and (ii) to publish a panel’s decision on a request for an advisory opinion. It felt that if the High Contracting Parties were to be directly notified, then so should all other interested parties, which would be practically difficult if not impossible. It also considered that publication of a decision to refuse a request may not contribute to the aim of enhancing dialogue between judges.
- vi. As regards Article 3, the Committee did not accept a proposal to give individual parties to underlying domestic proceedings the same right to

¹ In this paragraph, the numbering of articles of the draft Protocol refers to that found in Addendum V.

participate that a High Contracting Party would enjoy. It considered that such a provision would be difficult to define and apply, since “parties” meant different things in different member States. It noted that the President of the Court could be expected to invite relevant persons to participate whenever appropriate.

- vii. As regards Article 4, paragraph 4, the Committee did not accept a proposal to require the Court to publish advisory opinions in both official languages. It noted that although the Convention itself was silent on the question of languages, the Grand Chamber already issued its judgments and decisions in both official languages. It decided that the Explanatory Report should refer to the possibility of co-operation between the Court and national authorities in the preparation of translations of advisory opinions into the working language of the requesting court or tribunal.
- viii. Also as regards Article 4, paragraph 4, the Committee did not accept a proposal to require the Court to defer publication of an advisory opinion until after it had been translated, if necessary, into an official language of the requesting court or tribunal. It did not find any good reason to favour the requesting court or tribunal over other interested parties. It took note of concerns that the time taken for translation into the working language of the requesting court or tribunal of an advisory opinion may delay the resumption of suspended domestic proceedings, and decided to reflect them in the Explanatory Report.
- ix. As regards Article 5, the Committee did not accept a proposal to refer to the applicability of the admissibility criteria of Article 35 of the Convention to individual applications made further to domestic proceedings in relation to which the Court had given an advisory opinion. It considered that such reference was unnecessary and that as a matter of principle, the Protocol should not make any reference to admissibility. It recalled that the issue would instead be addressed in the Explanatory Report.

9. The Committee exchanged views with Ms Isil GACHET, Director of the Office of the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights, on the question of the potential role of the Commissioner under Article 3 of the Protocol. The Committee agreed that the Commissioner should have the right to participate in advisory opinion proceedings, in the same way that Protocol No. 14 had given the Commissioner the right to make third-party interventions in proceedings before Chambers and the Grand Chamber. The Explanatory Report should make clear that despite the slightly different wording, the relevant provision in the Protocol was intended to have exactly the same effect as that in the Convention.

10. The Committee exchanged views with Ms Elise CORNU of the Directorate of Legal Advice and Public International Law, including on technical matters concerning standard final clauses and Council of Europe treaty practice. It subsequently decided, amongst other things, that the Protocol should include a standard clause stating that reservations were not permitted. It also decided that Article 6 should be supplemented to state that “all the provisions of the Convention shall apply accordingly” and noted that this, in conjunction with Article 58 of the Convention, would allow for the

possibility of States denouncing the Protocol without denouncing the Convention; it decided to record this point in the Explanatory Report. After an indicative vote, it decided that the minimum number of ratifications required for entry into force of the Protocol should be ten, rather than three. Some experts wished to record that they reserved their position on the possible need for a provision on territorial application.

11. The Committee did not dispose of sufficient time to examine and adopt the draft Explanatory Report to Protocol No. 16. It instructed the Secretariat to revise the draft circulated before the meeting in accordance with the changes made to the text of the protocol itself during the meeting.

Item 4: Organisation of future work

4.1 Designation of members of a drafting group

12. In accordance with Committee of Ministers' Resolution CM/Res(2011)24 on intergovernmental committees and subordinate bodies, their terms of reference and working methods, the Committee elected the following States to send to Drafting Group "C" (GT-GDR-C – see document CDDH(2012)009REV.) experts whose participation would be at the expense of the Council of Europe's budget: Armenia, Bulgaria, France, Greece, Norway, the Slovak Republic and Switzerland. The Committee invited other States to send experts to participate at the expense of their national authorities' budgets, recalling that all participating experts enjoyed the same rights in all other respects. It elected Mr Martin KUIJER (The Netherlands) as Chairperson of the Group by acclamation.

13. The Committee gave guidance to Group C on the issue of interim measures under Rule 39 of the Rules of Court, indicating that particular attention should be paid to the following aspects:

- Whether there could be greater clarity concerning the deadlines for requesting interim measures;
- Whether the procedure for deciding on requests for interim measure requests could be adversarial;
- What is the Court's practice when interim measures are challenged by the State Party concerned;
- On what basis does the Court grant requests for interim measures;
- Whether the Court could give reasoning for its grants of interim measures;
- How the Court formulates its questions and the terms of the interim measures ordered in its letter to the State Party concerned;
- How the Court subsequently deals with applications concerning which interim measures have been indicated;
- What is the explanation for cases in which interim measures are granted but the related application subsequently found inadmissible;
- What could be done in response to worrying situations in which large numbers of requests for interim measures continue to be made, absorbing the Court's resources, despite the great majority being refused.

14. The Committee also recalled that the CDDH Final Report on a simplified procedure for amendment of certain provisions of the Convention had addressed the question of the possible "upgrading" of Rule 39 into the Convention or a Statute of

the Court. It noted that the GT-REF.ECHR would propose to the Ministers' Deputies, in accordance with the CDDH's recommendation, that any further work on this issue be postponed until work on priority issues had been completed.

15. The Committee also gave guidance to Group C on the question of a "representative application procedure" (see para. 20.d) of the Brighton Declaration):

- It would be necessary to clarify what was meant by a "representative application procedure", as well as potentially related concepts such as class actions and collective complaints;
- A fundamental consideration, as reflected in the Brighton Declaration, would be the advisability of any such new procedure, although it would be for the Committee of Ministers to take any final position on this;
- Work should take account of the proceedings of the 2009 Bled Round table;
- Group C should take into account potentially relevant situations such as collective complaints under the European Social Charter, the African human rights system and any national procedures;
- An important aspect would be to consider the development of proceedings in the Hungarian pension cases.

4.2 Designation of an expert consultant

16. The Committee designated Mr Martin EATON to prepare a draft "toolkit to inform public officials about the State's obligations under the Convention" (para. 9.f)iii) of the Brighton Declaration), for presentation to Drafting Group "D" (GT-GDR-D – see document CDDH(2012)009REV.).

17. It then gave the following guidance to the expert consultant for completion of the task:

- The principal target audience would be those categories of public official mentioned in paragraph 9.c)v) of the Brighton Declaration, although it should be made as widely useful as possible;
- The content, tone and length of the toolkit should be such as to make it relevant, accessible and comprehensible to persons in these categories – it should assume no prior knowledge of law or the Convention;
- The final product need not necessarily be a single text but could rather be a set of materials allowing flexible use in different national legal systems and different formats;
- It should be borne in mind that the toolkit would need translation into national official languages;
- The expert should take account of existing relevant material produced within the Council of Europe or by other actors, including national training bodies, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, etc.

Item 5: Other business

18. The Committee appointed Ms Natalia SHAKURO (Ukraine) as its Gender Equality Rapporteur.

19. The Committee expressed its appreciation and thanks to its Drafting Groups A and B, and to their Chairpersons, for the way in which they had successfully accomplished their tasks.

* * *

Annexe I

Liste des participants

MEMBERS / MEMBRES

ANDORRA / ANDORRE

M. Andreu JORDI, Représentant permanent adjoint, Représentation permanente d'Andorre auprès du Conseil de l'Europe, 10, avenue du Président Robert Schuman 67000 Strasbourg

ARMENIA / ARMENIE

Mr Arthur GRIGORYAN, Second Secretary, Legal Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia, Government Building N2, Republic Square, Yerevan 0010

AUSTRIA / AUTRICHE

Ms Brigitte OHMS, Deputy Government Agent, Division for International Affairs and General Administrative Affairs, Federal Chancellery, Dpt. V/5, Constitutional Service, Ballhausplatz 2, 1010 Wien

AZERBAIJAN / AZERBAIJAN

Mr Otari GVALADZE, Division of the work with law enforcement agencies of the Presidential Administration the Republic of Azerbaijan

BELGIUM / BELGIQUE

Mme Isabelle NIEDLISPACHER, co-Agent du Gouvernement, SPF Justice, Service des Droits de l'Homme, Boulevard de Waterloo 115, B-1000 Bruxelles

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Ms Zikreta IBRAHIMOVIC, Deputy Agent of the Council of Ministers of Bosnia and Herzegovina before European Court of Human Rights, Office of the Agent, Dzemala Bijedica 39/II, 71000 Sarajevo

BULGARIA / BULGARIE

Ms Kameliya NIKOLOVA, Human rights Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2, rue Aleksandar Zhendov, Sofia 1040

CYPRUS / CHYPRE

Apologies / excusé

CZECH REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE

Mr Vit A. SCHORM, Chairperson of the DH-GDR / Président du DH-GDR, Government Agent, Ministry of Justice, Vysehradská 16, 128 10 Praha 2

Mr Petr KONUPKA, Office of the Government Agent, Ministry of Justice, Vysehradská 16, 128 10 Praha 2

DENMARK / DANEMARK

Mr Mads Møller LANGTVED, Head of Section, The Danish Ministry of Justice, EU Law and Human Rights Division, Slotsholmsgade 10, DK-1216 Copenhagen K

ESTONIA / ESTONIE

Ms Maris KUURBERG, Government Agent, European Court of Human Rights, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Islandi väljak 1, 15049 Tallinn

FINLAND / FINLANDE

Mr Arto KOSONEN, Government Agent, Director of the Unit for Human Rights Court and Conventions, Legal Service, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, P.O. Box 411, FI-00023 Valtioneuvosto

FRANCE

Mme Emmanuelle TOPIN, Conseiller, Direction des affaires juridiques, Sous-direction des droits de l'Homme, Ministère des affaires étrangères, 57 boulevard des Invalides, F-75007 Paris

GEORGIA / GEORGIE

Mr Levan MESKHORADZE, Government Agent to the European Court of Human Rights, Address: 24 A, Gorgasali Str., Tbilisi, 0114, Georgia

GERMANY / ALLEMAGNE

Ms Katja BEHR, Agent of the Government, Head of Unit IV C 1, Human Rights Protection, Federal Ministry of Justice, Mohrenstrasse 37, 10117 Berlin

GREECE / GRECE

Mr Ioannis BAKOPOULOS, legal assistant in the Legal Council of the Greek State, Office of the Legal Counselor in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Akadimias 3, 10671 Athens

HUNGARY / HONGRIE

Apologies / excusé

IRLAND / IRELAND

Apologies / excusé

LATVIA / LETTONIE

Ms Inga REINE, Legal Advisor, Permanent Representation of the Republic of Latvia to the European Union, Avenue des Arts 23, B-1000, Brussels, Belgium

LIECHTENSTEIN

Mr Manuel FRICK, Diplomatic Officer, Office for Foreign Affairs, Heiligkreuz 14 – Postfach 684, FL- 9490 Vaduz

LITHUANIA / LITUANIE

Ms Karolina BUBNYTE, Head of the Division for the Representation at the ECHR, Ministry of Justice of Lithuania, Gedimino ave. 30/1, LT-01104 Vilnius

LUXEMBOURG / LUXEMBOURG

Apologies / excusé

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA/ REPUBLIQUE DE MOLDOVA

Mr. Lilian APOSTOL, Deputy Head, Government Agent Division, Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Moldova

THE NETHERLANDS / PAYS-BAS

Mr Martin KUIJER, Senior legal adviser human rights law, Ministry of Justice, Legislation Department, room H.511, Schedeldoekshaven, P.O. Box 20301, 2500 BZ The Hague

Ms Liselot EGMOND, Deputy Agent for the Government of the Netherlands, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dept. DJZ/IR, P.O. Box 20061, 2500 EB The Hague

NORWAY / NORVEGE

Mr Morten RUUD Special Adviser Ministry of Justice Box 8005 DEP 0030 OSLO, Norway

POLAND / POLOGNE

Mrs Aleksandra MEŻYKOWSKA, Co-Agent of the Polish Government, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Al. J. Ch. Szucha 23, 00-580 Warsaw

PORTUGAL

Mme Maria de Fátima GRAÇA CARVALHO, Agente du Gouvernement, Procureur-Général adjointe, Procuradoria Geral da Republica, rua de Escola Politécnica, N° 140, P-1249-269 Lisboa

ROMANIA / ROUMANIE

Ms Irina CAMBREA, Government Agent, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 14, Aleea Modrojan, Sector 1, Bucharest

RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE

Mr Nikolay MIKHAILOV, Office of the Representative of the Russian Federation at the European Court of Human Rights, Deputy Head, Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation, Zhitnaya St., 14, 119991 Moscow

Ms Maria MOLODTSOVA, 1st Secretary, Department for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 32/34, Sennaya sq., 119200 Moscow

Mr Vladislav ERMAKOV, Deputy to the Permanent Representative, Chancery, 75 allée de la Robertsau, 67000 Strasbourg

SERBIA / SERBIE

Mr Slavoljub CARIC, Government Agent, Ministry of Justice and Public Administration, Office of the Agent before the ECHR, Boul. Mihaola Pupina 2, 11000 Belgrade

SLOVAK REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE SLOVAQUE

Ms Marica PIROSIKOVA, Government Agent, Ministry of Justice, Župné nám. č. 13, 813 11 Bratislava

SLOVENIA / SLOVENIE

Apologies / excusé

SPAIN / ESPAGNE

Mr. Javier BORREGO BORREGO, Avocat d'Etat, Ministère de la Justice, Madrid

SWEDEN / SUEDE

Olof WIDGREN, Special Adviser, Department for International Law, Human Rights and Treaty Law, Ministry for Foreign Affairs SE-103 39 Stockholm

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE

Mr Adrian SCHIEDEGGER Agent suppléant du Gouvernement suisse devant la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme et le CAT, Département fédéral de justice et police DFJP, Office fédéral de la justice OFJ, Représentation de la Suisse devant la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme et le CAT, Bundesrain 20, 3003 Berne

**“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA” / “L’EX-RÉPUBLIQUE
YOUOSLAVE DE MACÉDOINE”**

Ms Danica DJONOVA, Ministry of Justice

TURKEY / TURQUIE

Ms Halime Ebru DEMIRCAN, Deputy to the Permanent Representative,
23, boulevard de l’Orangerie, F-67000 Strasbourg

Ms Arzu BEYAZIT, Judge, Human Rights Department, Ministry of Justice

UKRAINE / UKRAINE

Ms Natalia SHAKURO, Expert, Head of Human Rights and Council of Europe Unit, 1,
Mykhailivska Square, UA – 01018 Kyiv

UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME-UNI

Mr Rob LINHAM, Head of Council of Europe Human Rights Policy, Ministry of Justice, 102
Petty France, London SW1H 9AJ

OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS

HOLY SEE/ SAINT SIÈGE

M. Grégor PUPPINCK, Mission Permanente du Saint-Siège auprès du Conseil de l’Europe, 4
quai Koch, F-67000 Strasbourg

Mme Andreea POPESCU, Mission Permanente du Saint-Siège auprès du Conseil de l’Europe,
4 quai Koch, F-67000 Strasbourg

JAPAN/ JAPON

Mr Hideaki GUNJI, Consul, Consulate-General of Japan at Strasbourg, “Tour Europe” 20,
place des Halles, 67000 Strasbourg

MEXICO / MEXIQUE

Monsieur Alejandro Martínez Peralta, Observateur Permanent Adjoint du Mexique,
Représentation du Mexique auprès du Conseil de l’Europe, 8, boulevard du Président
Edwards, 67000 Strasbourg

**Conference of INGOs of the Council of Europe / Conférence des OING du Conseil de
l’Europe**

Apologised / excusé

Amnesty International

Mr Sébastien RAMU, Senior Legal Adviser, Law and Policy, International Secretariat 1 Easton
Street UK - London WC1X 0DW

**European Group of National Human Rights Institutions / Groupe européen des
institutions nationales des droits de l’homme**

Ms Stephanie LAGOUTTE, Senior Researcher, Research Department, Strandgade 56 DK-1401
Copenhagen

Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights / Bureau du Commissaire aux droits de l'homme

Ms Isil GACHET, Director, Office of the Commissioner for Human Rights, Council of Europe

Registry of the European Court of Human Rights / Greffe de la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme

Mr John DARCY, Adviser to the President and the Registrar, Private Office of the President, European Court of Human Rights

Parliamentary Assembly / Assemblée parlementaire

Mr Andrew DRZEMCZEWSKI, Head of Department, Legal Affairs & Human Rights Department / Chef de service des questions juridiques & des droits de l'homme

Department for the Execution of Judgments of the Court / Service de l'Exécution des Arrêts de la Cour

Mr Fredrik SUNDBERG, Deputy to the Head of Department

SECRETARIAT

**DG I – Human Rights and Rule of Law / Droits de l'Homme et Etat de droit
Council of Europe / Conseil de l'Europe, F-67075 Strasbourg Cedex**

Mr Jörg POLAKIEWICZ, Head of Human Rights Policy and Development Department / Chef du Service des politiques et du développement des droits de l'Homme

Mr Alfonso DE SALAS, Head of the Human Rights Intergovernmental Cooperation Division / Chef de la Division de la coopération intergouvernementale en matière de droits de l'Homme, Secretary of the CDDH / Secrétaire du CDDH

Mr David MILNER, Administrator / Administrateur, Human Rights Intergovernmental Cooperation Division / Division de la coopération intergouvernementale en matière de droits de l'Homme, Secretary of the DH-GDR / Secrétaire du DH-GDR

Mme Virginie FLORES, Lawyer / Juriste, Human Rights Intergovernmental Cooperation Division / Division de la coopération intergouvernementale en matière de droits de l'Homme
Mlle Haldia MOKEDDEM, Assistant / Assistante, Human Rights Intergovernmental Cooperation Division / Division de la coopération intergouvernementale en matière de droits de l'Homme

INTERPRETERS/INTERPRÈTES

Sally BAILEY-RAVET
Isabelle MARCHINI

Appendix II

Agenda (as adopted)

Item 1: Opening of the meeting, adoption of the agenda and of the order of business

General reference documents

- | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| - | Draft annotated agenda | DH-GDR(2012)OJ002 |
| - | Report of the 75 th CDDH meeting (19-22 June 2012) | CDDH(2012)R75 |
| - | Report of the 73 rd CDDH meeting (6-9 December 2011), including the terms of reference of the CDDH and its subordinate bodies for the biennium 2012-2013 | CDDH(2011)R73 & Appendix VIII |
| - | Report of the 1 st DH-GDR meeting (17-20 January 2012) | DH-GDR(2012)R1 |
| - | Decisions taken at the 122 nd session of the Committee of Ministers (23 May 2012) | CDDH(2012)008 |
| - | Ministers' Deputies' decisions on the follow-up to the 122 nd session of the Committee of Ministers (Strasbourg, 23 May 2012) | CM/Del/Dec(2012)1145/1.6 |
| - | Decisions adopted at the 1150 th (DH) meeting of the Ministers' Deputies | CM/Del/Dec(2012)1150(DH) |
| - | Interlaken Declaration | CDDH(2010)001 |
| - | Izmir Declaration | CDDH(2011)010 |
| - | Brighton Declaration | CDDH(2012)007 |
| - | Follow-up to the High-level Conference on the Future of the European Court of Human Rights (Brighton, 18-20 April 2012) (document prepared by the Secretariat) | CDDH(2012)009 REV. |

Item 2: Work of Drafting Group "A" on the reform of the Court (GT-GDR-A)

2.1 Draft CDDH report on the measures taken by member States to implement relevant parts of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations

Working document

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| - | Draft CDDH report on the measures taken by member States to implement relevant parts of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations | GT-GDR-A(2012)R2
<u>Addendum I</u> |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|

Reference documents

- | | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| - | Report of the 2 nd GT-GDR-A meeting (5-7 September 2012) | GT-GDR-A(2012)R2 |
| - | Report of the 1 st GT-GDR-A meeting (14-16 March 2012) | GT-GDR-A(2012)R1 |

- Report of the 75th CDDH meeting (19-22 June 2012) CDDH(2011)R75
- Compilation of replies to question I of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)003REV
- Compilation of replies to question II of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)004REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 1 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)005REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 2 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)006REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 3 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)007REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 4 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)008REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 5 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)009REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 6 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)010REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 7 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)011REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 8 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised)) GT-GDR-A(2012)012REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 9 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)013REV
- Compilation of replies to question III, element 10 of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)014REV
- Compilation of replies to question IV of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)015REV
- Compilation of replies to question V of the questionnaire on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (revised) GT-GDR-A(2012)016REV
- National report of Turkey on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations GT-GDR-A(2012)017
- National report of Greece on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations GT-GDR-A(2012)018
- National Implementation of the Interlaken Declaration: Perspectives of European civil society on national implementation of the Interlaken Declaration and Action Plan: Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine (document submitted by Open Society Justice Initiative) DH-GDR(2012)009
- National report of The Netherlands on implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations GT-GDR-A(2012)065

- Compilation of written comments on Draft CDDH report on measures taken by the member States to implement relevant parts of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations (prepared by the Secretariat) DH-GDR(2012)016
- Greek comments on Draft CDDH Report on measures taken by the member States to implement relevant parts of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations DH-GDR(2012)017

2.2 Draft CDDH report containing elements to contribute to the evaluation of the effects of Protocol No. 14 and the implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations on the Court's situation

Working document

- Draft CDDH report containing elements to contribute to the evaluation of the effects of Protocol No. 14 and the implementation of the Interlaken and Izmir Declarations on the Court's situation GT-GDR-A(2012)R2
Addendum II

Reference documents

- Report of the 2nd GT-GDR-A meeting (5-7 September 2012) GT-GDR-A(2012)R2
- Report of the 1st GT-GDR-A meeting (14-16 March 2012) GT-GDR-A(2012)R1
- CDDH Report on increasing the Court's capacity to process applications CDDH(2012)R74
Addendum I Annexe IV Part 1
- Analysis of statistics 2011 (published by the Court)
- Preliminary opinion of the Court in preparation for the Brighton Conference #3844232 v.3
- Information on cases pending before the ECtHR (Note prepared by the Registry) DH-GDR(2012)005
- Additional information on pending cases (prepared by the Registry) DH-GDR(2012)005
Addendum
- Information given by the Registry to the DH-GDR on the implementation and effects of Protocol No. 14 GT-GDR-A(2012)002
- Interventions of the President and the Registrar of the Court to the Committee of Ministers' Liaison Committee with the Court (CL-CEDH) (original language only) DD(2010)474
- Discours du Président de la Cour devant le CL-CEDH (only in French) DD(2011)885
- Speech of the Registrar of the Court to the CL-CEDH DD(2011)886
- The new admissibility criterion under Article 35(3)(b) of the Convention: case-law principles two years on (note by the Jurisconsult) GT-GDR-A(2012)067
- « Relevé des observations définitives sur la Cour européenne des droits de l'homme » (Report of the *Cour des Comptes* on the Court) GT-GDR-A(2012)068

(only in French)

- Summary of the report of the *Cour des Comptes* (prepared by the Secretariat) GT-GDR-A(2012)064
- The Interlaken Process and the Court (document prepared by the Court) DH-GDR(2012)018

Item 3: Work of Drafting Group “B” on the reform of the Court (GT-GDR-B)

3.1 Draft Protocol No. 15 to the Convention and draft Explanatory Report thereto

Working documents

- Draft Protocol No. 15 to the Convention GT-GDR-B(2012)R2
Addendum I
- Draft Explanatory Report to Protocol No. 15 to the Convention GT-GDR-B(2012)R2
Addendum II

Reference documents

- Report of the 2nd GT-GDR-B meeting (10-12 October 2012) GT-GDR-B(2012)R2
- Report of the 1st GT-GDR-B meeting (12-14 September 2012) GT-GDR-B(2012)R1
- Contribution of Poland on the question of amendment of Article 30 of the Convention to remove the parties’ right to object to a Chamber’s relinquishment of jurisdiction to the Grand Chamber GT-GDR-B(2012)017
- Observations from the European Group of National Human Rights Institutions on the drafting of Protocol No. 15 and Protocol No. 16 to the ECHR DH-GDR(2012)010
- Joint NGO Comments on the drafting of Protocols 15 and 16 to the ECHR DH-GDR(2012)011
- Compilation of written comments on draft Protocol no. 15 (prepared by the Secretariat) DH-GDR(2012)012
- Compilation of written comments on the draft Explanatory Report to Protocol no. 15 (prepared by the Secretariat) DH-GDR(2012)014
- Preamble of the Convention – amendments proposed by Poland to draft Protocol no. 15 DH-GDR(2012)019

3.2 Draft Protocol No. 16 to the Convention and draft Explanatory Report thereto

Working documents

- Draft Protocol No. 16 to the Convention GT-GDR-B(2012)R2
Addendum III

- Draft Explanatory Report to Protocol No. 16 to the Convention (prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the text of the draft protocol as approved by GT-GDR-B at its 2nd meeting) GT-GDR-B(2012)019

Reference documents

- Report of the 2nd GT-GDR-B meeting (10-12 October 2012) GT-GDR-B(2012)R2
- Report of the 1st GT-GDR-B meeting (12-14 September 2012) GT-GDR-B(2012)R1
- Secretariat memorandum on the legal issues raised during the first meeting of Drafting Group “B” on the reform of the Court GT-GDR-B(2012)012
- CDDH Report on measures to enhance relations between the Court and national courts (Appendix V to the Final Report on measures requiring amendment of the ECHR) CDDH(2012)R74
Addendum I, Appendix V
- Reflection paper on the proposal to extend the Court’s advisory jurisdiction # 3853038
- Observations from the European Group of National Human Rights Institutions on the drafting of Protocol No. 15 and Protocol No. 16 to the ECHR DH-GDR(2012)010
- Joint NGO Comments on the drafting of Protocols 15 and 16 to the ECHR DH-GDR(2012)011
- Compilation of written comments on draft Protocol no. 16 (prepared by the Secretariat) DH-GDR(2012)013
- Compilation of written comments on the draft Explanatory Report to Protocol no. 16 (prepared by the Secretariat) DH-GDR(2012)015

Item 4: Organisation of future work

Reference documents

- Report of the 75th CDDH meeting (19-22 June 2012) CDDH(2011)R75
- Committee of Ministers’ resolution on intergovernmental committees and subordinate bodies, their terms of reference and working methods CDDH(2011)012

4.1 Designation of members of Drafting Group “C” (GT-GDR-C)

4.2 Designation of an expert consultant for Drafting Group “D” (GT-GDR-D)

Item 5: Other business

Item 6: Adoption of the conclusions and meeting report

* * *