Parliamentary Assembly
Assemblée parlementaire
https://pace.coe.int

COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Information document

SG-AS (2026) 01
10 August 2026

Procedure for the election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights

Memorandum prepared by the Secretary General of the Assembly[1]

1. Introduction

1. Article 22 of the European Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter: Convention) stipulates that:

> "*[t]he judges shall be elected by the Parliamentary Assembly with respect to each High Contracting Party by a majority of votes cast from a list of three candidates nominated by the High Contracting Party*."

2. Article 22 thus lays down a cooperative process: national governments select three candidates while the Assembly elects one of them as a judge.

3. Consequently, the procedure leading up to the election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights has two stages. The first is the selection of candidates leading up to the transmission to the Assembly of a list of three candidates. This is the sole responsibility of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention (i.e. the States Parties, represented by their governments, hereinafter referred to as "governments"), which benefit from expert advice provided by the Advisory Panel of Experts (hereinafter: panel; see para. 5 and 6 below). The second stage of the procedure is the responsibility of the Parliamentary Assembly. Following the assessment by its Committee on the Election of Judges to the European Court of Human Rights (hereinafter: committee) of the candidates shortlisted by the States Parties, it is up to the Assembly's plenary to elect one of the three candidates.

2. Selection procedure by the High Contracting Parties, assisted by the Panel

4. The selection procedure is triggered by a letter of the Secretary General of the Assembly inviting the government to submit a list of candidates by a given deadline (about one year before the intended election date).[2] The deadline is chosen with a view to giving the government, the panel, the committee and the Assembly enough time to select and assess the candidates and proceed with the election. The quality of the national selection procedure is of crucial importance for the outcome of the whole process. In fact, when all three candidates transmitted to the Assembly are excellent, it may not matter who is elected in the end, from an institutional point of view: it will necessarily be an excellent judge who, in addition, will enjoy the democratic legitimacy conferred by the election.

[1] In Resolution 2248 (2018), the Parliamentary Assembly invited the Secretary General of the Assembly to publish a consolidated information document reflecting the election procedure before the Committee on the Election of Judges and the Assembly (paragraph 9.2).
[2] See model letter (in Appendix 1).

5. The Committee of Ministers decided in 2010 to set up the Advisory Panel of Experts to provide expert advice to governments on the qualification of the selected candidates. Governments are invited to submit to the panel the *curricula vitae* of the candidates they envisage presenting to the Assembly. The panel, following a confidential procedure, examines the *curricula vitae* and has the possibility of asking questions to the government. The panel then decides (by written procedure or at a meeting) whether it considers that all the candidates fulfil the requirements of Article 21, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which stipulates:

> *"The judges shall be of high moral character and must either possess the qualifications required for appointment to high judicial office or be jurisconsults of recognised competence."*

6. If, however, the panel considers that one or more of the candidates do not fulfil these requirements, it informs the national authorities accordingly. Governments are expected to follow the panel's recommendations, though – formally speaking – they remain free to submit their list to the Assembly regardless of the panel's views. However, the committee, which is informed confidentially of the panel's conclusions on the final list submitted by the government, has systematically insisted that the panel be consulted in a meaningful way and its views given due consideration by the government concerned.

7. The national selection procedure must fulfil certain requirements to increase the likelihood of the required outcome – namely that all three candidates are the best available. In 2012, the Committee of Ministers adopted a set of "Guidelines on the selection of candidates for the post of judge at the European Court of Human Rights".[3] The national selection procedures must be fair and transparent. The following are the key requirements:

> (1) the procedure should be stable and established in advance, through codification or in a settled administrative practice;
> (2) the call for candidatures should be public and disseminated widely;
> (3) a reasonable period should be allowed for the submission of applications;
> (4) the body responsible for recommending candidates should have a balanced composition, its members should have sufficient technical knowledge and command respect and confidence, and it should be free from undue influence;
> (5) all serious applicants should be interviewed, based upon a standardised format;
> (6) the applicants' linguistic abilities should be assessed;
> (7) any departure by the final decision-maker from the selection body's recommendation should be justified by reference to the criteria for the establishment of lists of candidates, and finally
> (8) the list should be submitted to the Assembly only after the Panel's opinion on the candidates' suitability has been obtained.

8. The Assembly,[4] for its part, also assesses the fairness, transparency and consistency of the national selection procedures, including public and open calls for candidatures. The committee has gradually placed a greater emphasis on this issue. In 2016, it rejected two lists on purely procedural grounds. In one case, the Committee of Ministers' Guidelines were not respected as the list was transmitted simultaneously to the panel and to the Assembly. This meant that the government was not able to take the views of the panel into account prior to transmission of the list to the Assembly. In another case, no meaningful national selection procedure was carried out at all. Following discussions in yet another case, in 2019, the committee decided that it would no longer consider lists of candidates when no interviews had been carried out during the national selection procedure. It also rejected a list on procedural grounds in 2021, considering that the national selection procedure was heavily dominated by government representatives. In 2025, the committee rejected a list on procedural grounds, considering that the national selection procedure had not been sufficiently transparent, as the possibility of presenting candidates to the selection body was limited to a number of official entities and it was not clear how these entities had made their initial selection. In 2025, it also rejected another list, considering that it could not be assumed that the members of the national selection body were free from undue influence.

9. The Assembly has identified examples of good practice in recent national selection procedures that could help States Parties to make their own procedures fairer and more transparent, while taking into account their legal, constitutional and political specificities. These include the following:[5]

---

[3] Adopted by the Committee of Ministers on 28 March 2012, CM(2012)40-final, as amended on 26 November 2014 by CM/Del/Dec(2014)1213/1.5-app5 and on 7-8 February 2024 by CM/Del/Dec(2024)1488/4.2.
[4] See Resolution 1646 (2009), paras. 2. and 4.1; and Resolution 2648 (2026), paras. 5-7.
[5] See Resolution 2648 (2026), para. 7.

(1) a minimum period of one month is given for submission of applications;
(2) the executive does not dominate the composition of the national selection body, with the majority of its members coming from outside the governmental structure, for instance from the judiciary, the ombudsperson's office, bar associations and academia;
(3) the nominal composition of the national selection body is disclosed in advance and made public;
(4) the general composition of the national selection body and details on the procedure are set out in the relevant regulation (statutory law or governmental decree) and not left to the discretion of the relevant minister;
(5) measures are taken to ensure that national selection bodies are as gender-balanced as possibly;
(6) civil society, legal professions' representatives and independent institutions are entitled to be present during the interviews as observers;
(7) the national selection body seeks advice from former judges at the Court in respect of the country concerned;
(8) candidates' linguistic abilities are tested in written and orally during interviews;
(9) relevant documents from the Council of Europe on the election of judges are translated into the national language and made available to all members of the national selection body.

10. The committee limits its assessment of the national selection procedure, which must be fully described (including the composition of the national selection body) in the letter transmitting the list of candidates, to its fairness and transparency in general and does not substitute its own choice of candidates to that of the national selection procedure. This means that, provided the procedure followed was generally fair and transparent, the committee will not reject the list on procedural grounds only because it found that other persons than the selected candidates ought to have been placed on the list. As specified in Article 22 of the Convention, it is the responsibility of governments to provide the Assembly with a shortlist of three candidates.[6] Basing itself on the Committee of Ministers' Guidelines and the Assembly's resolutions, the committee exercises general oversight of the fairness and transparency of the procedures followed in establishing the list of candidates, which should be transmitted to the Assembly in alphabetical order.[7]

11. The outcome of the national selection procedure must generally be a list of three candidates comprising at least one man and one woman. A single-sex list is acceptable when the candidates belong to the sex which is underrepresented in the Court (i.e. the sex to which under 40% of the total number of judges belong; the relevant time is the date of the Secretary General's letter inviting the government to present a list and informing it of the gender balance among judges at this time, see para. 4 above). In exceptional circumstances, where a government has taken all the necessary and appropriate steps to ensure that the list contains candidates of both sexes, the Assembly may decide to consider a single-sex list even when candidates do not belong to the underrepresented sex (see also paras. 22-24 below about the requirement of two-thirds majority and the rejection of an all-male list in 2022).[8] However, the Assembly strictly applies the "exceptional circumstances" threshold to justify exceptions to the rule that the lists submitted should contain at least one candidate of the underrepresented sex.[9]

3. Election procedure before the Assembly

12. Article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention (inserted by Protocol No. 15 to the Convention, entered into force on 1 August 2021) reads as follows:

> *"Candidates shall be less than 65 years of age at the date by which the list of three candidates has been requested by the Parliamentary Assembly, further to Article 22."*

Thus, judges are able to serve on the Court until the end of their mandate of 9 years, provided they are still under 65 years old at the date by which the Secretary General of the Assembly invited the government to submit a list of candidates.

[6] See the Court's second Advisory Opinion dated 22 January 2010 "on certain legal questions concerning the lists of candidates submitted with a view to the election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights" (No. 2) ("second Advisory Opinion"), para. 45: "Within the framework thus defined by the Convention, the High Contracting Parties have complete latitude in constituting their lists."
[7] See Appendix to Resolution 1432 (2005), para. 3.
[8] See the Court's (first) Advisory Opinion dated 12 February 2008 on certain legal questions concerning the lists of candidates submitted with a view to the election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights.
[9] See Resolution 2648 (2026), para. 10.

13. Article 23 of the Convention, as amended by Protocol No. 15 to the Convention, stipulates:

> *"1. The judges shall be elected for a period of nine years. They may not be re-elected.*
>
> *2. The judges shall hold office until replaced. They shall, however, continue to deal with such cases as they already have under consideration."*

14. After the list is transmitted to the Assembly, it is published on the Assembly's website. As from the date of transmission, the list is the Assembly's "property". It can only be withdrawn or modified by the government concerned as long as the deadline set for its transmission – specified in the letter of the Secretary General of the Assembly - has not yet expired.[10] After the expiry of the deadline, the government can no longer withdraw or modify the list of candidates. However, if a candidate decides to withdraw from the list, the election procedure is immediately interrupted, and the government concerned is invited to complete the list by replacing the candidate who has withdrawn.[11] This will be followed by another hearing of all three candidates by the committee.[12]

3.1. Procedure before the Committee on the Election of Judges

15. The candidatures are first examined by the committee, which is mandated by the plenary Assembly to scrutinise the *curricula vitae,* interview the candidates and make specific recommendations to the Assembly concerning their qualifications. Based on its recommendation, the Assembly proceeds with the election, or rejects the list.

16. The committee has 22 seats (including the chairpersons of the Committee on Legal Affairs and Human Rights and the Committee on Equality and Non-Discrimination, who are *ex officio* members). Its ordinary members and their substitutes are nominated by the political groups in proportion to their strength in the Assembly. Nominees must have appropriate legal expertise and experience. This committee is the only one in the Assembly to which such a requirement applies. The committee can only deliberate validly when a quorum of one third of its members[13] (six) is present. To ensure an appropriate level of participation, the Assembly has asked political groups to replace members with a poor attendance record, in principle after three consecutive or five non-consecutive absences.[14] Members lose their seats once the group they belong to has ceased to exist; however, a chairperson or vice-chairperson elected on behalf of such a group remains in office until their term expires.[15]

17. The committee meetings follow a consistent procedure. The meetings are held *in camera* and all participants are subject to strict confidentiality. Deliberations with respect to each list of candidates consist of three steps:

- a briefing session;
- interviews with candidates;
- discussion and vote.

18. The chairperson of the panel, or his or her representative, is invited to attend the briefing sessions in order to explain the panel's views on the list and reply to possible questions by members. The committee also receives information obtained by the chairperson from other sources considered by the chairperson as relevant. An expression of governmental preference shall play no role in the deliberations of the committee,[16] which bases itself solely on the criteria laid down in the Convention as "fleshed out" by the Assembly itself (see Appendix 2, below).

19. The committee must first decide whether there are any procedural or substantive grounds which might lead to the rejection of the list without interviewing the candidates.

---

[10] See second Advisory Opinion (note 6), para. 49.
[11] See second Advisory Opinion (note 6), paras. 56-57. See Appendix to Resolution 1432 (2005), para. 2.
[12] See Resolution 2648 (2026), para. 12.3.
[13] Excluding the two *ex officio* members.
[14] See Resolution 2278 (2019), para. 5.
[15] See Resolution 2278 (2019), para. 7.
[16] See Appendix to Resolution 1432 (2005), para. 3, sentence 3 ("any expressions of governmental preference shall play no role in the deliberations of the [then sub-] Committee on the Election of Judges.").

20. Procedural grounds include the following:[17]

- the national selection procedure did not satisfy the minimum requirements of fairness and transparency, for example when there was no public call for candidatures;
- when no interviews were held during the national selection procedure;
- or when the panel was not duly consulted.

21. The committee may recommend that the list is rejected on substantive grounds when it considers, on the sole basis of the candidates' *curricula vitae* and in light of the exchange of views with the chairperson or representative of the panel, that at least one of the candidates clearly does not fulfil the requirements of Article 21 para.1 of the Convention. The committee rejected lists on substantive grounds on the sole basis of the candidates' *curricula vitae,* without interviewing them, on several occasions since 2016.

22. A proposal to reject a list on procedural or substantive grounds, without interviewing the candidates, requires a majority of the votes cast.[18] The committee may propose the rejection of a list on both procedural and substantive grounds, if it considers that the procedure did not meet the minimum requirements and that not all candidates fulfil the conditions laid down in Article 21 para.1 of the Convention. It did so on one occasion in 2025.

23. The committee shall also reject a single-sex list unless the candidates belong to the sex which is underrepresented in the Court, i.e. the sex to which under 40% of the total number of judges belong, at the time of the Secretary General's letter inviting presentation of a list (para. 10 above). In exceptional circumstances, where a Contracting Party has taken all the necessary and appropriate steps to ensure that the list contains candidates of both sexes, the committee may decide to consider a single-sex list even when the candidates do not belong to the underrepresented sex.

24. Before the decision on the existence of exceptional circumstances is taken by the committee, the chairperson of the committee invites the Minister of Justice of the State concerned to take part in an exchange of views with the committee. The Minister, or a person designated by him or her, is given the opportunity to explain the circumstances which have prompted his or her government to transmit a single-sex list.

25. Such exceptional circumstances must be duly so considered by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast by the members of the committee, whose views must be ratified by the Assembly in the framework of a Progress Report of the Bureau. Interviews can therefore only take place at the next meeting of the committee following the ratification of the position of the committee by the Assembly. If the two-thirds majority is not reached in the committee for recognising exceptional circumstances, the committee shall recommend that the Assembly reject the list concerned. In 2022, the committee proposed to reject an all-male list despite explanations given by the Minister of the State Party concerned.

26. When a list is not rejected on procedural grounds or on substantial grounds on the sole basis of the candidates' *curricula vitae* or on gender equality grounds, the candidates are interviewed one by one, in alphabetical order. Each interview lasts thirty minutes.[19] The first five minutes can be used by the candidate to present his or her candidature. This opportunity, of which the candidates are informed ahead of time, is used by practically all candidates. After this, the chairperson opens the interviews by asking each candidate the same one or two questions. Members can ask any questions, including clarifications regarding the candidate's *curriculum vitae*. Questions can be asked in either of the two official languages. Candidates have simultaneous interpretation between both official languages at their disposal and may give their answers in either official language.

27. After the three interviews, the committee has an exchange of views on the merits of the candidates. The committee first decides whether all three candidates fulfil the criteria for election as a judge (Article 21 paragraph 1 of the Convention, quoted in paragraph 5, above), failing which it recommends to the Assembly the rejection of the list. Such a recommendation must be adopted by a majority of the votes cast.[20] Rejections of lists on substantive grounds, because not all the candidates fulfil the criteria, are necessary to preserve the freedom of choice conferred on the Assembly. The Assembly has decided not to consider lists of candidates, after interviewing them, on the following substantive grounds, namely where:

- the areas of competence of the candidates appear to be unduly restricted;

[17] See also section 2 above.
[18] Resolution 1366 (2004) para. 3. as modified by Resolution 2278 (2019), para. 2.4.2.
[19] In the case of meetings by videoconference, 15 minutes are added to each interview in order to compensate for possible technical delays.
[20] Resolution 1366 (2004) para. 3. as modified by Resolution 2278 (2019), para. 2.4.2.

- not all the candidates fulfil the conditions laid down by Article 21 para. 1 of the Convention;
- not all the candidates have an active knowledge of one of the official languages of the Council of Europe and a passive knowledge of the other.

28. The Assembly has stressed the importance for candidates to have knowledge of the national legal system of the Contracting State in respect of which they would be elected. Competence and experience in the field of human rights should also be taken into account in the overall assessment of candidates.[21]

29. When the list is not rejected, the committee votes on its preference among the candidates, by secret ballot.

30. For any decision other than that on preference among the candidates, voting shall take place by a show of hands, unless at least one third of the members present request a secret ballot. Only those members who were present during all three interviews are entitled to vote on a given list. Members from the State Party which submitted a list are permitted to participate in discussions, but they cannot vote on a possible rejection of the list, nor on the preference among the candidates.[22] The chairperson is entitled to vote.

31. The committee's recommendation is communicated to the Assembly in good time before the part-session during which the election is scheduled to take place. The recommendation does not include reasons for the committee's choice and does not indicate the exact majority. But the standard formulations used to express the result of the vote make it clear to what extent one or, possibly, two of the candidates represent the committee's preferences. For example, it is indicated that a recommendation in favour of one candidate was adopted "unanimously", "by an overwhelming majority", "by a large majority", "by a narrow majority" or simply "by a majority", sometimes "over" another candidate. It is understood that a second name is mentioned whenever the vote was fairly close between the first and second candidate, whilst the third candidate was far behind; that a "large" majority implies a majority of at least two thirds; and that an "overwhelming majority" implies unanimity less one or two votes. The recommendations are published on the Assembly's website a few days before the election (usually on the Wednesday before the part-session).

32. When the committee recommends the rejection of a list, for which succinct reasons must be given, the Secretary General of the Assembly and the chairperson of the committee provide any necessary information, in confidence, to the Permanent Representative of the State Party concerned in Strasbourg and to the chairperson of the national delegation to the Assembly, respectively. Should one or more candidates withdraw at this stage, before the Committee's recommendation to reject is made public (on the Wednesday before the part-session), the election procedure is suspended and the Government is invited to complete the list, after consulting in due course the Advisory Panel.[23] The committee's recommendation to reject a list is ratified by the Assembly in the framework of the Progress Report of its Bureau. Ratification of the committee's proposal signifies definitive rejection of the list. Should the recommendation to reject the list be defeated by a majority vote in the Assembly, the list is referred back to the committee[24]. In such a case, an election cannot take place during the same part-session, as the Assembly would not have the benefit of a recommendation by the committee in favour of one or another candidate. The consideration of the list would only come back on the Assembly's agenda after the committee has again taken position on the list.

3.2. Election by the Assembly

33. The Assembly is empowered by Article 22 of the Convention to elect the judges "by a majority of votes cast from a list of three candidates […]".

34. The election is usually held on the Tuesday or Wednesday of the part-session – a practice designed to achieve the highest possible participation. Members have the possibility to vote – by secret ballot – during the morning sitting. The names of the candidates are made available in alphabetic order. However, members have at their disposal the recommendation by the committee. If one candidate obtains the absolute majority of the votes cast, he or she is declared elected. Failing that, a second round takes place in the afternoon sitting, for which a relative majority is sufficient. Election results are publicly announced by the President of the Assembly at the end of the morning sitting and of the afternoon sitting in case of a second round.

[21] See Resolution 2648 (2026), para. 9.
[22] See para. 4.i. of the terms of reference of the Committee on the Election of Judges to the European Court of Human Rights as amended by Resolution 2278 (2019), para. 2.4.1.
[23] See Resolution 2648 (2026), para. 12.3.
[24] Resolution 1366 (2004) para. 3. as modified by Resolution 2278 (2019), para. 2.4.2.

35. The nine-year term of office of a judge elected by the Assembly to the Court shall commence from the date of taking up of his/her duties, and in any event no later than three months after his or her election. However, if the election takes place more than three months before the seat of the outgoing judge becomes vacant, the term of office shall commence the day the seat becomes vacant. If the election takes place less than three months before the seat of the outgoing judge becomes vacant, the elected judge shall take up his or her duties as soon as possible after the seat becomes vacant and the term of office shall commence as from then and in any event no later than three months after his or her election. [25]

[25] See paragraph 8 of Assembly Resolution 1726 (2010), adopted on 29 April 2010.

APPENDIX 1 – Model of a letter addressed to a Permanent Representative / Ambassador

Dear Ambassador,

I have the honour to inform you that, in accordance with Article 23 of the European Convention on Human Rights, as amended by Protocol No.15 to the Convention, the term of office of …., Judge at the European Court of Human Rights, will expire on …. and the Parliamentary Assembly has consequently to proceed with the election of a judge in respect of your country.

I should therefore be grateful if your authorities could submit a list of three candidates for the position of judge in respect of your country, in accordance with Article 22 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The letter transmitting the list of three candidates and their detailed *curricula vitae* should describe the procedure by which the candidates were selected. I refer you in particular to Parliamentary Assembly Resolution 1646 (2009) and Resolution 2648 (2026), as well as the Guidelines of the Committee of Ministers on the selection of candidates for the post of judge at the European Court of Human Rights adopted on 28 March 2012 (as amended in November 2014 and February 2024), which set out the requirements for fair and transparent national selection procedures.

The *curricula vitae* submitted to the Assembly should be prepared in both English and French, according to the template adopted by the Parliamentary Assembly (preferably in Word format). In order to facilitate the work of the Assembly and contacts with the candidates, the *curricula vitae* should indicate full professional and/or private contact details. For any questions regarding the processing of personal data by the Council of Europe, I invite you to refer to the attached Privacy Notice, which I encourage you to share with all candidates.

I should like to draw your attention to the fact that, since the entry into force of Protocol No. 14 to the European Convention on Human Rights, on 1 June 2010, the term of office of a judge elected is a non-renewable period of nine years. Since the entry into force of Protocol No. 15 to the European Convention on Human Rights, on 1 August 2021, a new age limit (less than 65 years of age at the date by which the Secretary General of the Assembly invited the government to submit a list of candidates, that is, in this case, [the date indicated in the letter] will apply and the previous age limit of 70 in force before Protocol No. 15 no longer applies.

As regards the need to ensure a balanced representation of women and men on the Court, I would refer you to the Assembly's Resolution 1366 (2004), as modified by Resolutions 1426 (2005), 1627 (2008), 1841 (2011), 2002 (2014) and 2278 (2019), and especially its paragraphs 3 and 4 which specify that lists of candidates must include at least one candidate of each sex unless a single-sex list of candidates is composed of an under-represented sex (i.e., the sex to which under 40% of the total number of judges belong) or if exceptional circumstances exist. At present, women/men are under-represented in the Court.

I would also like to draw your attention to the requirement of prior consultation with the advisory panel of experts on candidates for election as judge to the European Court of Human Rights established by the Committee of Ministers (Resolution CM/Res (2010) 26 as amended). Therefore, before submitting your list of candidates to the Parliamentary Assembly, you are invited to submit it to the advisory panel in time for the latter to be able to provide an opinion on whether the candidates included in the said list meet the requirements stipulated by the European Convention on Human Rights. I understand that the Secretariat of the advisory panel will be contacting you on this matter.

The principles regarding the election procedure, as well as additional information, can be found in the Memorandum "Procedure for the election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights", dated … .

I would like, in particular, to recall that the Committee on the Election of Judges to the European Court of Human Rights has decided to no longer consider lists of candidates drawn up without recourse to interviews at national level.

The election of a judge in respect of your country is scheduled for the Assembly's … part-session, following interviews with the candidates by the Committee on the Election of Judges to the European Court of Human Rights. I would therefore be grateful if the list of three candidates could be submitted to the Parliamentary Assembly (email: despina.chatzivassiliou@coe.int) by … at the latest.

For any other question relating to the election procedure before the Assembly, I invite you to contact XXX.

Yours sincerely,

Appendix to the model of letter addressed to a Permanent Representative / Ambassador

Election criteria and procedure:

According to Article 21, paragraph 1, of the European Convention on Human Rights, "The judges shall be of high moral character and must either possess the qualifications required for appointment to high judicial office or be jurisconsults of recognised competence".

According to Article 21 paragraph 2 (inserted by Protocol 15 to the Convention entered into force on 1 August 2021), "Candidates shall be less than 65 years of age at the date by which the list of three candidates has been requested by the Parliamentary Assembly, further to Article 22."

Article 21, paragraph 3, of the Convention provides that "During their term of office the judges shall not engage in any activity which is incompatible with their independence, impartiality or with the demands of a full-time office …".

According to Article 22 of the Convention "The judges shall be elected by the Parliamentary Assembly with respect to each High Contracting Party by a majority of votes cast from a list of three candidates nominated by the High Contracting Party".

Furthermore, Article 23 of the Convention, paragraphs 1 and 2, as amended by Protocol 15 to the Convention read as follows:

"1. The judges shall be elected for a period of nine years. They may not be re-elected.
2. The judges shall hold office until replaced. They shall, however, continue to deal with such cases as they already have under consideration."[26]

*****

Relevant texts:

- Resolution 2648 (2026) of the Parliamentary Assembly on Procedure for the election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights

- Resolution 1646 (2009) of the Parliamentary Assembly on the nomination of candidates and election of judges to the European Court of Human Rights

- Relevant extract from the Rules of the Parliamentary Assembly, May 2025, Complementary Texts, Elections by the Parliamentary Assembly, Part V "Candidates for the European Court of Human Rights", page 208: Resolution 1366 (2004), as modified by Resolutions 1426 (2005), 1627 (2008), 1841 (2011), 2002 (2014) and 2278 (2019)
(pace.coe.int/en/rules?id=EN_CEGCAIFG#Format-It)

- Committee of Ministers Resolution CM/Res(2009)5 on the status and conditions of service of judges of the European Court of Human Rights and of the Commissioner for Human Rights, adopted on 23 September 2009 *(https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805c0ce3)*

- Committee of Ministers Resolution CM/Res(2010)26, as amended by Resolution CM/Res(2014)44 on 26 November 2014, on the establishment of an Advisory Panel of Experts on Candidates for Election as Judge to the European Court of Human Rights
(https://search.coe.int/cm/Pages/result_details.aspx?ObjectId=09000016805c4ade)

- Guidelines of the Committee of Ministers on the selection of candidates for the post of judge at the European Court of Human Rights, March 2012, as amended in November 2014 by CM/Del/Dec(2014)1213/1.5-app5 and in February 2024 by CM/Del/Dec(2024)1488/4.2.
(https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?Ref=CM(2012)40&Language=lanEnglish&Ver=final&Site=COE&BackColorInternet=C3C3C3&BackColorIntranet=EDB021&BackColorLogged=F5D383)

[26] Former paragraph 2 of Article 23 ("The terms of office of judges shall expire when they reach the age of 70") was deleted by Protocol 15.

- Resolution 1726 (2010) of the Parliamentary Assembly on Effective implementation of the European Convention on Human Rights: the Interlaken process, paragraph 8

*****

Additional information:

The European Convention on State Immunity and its Additional Protocol setting up a European Tribunal, the members of which include, amongst others, members of the European Court of Human Rights, were opened for signature in May 1972. The Protocol entered into force on 22 May 1985. Your authorities may wish to notify the candidates to the present election that the person elected may be required to perform additional duties of judge at the European Tribunal in matters of State Immunity.

Newly elected judges may also be included in the Court's judicial formation that is asked to provide an Advisory Opinion on the interpretation of the 1997 Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine (ratified by 30 States). In December 2019, the European Court of Human Rights received, for the first time, a request for such an Advisory Opinion in line with Article 29 of the Convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine ("the Oviedo Convention").

*****

See also the Parliamentary Assembly's portal: https://pace.coe.int/en/pages/committee-30/AS-CDH

APPENDIX 2 – Model curriculum vitae for candidates seeking election to the European Court of Human Rights

In order to ensure that the members of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe have comparable information at their disposal when electing judges to the European Court of Human Rights, candidates are invited to submit a short curriculum vitae on the following lines, according to the **template adopted by the Assembly**.

I. Personal details
Name, Surname
Gender
Date and place of birth
Nationality

II. Education and academic, and other qualifications (200 words maximum)

III. Relevant professional activities (please put in bold the post(s) held at present)

a. Description of judicial activities (300 words maximum)
b. Description of non-judicial legal activities (300 words maximum)
c. Description of non-legal professional activities (300 words maximum)

IV. Activities and experience in the field of human rights (350 words maximum)

V. Public activities (Please put in bold the post(s) held at present)
a. Public office (200 words maximum)
b. Elected posts (200 words maximum)
c. Posts held in a political party or movement (200 words maximum)

VI. Other activities (field, duration, functions) (200 words maximum)

VII. Publications and other works (350 words maximum. You may indicate the total number of books and articles published, but mention only the most important titles - maximum 10)

VIII. Languages (Requirement: an active knowledge of one of the official languages of the Council of Europe and a passive knowledge of the other)

More information on the self-assessment of CEFR language levels by clicking on this link

Language	English	French				
Reading						
Writing						
Listening						
Speaking						
How acquired?						

IX. Other relevant information (150 words maximum)

X. Upgrading language skills

XI. Residency in Strasbourg

APPENDIX 3 – Timetable envisaged for elections

Elections foreseen in September 2026:

Bosnia and Herzegovina - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** (Mr Faris Vehabović) expired on 2 December 2021.

Elections foreseen in 2027 (dates to be defined):

Slovak Republic - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Slovak Republic** (Ms Alena Poláčková) expired on 28 December 2024.

Azerbaijan - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Azerbaijan** (Mr Lətif Hüseynov) expired on 3 January 2026.

North Macedonia - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **North Macedonia** (Mr Jovan Ilievski) expired on 31 January 2026.

Hungary - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Hungary** (Mr Péter Paczolay) expired on 23 April 2026.

Georgia - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Georgia** (Mr Lado Chanturia) expires on 7 January 2027.

Switzerland - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Switzerland** (Mr Andreas Zünd) expires on 8 February 2027.

Spain - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Spain** (Ms María Elósegui) expires on 14 March 2027.

Montenegro - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Montenegro** (Ms Ivana Jelić) expires on 11 July 2027.

San Marino - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **San Marino** (Mr Gilberto Felici) expires on 25 September 2027.

Norway - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Norway** (Mr Arnfinn Bårdsen) expires on 31 December 2027.

Albania - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Albania** (Mr Darian Pavli) expires on 6 January 2028.

Sweden - the term of office of the judge elected in respect of **Sweden** (Mr Erik Wennerström) expires on 31 March 2028.

APPENDIX 4 – Expiry of judges' terms of office*

2 December 2021	Judge elected in respect of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Mr Faris Vehabović)
3 January 2026	Judge elected in respect of Azerbaijan (Mr Lətif Hüseynov)
31 January 2026	Judge elected in respect of North Macedonia (Mr Jovan Ilievski)
23 April 2026	Judge elected in respect of Hungary (Mr Péter Paczolay)
7 January 2027	Judge elected in respect of Georgia (Mr Lado Chanturia)
8 February 2027	Judge elected in respect of Switzerland (Mr Andreas Zünd)[27] – expiry of 9-year term on 25 January 2030, but term of office ends on 8 February 2027 (age limit of 70 years)
14 March 2027	Judge elected in respect of Spain (Ms María Elósegui)
11 July 2027	Judge elected in respect of Montenegro (Ms Ivana Jelić)
25 September 2027	Judge elected in respect of San Marino (Mr Gilberto Felici)
31 December 2027	Judge elected in respect of Norway (Mr Arnfinn Bårdsen)
6 January 2028	Judge elected in respect of Albania (Mr Darian Pavli)
31 March 2028	Judge elected in respect of Sweden (Mr Erik Wennerström)
4 May 2028	Judge elected in respect of Italy (Mr Raffaele Sabato)
30 June 2028	Judge elected in respect of Türkiye (Ms Saadet Yüksel)
19 September 2028	Judge elected in respect of Malta (Ms Lorraine Schembri Orland)
31 December 2028	Judge elected in respect of Germany (Ms Anja Seibert-Fohr)
3 January 2029	Judge elected in respect of Estonia (Mr Peeter Roosma)
31 March 2029	Judge elected in respect of Portugal (Ms Ana Maria Guerra Martins)
21 June 2029	Judge elected in respect of France (Mr Mattias Guyomar)
7 March 2030	Judge elected in respect of Greece (Mr Ioannis Ktistakis)
12 September 2030	Judge elected in respect of Belgium (Mr Frédéric Krenc)
5 December 2030	Judge elected in respect of the Republic of Moldova (Ms Diana Sârci (ex-Scobioala))
12 December 2030	Judge elected in respect of the Czech Republic (Ms Kateřina Šimáčková)
1 January 2031	Judge elected in respect of Croatia (Mr Davor Derenčinović)
26 June 2031	Judge elected in respect of Ukraine (Mr Mykola Gnatovskyy)

[27] "Entry into force / application of Protocol 15. In order to take account of the length of the domestic procedure for the selection of candidates for the post of judge at the Court, Article 8, paragraph 1 of the Protocol foresees that these changes will apply only to judges elected from lists of candidates submitted to the Parliamentary Assembly by High Contracting Parties under Article 22 of the Convention after the entry into force of the Protocol. Candidates appearing on previously submitted lists, by extension including judges in office and judges-elect at the date of entry into force of the Protocol, will continue to be subject to the rule applying before the entry into force of the present Protocol, namely the expiry of their term of office when they reach the age of 70."

*The seat of the judge elected in respect of the Slovak Republic is currently vacant.

14 March 2032	Judge elected in respect of Iceland (Ms Oddný Mjöll Arnardóttir)
12 April 2032	Judge elected in respect of Denmark (Ms Anne Louise Bormann)
2 July 2032	Judge elected in respect of Romania (Mr Sebastian Răduleţu)
12 April 2033	Judge elected in respect of Bulgaria (Ms Diana Kovatcheva)
15 April 2033	Judge elected in respect of Lithuania (Mr Gediminas Sagatys)
1 May 2033	Judge elected in respect of Luxembourg (Mr Stéphane Pisani)
1 July 2033	Judge elected in respect of Ireland (Ms Úna Ní Raifeartaigh)
31 August 2033	Judge elected in respect of Liechtenstein (Mr Alain Chablais)
2 September 2033	Judge elected in respect of Latvia (Mr Artūrs Kučs)
15 September 2033	Judge elected in respect of Serbia (Mr Mateja Durović)
31 October 2033	Judge elected in respect of Austria (Mr András Jakab)
15 December 2033	Judge elected in respect of Poland (Ms Anna Adamska-Gallant)
31 December 2033	Judge elected in respect of Finland (Mr Juha Lavapuro)
30 March 2034	Judge elected in respect of Andorra (Ms Canòlic Mingorance Cairat)
27 April 2034	Judge elected in respect of Armenia (Mr Vahe Grigoryan)
29 May 2034	Judge elected in respect of Slovenia (Ms Vasilka Sancin)
6 July 2034	Judge elected in respect of Monaco (Mr Sébastien Biancheri)
21 September 2034	Judge elected in respect of the United Kingdom (Mr Hugh Mercer)
26 April 2035	Judge elected in respect of Cyprus (Mr Nicholas Emiliou)
26 April 2035	Judge elected in respect of the Netherlands (Ms Corinna Wissels)