



**COUNCIL OF  
THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**Brussels, 15 May 2007**

**9573/07**

**LIMITE**

**JURINFO 17  
JAI 243**



**NOTE**

---

From: Presidency

---

To: Working Party on Legal Data Processing (E-Justice)

---

No. prev. doc.: 6866/07 JURINFO 3

---

Subject: Questionnaire on the use of ICT in Member States' judicial systems  
- Study Part II: Comparative Analysis

---

***A. General information about the judicial systems in the Member States***

**A.1. Staff and bodies**

The aim of questions A.1.1. to A.1.3. is to give an approximate idea of the size of the Member States' judicial systems.

The term "judicial system" includes both courts and public prosecutor's offices. The employees envisaged are e.g. judges, public prosecutors, other specialised legal staff, office employees or staff acting in an honorary capacity. Persons working in the judicial system in roles which have no judicial content (for instance: caretakers, cleaning staff, prison warders) are not included.

The numbers of judges and public prosecutors are listed separately.

Member State	Number of persons employed in the judicial system	Number of judges	Number of public prosecutors	Population figure	Number of judges per 100.000 Inhabitants	Number of public prosecutors per 100.000 Inhabitants
Belgium	9.517	2.397	830	10.511.000	22,80	7,90
Bulgaria	4.075	2.356	1.719	7.679.000	30,68	22,38
Denmark	3.650	235	600	5.447.000	4,31	11,02
Germany	126.459	20.847	5.440	82.310.000	25,33	6,61
Estonia	2.245	242	160	1.347.000	18,00	11,88
Finland	6.600	1.170	320	5.279.000	22,16	6,06
France	29.000	5.685	1.922	60.656.000	9,37	3,17
Greece	13.633	3.300	557	11.057.000	29,85	5,04
United Kingdom*	25.959	1.713	3.331	60.609.000	2,83	5,50
Ireland	1.045	131	not specified	4.234.000	24,68	
Italy	62.625	12.035	4.061	58.883.000	20,44	6,90
Latvia	not specified	455	549	2.286.000	24,01	19,90
Lithuania	4.091	734	893	3.384.000	21,69	26,38
Luxembourg	475	154	41	474.000	32,46	8,64
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received	398.000		
Netherlands	13.030	2.100	600	16.366.000	12,83	3,67
Austria	10.929	1.707	226	8.233.000	20,73	2,74
Poland	54.066	9.890	5.949	38.536.000	25,66	15,44
Portugal	9.557	1.870	1.583	10.543.000	17,74	15,01
Romania	18.400	4.081	2.222	21.714.000	18,79	10,23
Sweden	7.373	920	907	9.113.000	10,10	9,95

\* The United Kingdom has three separate legal jurisdictions but for the purposes of this document the responses have been aggregated, the result being that some responses given may not apply to all UK jurisdictions.

<b>Slovakia</b>	2.002	1.258	744	5.431.000	23,16	13,70
<b>Slovenia</b>	3.500	1.000	210	2.003.000	49,91	10,48
<b>Spain</b>	34.365	4.435	19.980	44.708.000	9,92	42,68
<b>Czech Republik</b>	15.000	3.000	1.200	10.280.000	29,18	11,67
<b>Hungary</b>	14.483	3.772	1.960	9.981.000	37,79	19,64
<b>Cyprus</b>	not specified	85	100	784.000	10,84	12,5

## A.2. Organisation

Table A.2.1. gives an overview of the approximate functionality of the judicial systems in the Member States. We differ between centralised and decentralised administration / organisation of authorities and courts. In many Member States elements of both systems - centralised as well as decentralised - can be found. The question was about which form of organisation / administration is predominant. That is why we did not include the answer „Mixed forms“ in the questionnaire. However, the answer was given autonomously by some Member States.

<b>Member State</b>	<b>Predominantly centralised administration/organisation of authorities/courts</b>	<b>Predominantly decentralised administration/organisation of authorities/courts</b>	<b>Predominantly autonomous administration/organisation of authorities/courts</b>	<b>Mixed forms of administration/organisation of authorities/courts</b>
<b>Belgium</b>	✓			
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓			
<b>Denmark</b>				✓
<b>Germany</b>		✓		
<b>Estonia</b>	✓			
<b>Finland</b>	✓			
<b>France</b>	✓			
<b>Greece</b>			✓	

United Kingdom		✓		
Ireland	✓			
Italy			✓	
Latvia	✓			
Lithuania				✓
Luxembourg	✓			
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
Netherlands		✓		
Austria	✓			
Poland	✓			
Portugal	✓			
Romania	✓			
Sweden	✓			
Slovakia	✓			
Slovenia	✓			
Spain		✓		
Czech Republik	✓			
Hungary				✓
Cyprus			✓	

Total	16	4	3	3
-------	----	---	---	---

### A.3. IT facilities in the workplace and technical back-up

The aim of questions A.3.1. to A.3.4. was to ascertain what IT facilities workplaces in the Member States' judicial systems are equipped with. This information should help to show the relationship between the IT facilities available in the judicial systems and the current state of development of concepts of eJustice.

#### A.3.1. All workplaces

	PC				E-Mail				Internet				Speech recognition			
	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %
<b>Belgium</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Bulgaria</b>			✓				✓				✓		✓			
<b>Denmark</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Germany</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Estonia</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Finland</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>France</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Greece</b>		✓			✓				✓				✓			
<b>United Kingdom</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Ireland</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Italy</b>				✓			✓				✓		✓			
<b>Latvia</b>				✓				✓				✓	not specified			
<b>Lithuania</b>				✓				✓				✓	not specified			
<b>Luxembourg</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Malta</b>	no data received				no data received				no data received				no data received			
<b>Netherlands</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Austria</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			

Poland			✓			✓				✓			✓				
Portugal				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Romania				✓			✓				✓		✓				
Sweden				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Slovakia				✓				✓			✓		✓				
Slovenia				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Spain				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Czech Republik				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Hungary			✓				✓				✓		✓				
Cyprus			✓				✓				✓		✓				

<b>Total</b>	0	1	4	21	1	1	5	19	1	1	6	18	26	0	0	0
--------------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----	----	---	---	---

### A.3.2 Judges

The equipment of the judges' workplaces with:

	PC				E-Mail				Internet				Speech recognition				
	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	
Belgium				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Bulgaria			✓				✓				✓		✓				
Denmark				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Germany				✓				✓				✓	✓				
Estonia				✓				✓				✓	✓				

Finland				✓				✓				✓	✓			
France				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Greece	✓				✓				✓				✓			
United Kingdom				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Ireland				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Italy				✓			✓				✓		✓			
Latvia				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Lithuania				✓				✓				✓	n.s.			
Luxembourg				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Malta	no data received				no data received				no data received				no data received			
Netherlands				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Austria				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Poland			✓			✓			✓				✓			
Portugal				✓				✓				✓	n.s.			
Romania				✓			✓				✓		n.s.			
Sweden				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Slovakia				✓				✓			✓		✓			
Slovenia				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Spain				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Czech Republik				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Hungary				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Cyprus			✓			✓				✓			✓			
<b>Total</b>	1	0	3	22	1	2	3	20	2	1	4	19	23	0	0	0

### A.3.3. Public prosecutors

The equipment of the public prosecutors' workplaces with:

	PC				E-Mail				Internet				Speech recognition			
	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %
<b>Belgium</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Bulgaria</b>			✓				✓				✓		✓			
<b>Denmark</b>				✓				✓	✓				✓			
<b>Germany</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Estonia</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Finland</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>France</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Greece</b>		✓			✓				✓				✓			
<b>United Kingdom</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Ireland</b>	not applicable															
<b>Italy</b>				✓			✓				✓		✓			
<b>Latvia</b>				✓		✓						✓	✓			
<b>Lithuania</b>				✓				✓				✓	n.s.			
<b>Luxembourg</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Malta</b>	no data received				no data received				no data received				no data received			
<b>Netherlands</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Austria</b>				✓				✓				✓	✓			
<b>Poland</b>			✓			✓			✓				✓			
<b>Portugal</b>				✓				✓				✓	n.s.			



Romania				✓			✓				✓		n.s.			
Sweden				✓				✓				✓	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.
Slovakia				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Slovenia				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Spain				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Czech Republik				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Hungary			✓				✓				✓		✓			
Cyprus			✓				✓				✓		✓			
<b>Total</b>	0	1	4	20	1	2	5	17	3	0	5	17	21	0	0	0

#### A.3.4. Courtrooms

The equipment of courtrooms with:

	PC				E-Mail				Internet				Speech recognition			
	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %	less than 10 %	10 % to 50 %	50 % to 90 %	over 90 %
Belgium			✓				✓				✓		✓			
Bulgaria		✓			✓				✓				✓			
Denmark			✓				✓				✓		✓			
Germany				✓			✓				✓		✓			
Estonia				✓				✓				✓	✓			
Finland				✓				✓				✓		✓		
France	✓				✓				✓				✓			
Greece	✓				✓				✓				✓			

United Kingdom			✓				✓				✓			✓			
Ireland			✓				✓		✓					✓			
Italy		✓				✓				✓				✓			
Latvia	✓				✓				✓					✓			
Lithuania	✓				not specified				not specified				not specified				
Luxembourg		✓				✓			not specified				✓				
Malta	no data received				no data received				no data received				no data received				
Netherlands			✓		✓				✓					✓			
Austria	✓				✓				✓					✓			
Poland			✓		✓				✓					✓			
Portugal				✓				✓					✓	not specified			
Romania		✓			✓				✓					✓			
Sweden				✓				✓					✓	✓			
Slovakia				✓	✓					✓				✓			
Slovenia				✓		✓							✓	✓			
Spain				✓				✓					✓	✓			
Czech Republik				✓				✓					✓	✓			
Hungary		✓				✓				✓				✓			
Cyprus	✓				✓				✓					✓			

<b>Total</b>	6	5	6	9	10	4	5	6	10	3	4	7	23	1	0	0
--------------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	---	---

#### A.4. Networking (connectivity) of courts

Questions A.4.1. to A.4.3. aimed to ascertain whether and how the courts in the Member States are networked. "Networking" or "networked" means that the various computer workstations or courts are linked to one another by a dedicated technical connection. This makes it possible, for instance, to access, or communicate with, computers which are connected. Use of the Internet and e-mail alone is not what is meant.

	A.4.1. Network of computers within the same court building:	A.4.2. The extent of networks between various court buildings
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes	regionally
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>France</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	only courts with the same legal areas of responsibility
<b>United Kingdom</b>	partially	partially
<b>Ireland</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Italy</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Latvia</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Lithuania</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Luxembourg</b>	partially	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	✓ Yes	completely
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes	completely

<b>Poland</b>	partially
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Romania</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Spain</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Czech Republik</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Hungary</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Cyprus</b>	partially

regionally
completely
completely
completely
completely
completely
completely
completely
completely
no network at all

<b>A.4.1. Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
Yes	21
No	0
partially	4
Not specified	1

<b>A.4.2. Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
completely	20
not at all	1
regionally	2
only courts within the same branch	1
partially	1
not specified	1
no data received	1

<b>A.4.3. The networking is implemented technically by:</b>	
<b>Belgium</b>	BILAN - WAN – LAN – TCP/IP
<b>Bulgaria</b>	VPN IP connectivity; Ethernet Technology.
<b>Denmark</b>	TCP/IP tp-based level 6 network in the majority of locations. Some older buildings are networked using older technologies (10BASE-T over COAX). MPLS/ADSL WAN network between the court-locations.
<b>Germany</b>	Different networking solutions in the 16 german states.

<b>Estonia</b>	Private VPN channel
<b>Finland</b>	not specified
<b>France</b>	Judicial Courts: IP VPN; administrative courts: IP VPN (wan)
<b>Greece</b>	not specified
<b>United Kingdom</b>	A number of 'hub and spoke' MPLS based networks with a mixture of direct interconnection and connection via the Government Secure Intranet (GSI) (England and Wales); Externally managed IP/VPN (Scotland); NICTS infrastructure, 100Mbps LAN Extension Services, 2x2Mbps leased line, Satellite – all sites will be connected to relevant Divisional site with bandwidth ranging from 256Kbps to 1536Kbps (Northern Ireland)
<b>Ireland</b>	All Courts Service sites nationwide are connected to the Government MPLS Network over a local leased line infrastructure with the various sites accessing centralised database and information services located in a strategic data centre located in Dublin.
<b>Italy</b>	Public Connectivity System technology IP-MPLS (Internet Protocol - Multi-Protocol Label Switching)
<b>Latvia</b>	Networking is processed from one service centre – operated by State Stock Company "Tiesu namu aģentūra"
<b>Lithuania</b>	Courts are connected to the virtual private network (VPN), on the IP protocol basis. Each public prosecutor office has its own local network (LAN), these LAN are connected to the WAN, on the DSL and dedicated lines.
<b>Luxembourg</b>	At the level of the various courts, there are case management networks, there is common access to certain data banks (e.g. civil law channel, criminal record, European arrest warrant, international letters rogatory, management of cases involving minors, payment orders, treatment of criminal cases, financial criminal cases, management of fines, international letters rogatory and European arrest warrants).
<b>Malta</b>	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	Computer workstations are connected by a Local Area Network. LAN's are connected by a Wide Area Network.
<b>Austria</b>	Broadband, > 2 MBit, separate network.
<b>Poland</b>	LAN, VPN
<b>Portugal</b>	Ethernet or ATM
<b>Romania</b>	Each court/prosecutors' office LAN has a router which connects the courtroom/prosecutors' office with the Ministry of Justice.
<b>Sweden</b>	The PCs are linked in an overall network. Access to various applications and the courts' system is managed on the basis of area of competence.
<b>Slovakia</b>	WAN connected up to government network and the internet.
<b>Slovenia</b>	TCP/IP; WAN (between courts), LAN (within courts).
<b>Spain</b>	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not specified
<b>Hungary</b>	Star topology, frame relay; WAN-between courts, and LAN within courts
<b>Cyprus</b>	not applicable

The next question A.4.4. aimed to ascertain whether the networking of courts corresponds to the organisational structure of the courts or differs from it. This means, for instance, that there could be a centralised network structure although the courts are organised on a decentralised basis. The answer “partially” was not foreseen but it was given autonomously by some Member States.

	<b>A.4.4. The networking corresponds to the organisational structure of the courts</b>		
	predominantly YES	predominantly NO	partially
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Estonia</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>France</b>		⊘ No	
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Ireland</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Italy</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Latvia</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Lithuania</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not applicable		
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>		⊘ No	
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Poland</b>		⊘ No	

Portugal	✓ Yes		
Romania	✓ Yes		
Sweden	✓ Yes		
Slovakia	✓ Yes		
Slovenia	✓ Yes		
Spain		⊘ No	
Czech Republik	✓ Yes		
Hungary	✓ Yes		
Cyprus	not applicable		
<b>Total</b>	18	4	0

#### A.4.4. Overview

In the following Member States the networking of courts predominantly corresponds to the organisational structure of the courts

<b>Belgium</b>
<b>Bulgaria</b>
<b>Denmark</b>
<b>Germany</b>
<b>Finland</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>
<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Italy</b>
<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Lithuania</b>
<b>Austria</b>
<b>Portugal</b>
<b>Romania</b>

Sweden
Slovakia
Slovenia
Czech Republik
Hungary

### A.5. Technical back-up

The question, A.5., aimed to ascertain who is responsible for technical back-up of the equipment at the workplaces in your country's judicial system. Since we would assume that this is not the same throughout the country, only a rough assessment of the main type of back-up is required.

	A.5. Responsibility for technical back-up of workplaces (administration, maintenance, trouble-shooting, replacement) in Member States' judicial system		
	Predominantly employees of the judicial system	Predominantly employees of an external enterprise	both
Belgium	✓ Yes		
Bulgaria	✓ Yes		
Denmark			✓ Yes
Germany			✓ Yes
Estonia		✓ Yes	
Finland	✓ Yes		
France	✓ Yes		
Greece			✓ Yes
United Kingdom			✓ Yes
Ireland		✓ Yes	
Italy		✓ Yes	
Latvia		✓ Yes	



Lithuania	✓ Yes		
Luxembourg	not specified	not specified	not specified
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received
Netherlands	✓ Yes		
Austria	✓ Yes		
Poland	not specified	not specified	not specified
Portugal			✓ Yes
Romania	✓ Yes		
Sweden	✓ Yes		
Slovakia	✓ Yes		
Slovenia	✓ Yes		
Spain	✓ Yes		
Czech Republik	✓ Yes		
Hungary	✓ Yes		
Cyprus		✓ Yes	
<b>Total</b>	14	5	5

***B. Electronic documentation***

	<b>B.1.1.</b> There are legislative or other rules permitting judicial authorities and courts to maintain their documentation in electronic form:		
	YES, as a rule	NO, as a rule	Exception
Belgium	✓ Yes		
Bulgaria	✓ Yes		

Denmark	✓ Yes		
Germany	✓ Yes		criminal proceedings
Estonia	✓ Yes		
Finland	✓ Yes		
France	✓ Yes		
Greece	✓ Yes		
United Kingdom		⊘ No	Northern Ireland, some proceedings in Scotland
Ireland	✓ Yes		minute book in District Courts
Italy	✓ Yes		
Latvia	✓ Yes		
Lithuania	✓ Yes		
Luxembourg	✓ Yes		
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received
Netherlands		⊘ No	
Austria	✓ Yes		
Poland		⊘ No	
Portugal	✓ Yes		
Romania	✓ Yes		
Sweden	✓ Yes		
Slovakia	✓ Yes		
Slovenia	✓ Yes		
Spain	✓ Yes		
Czech Republik	✓ Yes		
Hungary	✓ Yes		
Cyprus		⊘ No	
<b>Total</b>	22	4	

**Overview I for Table B.1.1. :**

In the following Member States the electronic documentation is allowed as a rule:

**Belgium**

**Bulgaria**

**Denmark**

**Germany**

**Estonia**

**Finland**

**France**

**Greece**

**Ireland**

**Italy**

**Latvia**

**Lithuania**

**Luxembourg**

**Austria**

**Portugal**

**Romania**

**Sweden**

**Slovenia**

**Slovakia**

**Spain**

**Czech Republik**

**Hungary**

**Overview II for Table B.1.1. :**

In the following Member States the electronic documentation is not allowed as a rule

**United Kingdom**

**Netherlands**

**Poland**

**Cyprus**

**B.1.2. / B.1.3.** Legal provisions for electronic documentation and the rate of usage in percent

	The judicial documents are maintained electronically in their entirety	Only the "metadata" of a judicial document is maintained electronically, the document itself is stored on paper	The judicial documents are maintained electronically in their entirety and additionally also on paper
<b>Belgium</b>		✓ usage 95%	✓ usage 5 %
<b>Bulgaria</b>		✓	
<b>Denmark</b>		✓ usage 25 %	✓ usage 100 %
<b>Germany</b>		✓ usage 100 %	
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ usage less than 5%	✓ usage 10 %	✓ usage 85 %
<b>Finland</b>	✓ usage 20 %	✓ usage 60 %	
<b>France</b>		✓ usage 100%	
<b>Greece</b>		✓	✓
<b>United Kingdom</b>		✓ usage 40%	✓
<b>Ireland</b>		✓ usage 90 %	
<b>Italy</b>		✓ usage 80 %	✓
<b>Latvia</b>		✓ usage 45 %	

Lithuania		✓	✓ usage 20 %
Luxembourg		✓ usage 40 %	
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received
Austria		✓ usage 100 %	
Portugal	✓ usage 5 %	✓ usage 95 %	
Romania		✓ usage 50 %	
Sweden			✓ usage 90%
Slovakia		✓ usage 50 %	✓ usage 50 %
Slovenia		✓ usage 90 %	✓ usage 20 %
Spain			✓ usage 75 %
Czech Republik		✓ usage 80 %	
Hungary		✓ usage 100 %	

Total	3	21	11
-------	---	----	----

**B.1.4.** There are types of procedure in which documentation *must*, by law, be maintained in electronic form by the authorities or courts:

<b>Belgium</b>	✓	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	⊘	No
<b>Denmark</b>	⊘	No
<b>Germany</b>	✓	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓	Yes
<b>Finland</b>	✓	Yes
<b>France</b>	⊘	No
<b>Greece</b>	⊘	No
<b>United Kingdom</b>	⊘	No
<b>Ireland</b>	⊘	No
<b>Italy</b>	⊘	No
<b>Latvia</b>	⊘	No
<b>Lithuania</b>	⊘	No
<b>Luxembourg</b>	⊘	No
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	
<b>Austria</b>	⊘	No
<b>Portugal</b>	✓	Yes
<b>Romania</b>	⊘	No
<b>Sweden</b>	⊘	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	✓	Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	✓	Yes
<b>Spain</b>	⊘	No
<b>Czech Republik</b>	⊘	No
<b>Hungary</b>	⊘	No

Overview for table B.1.4. :	
Yes	7
No	16
Not specified	3

## B. 2.1. Technical standards

	B.2.1. In the following Member States there exist technical standards for electronic documentation within the judicial system:	B.2.2. The compliance with technical standards is required by law or other rules:
Belgium	⊘ No	
Bulgaria	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
Denmark	⊘ No	no uniform regulation
Germany	✓ Yes	no uniform regulation
Estonia	✓ partially	no uniform regulation
Finland	⊘ No	
France	✓ partially	no uniform regulation
Greece	✓ Yes	⊘ No
United Kingdom	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
Ireland	⊘ No	
Italy	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
Latvia	⊘ No	
Lithuania	⊘ No	
Luxembourg	⊘ No	
Malta	no data received	no data received
Austria	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
Portugal	✓ Yes	no uniform regulation

Romania	⊘ No
Sweden	⊘ No
Slovakia	✓ Yes
Slovenia	⊘ No
Spain	⊘ No
Czech Republik	⊘ No
Hungary	✓ Yes

✓ Yes
no uniform regulation
✓ Yes

<b>Overview I of table B.2.1.:</b>
The following Member States have technical standards for electronic documentation within the judicial system:
<b>Bulgaria</b>
<b>Germany</b>
<b>Greece</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>
<b>Italy</b>
<b>Austria</b>
<b>Portugal</b>
<b>Slovakia</b>
<b>Hungary</b>

<b>Overview II of table B.2.1.:</b>
The following Member States have no technical standards for electronic documentation within the judicial system:
<b>Denmark</b>
<b>Finland</b>
<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Lithuania</b>
<b>Luxembourg</b>
<b>Romania</b>
<b>Sweden</b>
<b>Slovenia</b>
<b>Spain</b>
<b>Czech Republik</b>

<b>Overview III of table B.2.1.:</b>
The following Member States do partially have technical standards for electronic documentation within the judicial system:
<b>Estonia</b>
<b>France</b>



**B.2.3. The origin of technical solutions for electronic documentation.**

	<b>B.2.3. Technical solution is used for electronic documentation:</b>		
	Software developed specifically for judicial use	Standard market software	both
<b>Belgium</b>		✓	
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓		
<b>Denmark</b>			✓
<b>Germany</b>			✓
<b>Estonia</b>			✓
<b>Finland</b>	✓		
<b>France</b>	✓		
<b>Greece</b>			✓
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓		
<b>Ireland</b>		✓*	
<b>Italy</b>	✓		
<b>Latvia</b>			✓
<b>Lithuania</b>	✓		
<b>Luxembourg</b>			✓
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Austria</b>	✓		
<b>Portugal</b>	✓		
<b>Romania</b>	✓		
<b>Sweden</b>			✓
<b>Slovakia</b>			✓
<b>Slovenia</b>			✓

Spain	✓		
Czech Republik	✓		
Hungary	✓		
<b>Total</b>	12	2	9

### B.3.1. and B.3.2. Involvement in the maintenance of electronic documentation

	<b>B.3.1.</b> The extent, in which judges are personally involved in the maintenance of electronic documentation:	<b>B.3.2.</b> The extent, in which public prosecutors are personally involved in the maintenance of electronic documentation:
<b>Belgium</b>	partially	partially
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not at all / hardly	not at all / hardly
<b>Denmark</b>	partially	predominantly
<b>Germany</b>	partially	partially
<b>Estonia</b>	partially	predominantly
<b>Finland</b>	partially	partially
<b>France</b>	partially	partially
<b>Greece</b>	not at all / hardly	not at all / hardly
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not at all / hardly	not at all / hardly
<b>Ireland</b>	not at all / hardly	not applicable
<b>Italy</b>	partially	predominantly
<b>Latvia</b>	partially	not at all / hardly
<b>Lithuania</b>	predominantly	predominantly
<b>Luxembourg</b>	partially	partially
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received
<b>Austria</b>	partially	partially
<b>Portugal</b>	partially	partially
<b>Romania</b>	partially	partially
<b>Sweden</b>	partially	throughout
<b>Slovakia</b>	partially	partially

<b>Slovenia</b>	partially
<b>Spain</b>	not at all / hardly
<b>Czech Republik</b>	predominantly
<b>Hungary</b>	partially

partially
partially
predominantly
partially

<b>Answer</b>	<b>Total</b>
not at all / hardly	5
partially	16
predominantly	2
throughout	0

<b>Total</b>
4
12
5
1

#### **B.4.1. Archiving of judicial acts which exist in both electronic and paper form.**

<b>B.4.1.</b>
In the following Member States the paper versions can be destroyed when judicial documents which are kept in both electronic and paper form are to be archived:
<b>Germany</b>
.....
<b>Finland</b>
.....
<b>France</b>
.....
<b>Italy</b>
.....
<b>Austria</b>

**B.5.1. Access to electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.).**

<b>B.5.1. Access to electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.) is possible by:</b>				
	A print-out made by the court or the judicial authorities	Electronic transmission of the document or extracts from it by the court or the judicial authorities (e.g. by e-mail)	Direct access to the document via an internal network	Direct access to the document via a public network (e.g. Internet)
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes			✓ Yes
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		✓ Yes
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		✓ Yes
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>France</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		
<b>Greece</b>	✓ Yes			
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		✓ Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	✓ Yes		✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Italy</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Latvia</b>	✓ Yes			
<b>Lithuania</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	✓ Yes			
<b>Malta</b>	no data received			
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes			✓ Yes
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes		✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Romania</b>	✓ Yes			✓ Yes

Sweden	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		
Slovakia	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		
Slovenia	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		
Spain	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
Czech Republik	✓ Yes			
Hungary	not applicable			
<b>Total</b>	22	13	7	12

**B.5.2.** Access to electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.) is already:

Belgium	partially technically feasible
Bulgaria	partially technically feasible
Denmark	partially technically feasible
Germany	partially technically feasible
Estonia	partially technically feasible
Finland	partially technically feasible
France	partially technically feasible
Greece	not applicable
United Kingdom	partially technically feasible
Ireland	partially technically feasible
Italy	partially technically feasible
Lithuania	not at all feasible
Luxembourg	not applicable
Malta	no data received
Austria	partially technically feasible
Portugal	completely technically feasible
Romania	partially technically feasible
Sweden	partially technically feasible
Slovakia	partially technically feasible

<b>Slovenia</b>	partially technically feasible
<b>Spain</b>	not at all feasible
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not applicable
<b>Hungary</b>	not at all feasible

Overview of table B.5.2.:	
not at all feasible	3
partially feasible	15
completely	1
not specified / no data received	1
not applicable	3
no electronic documents at all	3

**B.5.3 and B.5.4. Existence of / compliance with technical standards for inspection of electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system**

	<b>B.5.3.</b> The following Member States have technical standards for inspection of electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system:	<b>B.5.4.</b> Compliance with technical standards is required by law or under other rules in these Member States:
<b>Belgium</b>	⊘ No	
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Denmark</b>	⊘ No	
<b>Germany</b>	⊘ No	
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes	no uniform regulation
<b>Finland</b>	⊘ No	
<b>France</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Greece</b>	not applicable	
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ partially	not specified

Ireland	<input type="radio"/> No
Italy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Latvia	<input type="radio"/> No
Lithuania	<input type="radio"/> No
Luxembourg	not applicable
Malta	no data received
Austria	<input type="radio"/> No
Portugal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Romania	<input type="radio"/> No
Sweden	<input type="radio"/> No
Slovakia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
Slovenia	<input type="radio"/> No
Spain	<input type="radio"/> No
Czech Republik	<input type="radio"/> No
Hungary	<input type="radio"/> No

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
no data received
no uniform regulation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes

<b>Overview I for table B.5.3. :</b>
The following Member States have technical standards for inspection of electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system:
<b>Bulgaria</b>
<b>Estonia</b>
<b>France</b>
<b>Italy</b>
<b>Portugal</b>
<b>Slovakia</b>

<b>Overview II for table B.5.3. :</b>
The following Member States do not have technical standards for inspection of electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system:
<b>Belgium</b>
<b>Denmark</b>
<b>Germany</b>
<b>Finland</b>
<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Lithuania</b>
<b>Austria</b>
<b>Romania</b>
<b>Sweden</b>
<b>Slovenia</b>
<b>Spain</b>
<b>Czech Republik</b>
<b>Hungary</b>

<b>Overview III for table B.5.3. :</b>
The following Member States do partially have technical standards for inspection of electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system:
<b>United Kingdom</b>

**B.5.5. Electronic document inspection by persons involved but not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.)**

<b>B.5.5.</b> The percentage of cases in which persons involved but not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.) inspect electronically		
	In courts	In public prosecutors' offices
<b>Belgium</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Bulgaria</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Denmark</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Germany</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %



<b>Estonia</b>	10 to 50 %	not applicable
<b>Finland</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>France</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Greece</b>	not applicable	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	less than 10 %	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>	less than 10 %	not applicable
<b>Italy</b>	10 to 50 %	not specified
<b>Latvia</b>	10 to 50 %	less than 10 %
<b>Lithuania</b>	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received
<b>Austria</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Portugal</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Romania</b>	10 to 50 %	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Slovakia</b>	less than 10 %	less than 10 %
<b>Slovenia</b>	10 to 50 %	less than 10 %
<b>Spain</b>	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Hungary</b>	not applicable	not applicable

<b>Overview I of table B.5.5. (courts):</b>	
more than 90%	0
50-90%	0
10-50%	6
less than 10%	11
not applicable	6

<b>Overview II of table B.5.5.(prosecutors' offices):</b>	
more than 90%	0
50-90%	0
10-50%	0
less than 10%	12
not applicable	8

<b>B.6.1.</b> What experience do you have of the introduction of electronic documents within the judicial system? (You may make general comments here)	
<b>Slovenia</b>	Consolidation (centralization) of documents, which allows the courts to move cases from one to another; there is a big need for Help Desk support, especially in the beginning
<b>Austria</b>	Difficult implementation phase. The still quite limited contents of electronic documents are criticised by many; Regret about fewer social interaction; Complaints about the costs of € 1,-- per enquiry; Are going to be reduced to € 0,20 per enquiry.
<b>Finland</b>	There is good experience of a closed and secure system for the exchange of documents between attorneys and courts (A-posti).
<b>Italy</b>	Saves time and internal resources in supplying copies and information.
<b>Spain</b>	There are widely-used processing applications which facilitate the use of documents in electronic format. We have several years' experience with these, although their development depends on the legal framework, which is currently being adapted to this end.
<b>Portugal</b>	There are cultural difficulties in switching to an entirely electronic system. Technically speaking, too, there are some problems; these are being overcome with communications network bandwidth improvements.
<b>Estonia</b>	The information system for the registration of electronic document has made progress with some difficulty. We have now reached a situation in which almost 100% of court decisions are recorded in the court information system (meta-data and the document as a whole). For other documents this proportion is currently under 50%, but we have established the target of storing all documents in the information system and of digitalising court records.

<b>B.6.2.</b> What experience do you have of the introduction of access to electronic documents by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.)? (You may make general comments here)	
<b>Slovenia</b>	Usage has grown by 100% on yearly bases. A big usage of Help Desk support.
<b>Italy</b>	Less crowding and office counters saves time and money in obtaining information and copies of documentation
<b>Estonia</b>	To date, the possibility of offering electronic documentation to persons involved in proceedings has not been implemented, because the technical solution has not yet been found. The biggest advantage of making such access possible is currently considered to be the saving in postage costs and the speeding up of proceedings. We hope to be able to allow at least partial access for persons involved in proceedings in the next few years.
<b>Slovakia</b>	This type of access is limited by the overall evolution in computerisation in Slovakia. As computerisation in Slovakia expands gradually, so we expect fresh requests from persons not directly employed in the judicial system. Given the unsatisfactory state of data exchange in government and public administration, the top priority will be to deal with the interconnection of information systems at government level.

**C. Electronic communication with persons involved in proceedings**

**C.1. Transmission of documents: Electronic submission**

Submission of documents in electronic form with courts or public prosecutors is					
C.1.1. legally permissible (respectively a legislative or other rule is planned)					
C.1.2 implemented technically					
C.1.3. used (percentage):					
	Civil-law actions	Debt enforcement proceedings	Criminal proceedings	Administrative court proceedings	Other proceedings
<b>Belgium</b>	permissible	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	regulation planned and implemented, usage below 10 %	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Denmark</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned
<b>Germany</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Estonia</b>	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>Finland</b>	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>France</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	not permissible	regulation planned	Not specified
<b>Greece</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10 %	not specified	not specified	not specified	permissible and implemented, usage below 10 %
<b>United Kingdom</b>	permissible and implemented, usage 10–50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Ireland</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned			permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>Italy</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>Latvia</b>	not permissible	not permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	

<b>Lithuania</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not specified	not permissible
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	not permissible
<b>Austria</b>	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Poland</b>	planned	not permissible	not specified	not specified	not permissible
<b>Portugal</b>	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>Romania</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	not specified	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	permissible	regulation planned
<b>Spain</b>	regulation planned and implemented	regulation planned and implemented	regulation planned and implemented	regulation planned and implemented	regulation planned and implemented
<b>Czech Republik</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible
<b>Hungary</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	not permissible	regulation planned	regulation planned
<b>Cyprus</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible

not permissible	4	6	6	5	7
regulation planned	8	7	4	4	3
regulation planned and implemented	2	1	1	1	1
permissible	1	0	0	2	1
permissible and implemented	9	8	10	7	8
not specified	3	5	6	8	7

<b>C.1.4.</b> In the following individual types of proceedings an electronic submission of documents is not permissible and not planned in future:		2 MS
<b>Spain</b>	Proceedings of the Military Courts, which do not depend on the Ministry of Justice, although there is a chamber in the Supreme Court ("Military Chamber") and it is computerised.	
<b>Greece</b>	Adoption proceedings are considered unsuitable.	

<b>C.1.5.</b> In the following individual types of proceedings an electronic submission of documents is permissible in principle but excluded for certain types of documents:		1 MS
	Proceedings	Type of document
<b>United Kingdom</b>	divorce cases	Principal exclusions are cases where the original documentation is considered imperative eg divorce cases where the original marriage certificate is required to be produced and retained by the court.

**C.1.6. Possibility of change of transmission method at a later stage.**

	<b>C.1.6.</b> Where proceedings were initiated electronically or by conventional means, it is still possible to change the method of transmission at a later stage:
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	no regulation
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes
<b>France</b>	✓ partially
<b>Greece</b>	not specified
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	no regulation

Italy	✓ Yes
Latvia	✓ Yes
Lithuania	not specified
Luxembourg	not applicable
Malta	no data received
Netherlands	⊘ No
Austria	✓ Yes
Poland	✓ Yes
Portugal	✓ Yes
Romania	not specified
Sweden	✓ Yes
Slovakia	✓ Yes
Slovenia	✓ Yes
Spain	✓ Yes
Czech Republik	⊘ No
Hungary	not applicable
Cyprus	not applicable

Overview for table C.1.6.:	
Change allowed	16
Change not allowed	2
Change not regulated	2
not specified / no data received	4
not applicable	3

**C.1.7. and C.1.8. Inducements for electronic transmission of documents.**

C.1.7. / C.1.8. There are types of proceedings where persons involved who are not part of the judicial system are offered inducements for transmitting documents to the judicial authorities electronically:			
	Inducements are offered	Proceedings	Type of inducement
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes		financial, more swift procedures
<b>Bulgaria</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Denmark</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Germany</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Estonia</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Finland</b>	⊗ No		
<b>France</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Greece</b>	⊗ No		
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes	CCBC (county court bulk centre)	fee discount
<b>Ireland</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Italy</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Latvia</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Lithuania</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not applicable		
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes	debt enforcement proceedings	increased reward for attorneys
		business register	reduction of court fees
<b>Poland</b>	⊗ No		
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes	all types	10 % reduction of court fees

Romania	⊘ No		
Sweden	⊘ No		
Slovakia	✓ Yes	commercial register cases	lower court fees
Slovenia	⊘ No		
Spain	⊘ No		
Czech Republik	⊘ No		
Hungary	✓ Yes		
Cyprus	not applicable	company registration proceedings	lower court fees, shorter procedures

Overview for table C.1.7.:	
Inducements	6
No inducements	18
not applicable	2
not specified / no data received	1

C.1.9. What experience do you have of electronic transmission of documents to the judicial authorities by persons involved in proceedings who are not directly employed in the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc)?	
<b>Austria</b>	Difficult implementation phase, followed by high demands (in 2006 7.2 million documents were transmitted electronically). Widely accepted.
<b>Finland</b>	The use of e-mail by private persons and companies has been expanding rapidly in the last few years.
<b>Netherlands</b>	In general, both parties, lawyers and judicial authorities are willing to participate in experiments concerning electronic transmission of documents.
<b>Italy</b>	Saves time and resources for lawyers and clerks in going to the offices and queuing and the counters
<b>Estonia</b>	In conjunction with the growth in popularity of use of the digital signature, the number of documents presented to the court electronically has also increased. It is free, and speedier, to send documents by electronic means.
<b>Portugal</b>	Experience has been positive, but it should be noted that e-mail is not the most technically appropriate means. Recent experience shows that the use of other forms of electronic transmission, particularly web forms, has clear advantages.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	There has been enthusiastic support for electronic initiatives from some court users. However, there has been some reluctance to embrace electronic ways of working by parts of the legal profession



## C.2. Transmission of documents: electronic "way back"

	Transmission of documents in electronic form by courts or public prosecutors to persons involved who are not part of the judicial system is				
	C.2.1. legally permissible (respectively a legislative or other rule is planned)				
	C.2.2. implemented technically				
	C.2.3. used (percentage):				
	Civil-law actions	Debt enforcement proceedings	Criminal proceedings	Administrative court proceedings	Other proceedings
<b>Belgium</b>	permissible	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	regulation planned and implemented, usage 10-50%	regulation planned	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Denmark</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>Germany</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	not permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Estonia</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Finland</b>	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>France</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	regulation planned	not specified
<b>Greece</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not specified	not specified	not specified	permissible and implemented
<b>United Kingdom</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible	permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Ireland</b>	not specified	not specified			not specified
<b>Italy</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Latvia</b>	not permissible	not permissible	permissible and implemented	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not specified	not permissible
<b>Malta</b>	not permissible	not permissible	no data received	no data received	no data received

<b>Netherlands</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Austria</b>	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage at 50-90%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%
<b>Poland</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	permissible	not permissible
<i>Portugal</i>	permissible	not specified	not specified	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible
<b>Romania</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	regulation planned
<b>Slovenia</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	permissible and implemented	regulation planned
<b>Spain</b>	regulation planned	not permissible	regulation planned and implemented	regulation planned and implemented	regulation planned and implemented
<b>Czech Republik</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible
<b>Hungary</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	not permissible	regulation planned	regulation planned
<b>Cyprus</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible

Not permissible	7	8	9	6	7
Regulation planned	4	4	1	2	3
Regulation planned and implemented	1	0	1	1	1
permissible	3	3	2	3	2
Permissible and implemented	9	6	7	8	6
Not specified	3	6	7	7	8

<b>C.2.4.</b> In the following individual types of proceedings an electronic transmission of documents by judicial authorities to persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system are not permissible in principle, and not planned in future:		2 MS
<b>Latvia</b>	According to Electronic Documents Law it is not applicable to transactions in the field of family law and inheritance law.	
<b>Spain</b>	Proceedings of the Military Courts, which do not depend on the Ministry of Justice, although there is a chamber in the Supreme Court ("Military Chamber").	

<b>C.2.5.</b> Types of individual proceedings where electronic transmission of documents to persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system is legally permissible in principle but excluded for certain types of documents:		5 MS
<b>Finland</b>	civil and criminal proceedings: summons (instructions from the court to the defendant to present a defence to the claim or charge) cannot be sent electronically	
<b>Latvia</b>	All court proceedings: Parts of documents containing personal data. These documents can be obtained in compliance with specific procedures	
<b>Austria</b>	All court proceedings: Rsa, personal notification (e. g. actions)	
<b>Portugal</b>	All court proceedings: Initial court summons	
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Criminal proceedings: Any document that the transmitting of it would contravene the Data Protection Act 1998.	

## C 2.6. Experiences

<b>C.2.6.</b> What experiences do you have of electronic transmission of documents by the judicial authorities to persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system? (You may make general comments here)	
<b>Austria</b>	Widely accepted; high demand and usage; considerable potential for cost reduction
<b>Finland</b>	Increasing number of documents are being sent by (secure) e-mail to the parties.
<b>Italy</b>	Saves time and resources for court clerks and officers in notifying court communications to layers
<b>Estonia</b>	The electronic transmission of documents is a problem in cases where the person has not provided an email address to the court or other judicial authority. Currently in Estonia it is not possible to oblige people to have an email address. There is a problem with procedural documents which have to be delivered in person. It is hardly possible to use the electronic delivery method in such cases.
<b>Portugal</b>	E-mail transmission is technically inadvisable, given the system's unreliability and the technical impossibility of guaranteeing receipt. Interaction via web applications would be wiser, though we do not yet have any practical experience of such interaction.

### C.3. Other comments on electronic communication

**C.3.1.** In the following Member States there are technical standards for electronic transmission of documents between the judicial authorities and persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system:

Belgium	⊘ No
Bulgaria	⊘ No
Denmark	⊘ No
Germany	✓ Yes
Estonia	✓ Yes
Finland	✓ Yes
France	✓ Yes
Greece	✓ Yes
United Kingdom	✓ Yes
Ireland	⊘ No
Italy	✓ Yes
Latvia	✓ Yes
Lithuania	⊘ No
Luxembourg	not applicable
Malta	no data received
Netherlands	✓ Yes
Austria	✓ Yes
Poland	⊘ No
Portugal	⊘ No
Romania	⊘ No
Sweden	⊘ No

**C.3.2.** Compliance with technical standards required by law or under other rules:

no uniform regulation
no uniform regulation
⊘ No
✓ Yes
⊘ No
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
no uniform regulation
not applicable
not applicable
no data received
⊘ No
✓ Yes

<b>Slovakia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Spain</b>	⊘ No
<b>Czech Republik</b>	⊘ No
<b>Hungary</b>	⊘ No
<b>Cyprus</b>	not applicable

✓ Yes
no uniform regulation
not applicable

<b>Overview I for table C.3.1.</b>
In the following Member States there are technical standards for electronic transmission of documents between the judicial authorities and persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system:
<b>Germany</b>
<b>Estonia</b>
<b>Finland</b>
<b>France</b>
<b>Greece</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>
<b>Italy</b>
<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Netherlands</b>
<b>Austria</b>
<b>Slovakia</b>
<b>Slovenia</b>

<b>Overview II for table C.3.1.</b>
In the following Member States there are NO technical standards for electronic transmission of documents between the judicial authorities and persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system:
<i>Belgium</i>
<b>Bulgaria</b>
<b>Denmark</b>
<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Lithuania</b>
<b>Poland</b>
<b>Portugal</b>
<b>Romania</b>
<b>Sweden</b>
<b>Spain</b>
<b>Czech Republik</b>
<b>Hungary</b>

**Table C.3.3. Method of transmission of electronic documents to the recipient.**

	C.3.3. The electronic documents are transmitted:		
	via a separate network (extranet)	via the internet	other solution
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Bulgaria</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Denmark</b>			via e-mail or fax
<b>Germany</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Estonia</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
<b>France</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Greece</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>United Kingdom</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Ireland</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Italy</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Latvia</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not applicable		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not applicable		
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
<b>Poland</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Romania</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Slovakia</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	

Slovenia		✓ Yes	
Spain	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
Czech Republik		✓ Yes	
Hungary	not applicable		
Cyprus	not applicable		
<b>Total</b>	5	17	1

**C.3.4. to 6. Possibility of "machine-machine communication" (transmission in structured form)**

	C.3.4. Incoming electronic data are transmitted in structured form for automated further processing	C.3.5. The following parts of the data sent are transmitted in structured form:		C.3.6. Technical implementation of the structuring of the data.
		The (meta-)data (e.g. names, addresses, dates, reference numbers, etc.)	The documents (e.g. reasons for a judgement, grounds for a claim, etc.)	
Belgium	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	planned
Bulgaria	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
Denmark	⊘ No			
Germany	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		Use of an electronic form and Data-exchange format such as XML
Estonia	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Data-exchange format, such as XML
Finland	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Use of an electronic form, Data-exchange format, Other: structured ASCII file
France	partially	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Data-exchange format such as XML
Greece		✓ Yes		Data-exchange format such as XML

<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Use of an electronic form and Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Ireland</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Italy</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Latvia</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	⊘ No	Use of an electronic form and Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Lithuania</b>	not applicable			
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	⊘ No	Use of an electronic form
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Poland</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Use of an electronic form and Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Romania</b>	⊘ No			
<b>Sweden</b>	✓ partially	✓ Yes	⊘ No	Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Slovakia</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Electronic form and Data-exchange format such as XML
<b>Slovenia</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	Electronic form, data-exchange format , other: structured ASCII file
<b>Spain</b>	⊘ No			
<b>Czech Republik</b>	⊘ No			
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Cyprus</b>	not applicable			
<b>Total</b>	15	16	11	Predominantly: Data-exchange format such as XML



### C.3.7. The origin of technical solutions for electronic communication

C.3.7. The origin of technical solution is used for the electronic transmission of documents between the judicial system and persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system			
	Software developed specifically for judicial use	Standard market software	both
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Denmark</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Germany</b>			✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Finland</b>			✓ Yes
<b>France</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Greece</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>United Kingdom</b>			✓ Yes
<b>Ireland</b>			✓ Yes
<b>Italy</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Latvia</b>			✓ Yes
<b>Lithuania</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>			✓ Yes
<b>Austria</b>		✓ Yes	
<b>Poland</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Romania</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>	✓ Yes		
<b>Slovakia</b>			✓ Yes

Slovenia		✓ Yes	
Spain	✓ Yes		
Czech Republik			✓ Yes
Hungary	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Cyprus	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Total</b>	6	4	8

#### C.4. Signatures

**C.4.1.** The authenticity and integrity of the data sent in the course of electronic communication between courts, judicial authorities and persons involved in proceedings who are not part of the judicial system is ensured by the following protection techniques:

These techniques are particularly used in the following types of documents:

	Simple signature within the meaning of Article 2, point 1, of the Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on a Community framework for electronic signatures (Signatures Directive).	Advanced electronic signature within the meaning of Article 2, point 2, of the Signatures Directive.	Advanced electronic signature within the meaning of Article 5(1) of the Signatures Directive (qualified signature)	Other protection techniques:
Belgium	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
Bulgaria		✓ Yes		
Denmark			✓ only for public prosecutors	
Germany		✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
Estonia			✓ Yes	
Finland	✓ Yes			
France				✓ Yes
Greece	PKI planned			
United Kingdom	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes

Ireland	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
Italy			✓ Yes	
Latvia	not specified	not specified	✓ Yes	not specified
Lithuania	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
Luxembourg	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
Netherlands				
Austria	✓ Yes	✓ Yes		✓ Yes
Poland			✓ Yes	
Portugal		✓ Yes		
Romania				
Sweden				
Slovakia				✓ Yes
Slovenia			✓ Yes	✓ Yes
Spain	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes	
Czech Republik	✓ Yes			
Hungary		✓ Yes	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
Cyprus	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Total</b>	6	8	11	6

## C.5. Video-conferencing

In the following Member States the usage of video-conferencing techniques allowing judges and prosecutors to conduct proceedings without some of the persons involved being physically present is

**C.5.1.** legally permissible (respectively a legal or other rule is planned),

**C.5.2** implemented technically,

**C.5.3.** used (in percent):

	Civil-law actions	Criminal proceedings	Administrative court proceedings	Other proceedings
<b>Belgium</b>	not permissible	permissible and implemented	not specified	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not permissible	permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Denmark</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>Germany</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Estonia</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage at 10-50%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10 %	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible	permissible
<b>France</b>	permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible
<b>Greece</b>	not permissible	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>United Kingdom</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible	permissible
<b>Ireland</b>	implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%		implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Italy</b>	not permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Latvia</b>	not permissible	permissible	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not permissible	permissible	not permissible	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received

<b>Netherlands</b>	not permissible	planned	planned	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Austria</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	Proceeding does not exist	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Poland</b>	planned	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Portugal</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Romania</b>	not permissible	permissible and implemented	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Slovakia</b>	not permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	regulation planned	regulation planned	regulation planned	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%
<b>Spain</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>Czech Republik</b>	regulation planned	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Hungary</b>	regulation planned	permissible and implemented	regulation planned	regulation planned
<b>Cyprus</b>	not permissible	permissible and implemented, usage below 10%	not permissible	not permissible

not permissible	10	0	9	8
planned	4	2	3	1
permissible	3	5	4	5
permissible and implemented	8	17	5	7
not specified	2	3	6	6

**C.5.4.** Persons involved who may or must participate through video-conferencing so that it is not necessary for them to be physically present:

Type of proceedings	Type of person involved							
	Judge	Party	Lawyer	Expert	Witness	Interpreter	Defendant	Public Prosecutor
Civil-law actions	3 MS	6 MS	6 MS	8 MS	8 MS	5 MS		
Enforcement proceedings	2 MS	5 MS	5 MS	6 MS	6 MS	4 MS		
Criminal proceedings	5 MS		9 MS	13 MS	18 MS	10 MS	11 MS	7 MS
Criminal enforcement proceedings	2 MS		3 MS	3 MS	5 MS	3 MS	3 MS	3 MS
Administrative court proceedings	4 MS	6 MS	6 MS	7 MS	7 MS	5 MS		
Administrative enforcement proceedings	1 MS	2 MS	2 MS	3 MS	3 MS	1 MS		
Labour court proceedings	1 MS	4 MS	4 MS	5 MS	5 MS	3 MS		
Financial court proceedings	1 MS	2 MS	2 MS	3 MS	3 MS	1 MS		
Social court proceedings	1 MS	4 MS	4 MS	6 MS	6 MS	3 MS		

### C.5.5. Experience of cross-border use of video-conferencing in the judicial system

<b>C.5.5.</b> The following Member States have experience of cross-border use of video-conferencing in the judicial system:
<b>Belgium</b>
<b>Germany</b>
<b>Estonia</b>
<b>Finland</b>
<b>France</b>
<b>Greece</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>
<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Netherlands</b>
<b>Austria</b>
<b>Poland</b>
<b>Portugal</b>
<b>Romania</b>
<b>Sweden</b>
<b>Slovenia</b>

<b>C.5.6.</b> What experience do you have of the use of video-conferencing in the judicial system? (You may make general comments here)	
<b>Ireland</b>	Experience has been satisfactory. Very successful in relation to juvenile witnesses and victims in criminal trials in particular. Also very successful in taking evidence from witnesses abroad.
<b>Germany</b>	Die gerichtliche Praxis hat im Allgemeinen gute Erfahrungen mit dem Einsatz der Videokonferenztechnik, sofern entsprechende Schulungen erfolgten. Darüber hinaus dient der Einsatz dieser Technik insbesondere in der verwaltungs- und finanzgerichtlichen Praxis der Senkung der Verfahrenskosten und des zeitlichen Aufwands durch die Zuschaltung von Verfahrensbeteiligten und wirkt sich effizienzsteigernd aus.
<b>Austria</b>	Bisher sehr positive Erfahrungen und allseits positive Resonanz (seitens der Richter, der Rechtsanwälte und auch der Zeugen).

<b>Netherlands</b>	Experiments are about to start at the court of Maastricht, so we have no recent experience. In 1995, 1999 and 2001 experiments have been set up at different courts. The experiences were considered to be positive, although the equipment at that time was not as good as it is nowadays.
<b>Slovenia</b>	In general, the experiences have been very positive – the use of video-conferencing shortened the length of the procedure. However, there is a certain cost involved (app. 200 euro for the hire of equipment).
<b>Cyprus</b>	The aim of the Witness Protection Law 2001 (Law 95(I)/2001), as its title suggests, is the protection of witnesses in criminal proceedings, not the saving of time and expense. Video conferencing is one of the ways of giving evidence that is provided for in this law. Only the witness may not be physically present.
<b>Poland</b>	Very useful, as it saves time and money. In principle, the courts don't reject it.
<b>France</b>	Videoconferencing is widely promoted but its use is left to the discretion of judges who do not use it as a matter of course. Before administrative courts 12 videoconferences took place in 2006. The users appear satisfied.
<b>Estonia</b>	<p>The video-conferencing system has been surprisingly well-received. This has proved to be possible thanks to awareness-raising about the use of this method, very user-friendly and reliable technical solutions, training, and practical and regular occasions for its use arising above all in criminal proceedings.</p> <p>The noteworthy aspect of the solution for holding long-distance court sittings does not lie so much in the video-conferencing technology used, but in the fact that its introduction has been accompanied by a change in the organisation of work, making it appreciably faster, easier, more secure and also cheaper.</p> <p>The use of video-conferencing for court sittings has made it possible to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) speed up the processing of court cases involving detainees and foreign countries;</li> <li>(2) reduce the costs for the state connected with the transport of the parties;</li> <li>(3) avoid the security risks inherent in transporting prisoners to court;</li> <li>(4) make the processing of the court case easier for the parties (by freeing the parties from the inconvenience of having to come to court)</li> </ol>
<b>Portugal</b>	Positive. It has been helpful in encouraging citizens to cooperate with the justice system.
<b>Sweden</b>	The courts are very interested in using this technique. At first there was some resistance because the technology was unstable. As the technology improved and stabilised, use has increased, especially in the last year.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	<p>This is being used more often and all parties are becoming used to the procedure.</p> <p>It is used extensively in the criminal courts for video bail and remand hearings. It is used for special measures covering vulnerable witnesses etc;</p> <p>It is also used for witnesses in Family Courts</p>



## D. Electronic Registers

### Individual Overviews for each type of Register

	Commercial Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	centralised	permissible and imposed	IP estimated use 10-50%	permissible and imposed	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible and imposed	DT estimated use more than 90%
<b>Estonia</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible	IP / DT estimated use 10-50%
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	both centralised and decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	permissible	IP
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	not available				

	<b>Commercial Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Latvia</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Lithuania</b>	not available				
<b>Luxembourg</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible	DT estimated use 10-50%
<b>Poland</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%

	Commercial Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovakia</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	planned	IP
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	permissible and imposed	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Spain</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	permissible	not specified
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Cyprus</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	not permissible	not applicable

<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 16 Decentralized: 5 Both: 1 Not specified: 3 Not available: 2 Not permissible: 2	Permissible: 16 Permissible and imposed: 2 Not specified: 5 Not available: 2 IP: 16 IP / DT: 2	DT: 0 Not applicable: 2 Not specified: 5 Not available: 2 Not permissible: 11 Permissible: 6	Permissible and imposed: 2 Planned: 1 Not specified: 5 Not available: 2 IP: 4	IP/DT: 1 DT: 2 Not applicable: 11 Not specified: 7 Not available: 2
--------------	--	---	---	---	---

	<b>Business Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	centralised	permissible and imposed	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible	1.1.1.1.
<b>Estonia</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	both centralised and decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	permissible	IP
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>United Kingdom</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	Not specified	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable

	<b>Business Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Lithuania</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Luxembourg</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Austria</b>	not available				
<b>Poland</b>	not available				
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Romania</b>	not available				
<b>Sweden</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%
<b>Slovakia</b>	not available				

	Business Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not applicable
<b>Spain</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not available				
<b>Hungary</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT estimated use less than 10%	permissible	DT implemented
<b>Cyprus</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	not permissible	not applicable

<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 12  Decentralized: 3  Both: 1  Not specified: 6  Not available: 5  Not permissible: 2	Permissible: 11  Permissible and imposed: 1  Not specified: 8  Not available: 5  IP: 7  IP/DT: 3	DT: 2  Not applicable: 2  Not specified: 8  Not available: 5  Not permissible: 11  Permissible: 4	Permissible and imposed: 0  Planned: 1  Not specified: 7  Not available: 5  IP: 2	IP/DT: 0  DT: 1  Not applicable: 12  Not specified: 7  Not available: 5
--------------	--	--	---	---	---

	Land Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT estimated use 10-50%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Denmark</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	planned	not applicable
<b>Germany</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%	permissible	not specified
<b>Estonia</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible	DT estimated use less than 10%
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	decentralised	planned	Not applicable	planned	Not applicable
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	by providers which are not part of the judicial system	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	not specified estimated use 50-90%	not specified	not specified

	Land Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Lithuania</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Luxembourg</b>	centralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	planned	not applicable
<b>Poland</b>	centralised	planned	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	centralised	permissible	DT estimated use more than 90%	permissible	DT
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic				



	Land Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	permitted and imposed	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Spain</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Hungary</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP / DT	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Cyprus</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable

1.1.1.2.

<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 17 Decentralized: 7 Not specified: 2 nonelectronic: 1 Not permissible: 5 Permissible: 14	Permissible and imposed: 1 Planned: 2 Not specified: 4 nonelectronic: 1 IP: 10 IP/DT: 3	DT: 1 Not applicable: 7 Not specified: 5 nonelectronic: 1 Not permissible: 16 Permissible: 3	Permissible and imposed: 0 Planned: 3 Not specified: 4 nonelectronic: 1 IP: 0	IP/DT: 0 DT: 2 Not applicable: 19 Not specified: 5 nonelectronic: 1
--------------	--	--	---	---	---

	<b>Experts Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not available				
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	not available				
<b>Estonia</b>	not available				
<b>Finland</b>	not available				
<b>France</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	not available				
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	not specified estimated use 10-50%	not permissible	not applicable

	Experts Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	not available				
<b>Lithuania</b>	not available				
<b>Luxembourg</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	permissible	IP
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible	DT estimated use less than 10%
<b>Poland</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>	not available				
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Slovakia</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	permitted and imposed	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable

	Experts Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50- 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Hungary</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	permissible	DT
<b>Cyprus</b>	not available				

1.1.1.3.

1.1.1.4.

<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 8  Decentralized: 5  Not specified: 4  nonelectronic:1  not available: 9  Not permissible: 6 Permissible: 6	Permissible and imposed: 1 Not specified: 4 nonelectronic: 1 not available: 9 IP: 6 IP/DT: 0	DT: 0  Not applicable: 6  Not specified: 5  nonelectronic:1 not available: 9 Not permissible: 10	Permissible: 3  Permissible and imposed: 0 Not specified: 4 nonelectronic: 1 not available: 9 IP: 1	IP/DT: 0  DT: 2  Not applicable: 10 Not specified: 4 nonelectronic:1 not available: 9
--------------	---	---	--	---	--

	<b>Compulsory Auction Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Estonia</b>	not available				
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	not available				
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not permissible	not applicable	not specified	not specified
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	not available				
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	not specified estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable

	<b>Compulsory Auction Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	not available				
<b>Lithuania</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	not available				
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Poland</b>	not available				
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	permissible	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic				

	Compulsory Auction Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovenia</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50 - 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not available				
<b>Hungary</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Cyprus</b>	not available				

	1.1.1.5.			1.1.1.6.	
<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 5 Decentralized: 3 Not specified: 9 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 8 Not permissible: 1 Permissible: 8	Permissible and imposed: 0 Not specified: 8 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 8 IP: 5 IP/DT: 1	DT: 0 Not applicable: 1 Not specified: 10 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 8 Not permissible: 10	Permissible: 1 Permissible and imposed: 0 Not specified: 6 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 8 IP: 0	IP/DT: 0 DT: 1 Not applicable: 10 Not specified: 6 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 8

	Enforcement Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	not permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	not available				
<b>Estonia</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use less than 10%	not specified	IP/DT estimated use less than 10%
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	not available				
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	decentralised	permissible and imposed	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	not available				
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	not specified estimated use less than 10%	not permissible	not applicable



	Enforcement Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Lithuania</b>	centralised	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	not available				
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	permissible	not specified	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Poland</b>	not available				
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	permissible	DT estimated use 10 - 50%	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable

	Enforcement Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovenia</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not available				
<b>Hungary</b>	both centralised and decentralised	permissible	DT estimated use 50 - 90%	permissible	DT estimated use less than 10%
<b>Cyprus</b>	not available				

	I.I.I.7.			I.I.I.8.	
<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 7 Decentralized: 4 Both: 1 Not specified: 7 nonelectronic:1 not available: 7 Not permissible: 5	Permissible: 5 Permissible and imposed: 1 Not specified: 8 nonelectronic: 1 not available: 7 IP: 3 IP/DT: 0	DT: 2 Not applicable: 4 Not specified: 10 nonelectronic:1 not available: 7 Not permissible: 9	Permissible: 3 Permissible and imposed: 0 Not specified: 7 nonelectronic: 1 not available: 7 IP: 0	IP/DT: 1 DT: 3 Not applicable: 9 Not specified: 5 nonelectronic:1 not available: 7

	<b>Societies Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	permissible	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Estonia</b>	centralised	permissible	not specified	permissible	IP/DT estimated use 10-50%
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	permissible	IP	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	not available				
<b>Italy</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified

	<b>Societies Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Lithuania</b>	not available				
<b>Luxembourg</b>	centralised	permissible	IP/DT	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	not available				
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Poland</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic				

	<b>Societies Register</b>				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Spain</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	not available				
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Cyprus</b>	not available				

L.1.1.9.

L.1.1.10.

<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 10  Decentralized: 2  Not specified: 6  nonelectronic:4  not available: 5  Not permissible: 3 Permissible: 6	Permissible and imposed: 0  Not specified: 9  nonelectronic: 4  not available: 5  IP: 2  IP/DT: 1	DT: 1  Not applicable: 3  Not specified: 11  nonelectronic:4  not available: 5  Not permissible: 9	Permissible: 1  Permissible and imposed: 0  Not specified: 8  nonelectronic: 4  not available: 5  IP: 0	IP/DT: 1  DT: 0  Not applicable: 9  Not specified: 8  nonelectronic:4  not available: 5
--------------	--	---	--	---	---

	Debtors Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not available				
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	decentralised	permissible	DT estimated use 10-50%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Estonia</b>	centralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	permissible	not specified	not permissible	not applicable
<b>France</b>	decentralised	permissible	IP estimated use 10-50%	partially permissible	not specified
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>United Kingdom</b>	decentralised	permissible and imposed	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Ireland</b>	not available				
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	permissible	not specified estimated use less than 10%	not permissible	not applicable

	Debtors Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Latvia</b>	not available				
<b>Lithuania</b>	not available				
<b>Luxembourg</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	centralised	permissible	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Austria</b>	not available				
<b>Poland</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	decentralised	not permissible	not applicable	not permissible	not applicable

	Debtors Register				
	Maintenance	Right of consultation		Right of proposal	
		legal admissibility	technical solution and usage	legal admissibility	technical solution and usage
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	permissible and imposed	DT estimated use more than 90%	not permissible	not applicable
<b>Spain</b>	decentralised	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republik</b>	nonelectronic				
<b>Hungary</b>	both, centralised and decentralised	permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%	permissible	DT estimated use less than 10%
<b>Cyprus</b>	not available				

I.I.I.I.

I.I.I.I.

<b>Total</b>	Centralised: 6 Decentralized: 8 Both: 1 Not specified: 4 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 6 Not permissible: 3	Permissible: 7 Permissible and imposed: 2 Not specified: 7 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 6 IP: 3 IP/DT: 0	DT: 4 Not applicable: 3 Not specified: 9 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 6 Not permissible: 10	Permissible: 3 Permissible and imposed: 0 Not specified: 6 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 6 IP: 0	IP/DT: 0 DT: 2 Not applicable: 10 Not specified: 7 nonelectronic: 2 not available: 6
--------------	---	---	---	---	---



## D.1. Maintenance of judicial registers

**D.1.1.** Which judicial registers in your country are maintained electronically and how are they maintained?

**N.B.:** "centralised" means that there is only one authority in your country which manages the electronic register in question. "decentralised" on the other hand means that there is e.g. a separate authority for each region, which manages the register in question at regional level.

	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register
<i>Belgium</i>	centralised	not specified	centralised	decentralised
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised		centralised	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	centralised	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	decentralised	centralised	decentralised	
<i>Estonia</i>	centralised	not specified	centralised	
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	
<b>France</b>	both centralised and decentralised	both centralised and decentralised	decentralised	nonelectronic
<b>Greece</b>	decentralised	not specified	decentralised	decentralised
<b>United Kingdom</b>	decentralised	decentralised	decentralised	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>		by providers which are not part of the judicial system	by providers which are not part of the judicial system	
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	decentralised	decentralised	decentralised
<b>Latvia</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	
<b>Lithuania</b>		centralised	centralised	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	decentralised
<i>Malta</i>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	centralised
<b>Austria</b>	centralised		centralised	centralised
<b>Poland</b>	centralised		centralised	decentralised
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	
<b>Romania</b>	centralised		centralised	centralised
<b>Sweden</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	centralised
<b>Slovakia</b>	centralised		nonelectronic	centralised
<b>Slovenia</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	centralised

<b>Spain</b>	decentralised	decentralised	decentralised	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>	centralised		centralised	centralised
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	centralised	decentralised	centralised
<b>Cyprus</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register

<b>D.1.1.</b>	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register
<i>Belgium</i>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	decentralised		nonelectronic	decentralised
<b>Estonia</b>		centralised	centralised	centralised
<b>Finland</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	centralised
<b>France</b>			nonelectronic	decentralised
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	decentralised	decentralised	decentralised
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	decentralised	not specified	decentralised
<b>Ireland</b>				
<b>Italy</b>	decentralised	decentralised	not specified	decentralised
<b>Latvia</b>		not specified	centralised	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not specified	centralised		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	centralised	decentralised
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>				centralised
<b>Austria</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	
<b>Poland</b>			nonelectronic	nonelectronic
<b>Portugal</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	centralised
<b>Romania</b>	centralised	centralised	centralised	centralised
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	centralised	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic	decentralised	nonelectronic	decentralised
<b>Slovenia</b>	decentralised	nonelectronic	centralised	centralised

Spain	not specified	not specified	decentralised	decentralised
Czech Republic				nonelectronic
Hungary	nonelectronic	both centralised and decentralised	not specified	both centralised and decentralised
Cyprus				
	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register

**D.1.2.** Are the decentralised registers networked with one another?

**N.B.:** "Networking" or "networked" means that the registers are linked by a dedicated technical connection via which they can communicate.

Belgium	⊘ No
Germany	✓ Yes
France	✓ Yes
Greece	⊘ No
United Kingdom	⊘ No
Ireland	⊘ No
Italy	✓ Yes
Luxembourg	⊘ No
Malta	no data received
Netherlands	⊘ No
Poland	⊘ No
Sweden	✓ Yes
Slovakia	✓ Yes
Slovenia	⊘ No
Spain	⊘ No
Hungary	✓ Yes

Overview of table D.1.2.:	
yes	6
no	9
not specified / no data received	1

**D.1.3. If yes, how is networking of the decentralised registers implemented?**

	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register
<i>Germany</i>	enquiry	not specified	enquiry	
<b>France</b>	by a specific platform	not specified	mutual data exchange and automated data inquiries	nonelectronic
<b>Italy</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Slovakia</b>	not applicabe		nonelectronic	not applicable
<b>Hungary</b>	not applicable	not applicable	automated data inquiries	not applicable
	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register
<b>Germany</b>	not specified		enquiry	not specified
<b>France</b>			nonelectronic	not specified
<b>Italy</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Sweden</b>	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic	not sepcified	nonelectronic	not specified
<b>Hungary</b>	nonelectronic	individual data inquiries and consultation	not specified	mutual data exchanges

## D.2. Right of consultation (retrieval rights)

	D.2.1. In the case of which registers is electronic consultation by persons who are not directly employed in the judicial system (e.g. parties, lawyers, etc.) legally permissible?			
	D.2.2. Can such registers only be consulted electronically (use imposed)?			
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register
<i>Belgium</i>	permissible and imposed	not specified	permissible	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	permissible		permissible	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	permissible	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	permissible	permissible and imposed	permissible	
<b>Estonia</b>	permissible	not specified	permissible	
<b>Finland</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	
<b>France</b>	permissible	permissible	planned	nonelectronic
<b>Greece</b>	not permissible	not specified	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>		not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Italy</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>Latvia</b>	not permissible	not permissible	permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>		permissible	permissible	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	permissible	permissible	not specified	permissible
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	not permissible
<b>Austria</b>	permissible		permissible	permissible
<b>Poland</b>	permissible		planned	not permissible
<b>Portugal</b>	permissible	permissible	not permissible	
<b>Romania</b>	permissible		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	not permissible
<b>Slovakia</b>	permissible		nonelectronic	permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	permissible and imposed	not specified	permitted and imposed	permitted and imposed
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>	permissible		permissible	permissible
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>Cyprus</b>	permissible	permissible	not permissible	
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register

D.2.1. D.2.2.	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register
<i>Belgium</i>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	permissible	not permissible	permissible	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	permissible		nonelectronic	permissible
<b>Estonia</b>		permissible	permissible	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	permissible	not permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>France</b>			nonelectronic	permissible
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>				
<b>Italy</b>	permissible	permissible	not specified	permissible
<b>Latvia</b>		not specified	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not specified	not specified		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	permissible	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>				permissible
<b>Austria</b>	permissible	permissible	not specified	
<b>Poland</b>			nonelectronic	nonelectronic
<b>Portugal</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	permissible
<b>Romania</b>	permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	permissible	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic	not permissible	nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	permissible	nonelectronic	not specified	permitted and imposed
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>				nonelectronic
<b>Hungary</b>	nonelectronic	permissible	not specified	permissible
<b>Cyprus</b>				
	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register

**D.2.3.** If electronic consultation by persons involved who are not directly employed in the judicial system (e.g. parties, lawyers, etc.) is permissible, how is this organised and implemented technically?

**D.2.4.** How many of the consultations are already being conducted electronically where use is optional?

In this table **IP** means "Internet portal", **DT** means "Data transmission"

	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register
<b>Belgium</b>	IP estimated use 10-50%	not specified	IP	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%		IP / DT estimated use 10-50%	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified		IP estimated use more than 90%	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	IP estimated use more than 90%	IP estimated use more than 90%	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%	
<b>Estonia</b>	IP estimated use more than 90%	not specified	IP estimated use more than 90%	
<b>Finland</b>	IP	IP	IP	
<b>France</b>	IP estimated use 10 – 50 %	IP estimated use 10 – 50 %	planned	nonelectronic
<b>Greece</b>	not permissible	not specified	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>		not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Italy</b>	IP estimated use 50-90%	IP estimated use 50-90%	technical organization not specified estimated use 50-90%	technical organization not specified estimated use 10-50%
<b>Latvia</b>	not permissible	not permissible	IP estimated use 50-90%	

<b>Lithuania</b>		IP / DT	IP	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	IP / DT	IP / DT	not specified	IP
<b>Malta</b>	no data received		no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	IP estimated use more than 90%	IP estimated use more than 90%	IP estimated use more than 90%	not permissible
<b>Austria</b>	IP estimated use more than 90%		IP estimated use more than 90%	IP estimated use more than 90%
<b>Poland</b>	IP estimated use less than 10%		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Portugal</b>	IP estimated use 10 -50%	DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	
<b>Romania</b>	IP		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	IP estimated use 50-90%	IP estimated use 50-90%	DT estimated use more than 90%	not permissible
<b>Slovakia</b>	IP estimated use 10-50%		nonelectronic	IP estimated use more than 90%
<b>Slovenia</b>	IP estimated use more than 90%	IP	IP estimated use more than 90%	IP estimated use more than 90%
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>	IP estimated use 50-90%		IP	IP estimated use 50-90%



<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	IP / DT estimated use less than 10%	IP / DT	IP
<b>Cyprus</b>	IP estimated use 10-50%	IP estimated use 10-50%	not permissible	
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register

<b>D.2.3. D.2.4.</b>	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Bulgaria</b>	IP / DT estimated use 50-90%	IP estimated use less than 10%	not specified	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	IP estimated use less than 10%		nonelectronic	DT estimated use 10-50%
<b>Estonia</b>		IP estimated use less than 10%	not specified	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	IP	not permissible	IP	not specified
<b>France</b>			nonelectronic	IP estimated use 10-50%
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	IP estimated use more than 90%	not specified	IP estimated use more than 90%

<b>Ireland</b>				
<b>Italy</b>	technical organization not specified estimated use 10-50%	technical organization not specified estimated use less than 10%	not specified	technical organization not specified estimated use less than 10%
<b>Latvia</b>		not specified	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not specified	not specified		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	IP / DT	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>				IP estimated use more than 90%
<b>Austria</b>	IP estimated use more than 90%	not specified	not specified	
<b>Poland</b>			nonelectronic	nonelectronic
<b>Portugal</b>	not specified	DT estimated use 10-50%	DT estimated use 50-90%	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Romania</b>	IP	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	IP estimated use 50-90%	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic	not permissible	nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	IP estimated use 50-90%	Non electronic	not specified	DT estimated use more than 90%
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified

<b>Czech Republic</b>				nonelectronic
<b>Hungary</b>	nonelectronic	DT estimated use 50-90%	not specified	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Cyprus</b>				
	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register

### D.3. Right of proposal (Input rights)

	<p><b>D.3.1.</b> In the case of which registers is the electronic proposal of entries, amendments or deletions by persons who are not directly employed in the judicial system (e.g. parties, lawyers, etc.) legally permissible?</p> <p><b>D.3.2.</b> Can this only be done electronically (use imposed)?</p>			
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register
<b>Belgium</b>	permissible and imposed	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not permissible		not permissible	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	planned	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	permissible and imposed	permissible	permissible	
<b>Estonia</b>	permissible	not specified	permissible	
<b>Finland</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>France</b>	permissible	permissible	planned	nonelectronic
<b>Greece</b>	not permissible	not specified	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Ireland</b>		not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Italy</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not specified	not permissible
<b>Latvia</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>		not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	permissible

<b>Austria</b>	permissible		planned	permissible
<b>Poland</b>	not permissible		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Portugal</b>	permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Romania</b>	not permissible		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	permissible	permissible	permissible	not permissible
<b>Slovakia</b>	planned		nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	not permissible	not specified	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>	permissible		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	permissible	not permissible	permissible
<b>Cyprus</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register

<b>D.3.1. D.3.2.</b>	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register
<i>Belgium</i>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	not permissible		nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Estonia</b>		not specified	permissible	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>France</b>			nonelectronic	partly permissible
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>				
<b>Italy</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not specified	not permissible
<b>Latvia</b>		not specified	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not permissible	not permissible		
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>				not permissible

<b>Austria</b>	permissible	permissible	not specified	
<b>Poland</b>			nonelectronic	nonelectronic
<b>Portugal</b>	not permissible	permissible	not permissible	permissible
<b>Romania</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic	not permissible	nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	not permissible	nonelectronic	not specified	not permissible
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>				nonelectronic
<b>Hungary</b>	nonelectronic	permissible	not specified	permissible
<b>Cyprus</b>				
	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register

If electronic proposal of entries, amendments or deletions by persons involved who are not directly employed in the legal system (e.g. parties, lawyers, etc.) is permissible:

**D.3.3.** How is this organised technically?

**D.3.4.** Has such organisation already been implemented technically?

**D.3.5.** Insofar as it has been implemented technically, how many of the proposals are being conducted electronically where use is optional?

	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register
<b>Belgium</b>	not specified	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not permissible		not permissible	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified		planned	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	DT estimated use more than 90%	not specified	not specified	
<b>Estonia</b>	IP / DT estimated use at 10- 50%	not specified	DT estimated use less than 10%	

<b>Finland</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>France</b>	IP	IP	planned	nonelectronic
<b>Greece</b>	not permissible	not specified	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>		not permissible	not permissible	
<i>Italy</i>	not permissible	not permissible	not specified	not permissible
<i>Latvia</i>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>		not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received		no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	IP
<b>Austria</b>	DT estimated use at 10- 50%		not permissible	DT estimated use less than 10%

<b>Poland</b>	not permissible		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Portugal</b>	IP estimated use less than 10%	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Romania</b>	not permissible		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Sweden</b>	IP estimated use less than 10%	IP estimated use less than 10%	DT	not permissible
<b>Slovakia</b>	IP		nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>	not specified		not permissible	not permissible
<b>Hungary</b>	not specified	DT Implemented	not permissible	DT
<b>Cyprus</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
	Commercial Register	Business Register	Land Register	Experts Register

D.3.3. D.3.4. D.3.5	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register
<b>Belgium</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>Bulgaria</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	
<b>Denmark</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Germany</b>	not permissible		nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Estonia</b>		IP / DT estimated use less than 10%	IP / DT estimated use at 10-50%	not specified
<b>Finland</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<i>France</i>			nonelectronic	not specified
<b>Greece</b>	not specified	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<b>United Kingdom</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Ireland</b>				
<b>Italy</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not specified	not permissible
<b>Latvia</b>		not specified	not permissible	
<b>Lithuania</b>	not permissible	not permissible		



<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<i>Malta</i>	no data received	no data received	no data received	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>				not permissible
<b>Austria</b>	DT estimated use 50-90%	DT estimated use 50-90%	not specified	
<b>Poland</b>			nonelectronic	nonelectronic
<b>Portugal</b>	not permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%	not permissible	DT estimated use 50-90%
<b>Romania</b>	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible	not permissible
<i>Sweden</i>	not specified	not specified	not permissible	not specified
<b>Slovakia</b>	nonelectronic	not permissible	nonelectronic	not permissible
<b>Slovenia</b>	not permissible	nonelectronic	not specified	not permissible
<b>Spain</b>	not specified	not specified	not specified	not specified
<b>Czech Republic</b>				nonelectronic
<b>Hungary</b>	nonelectronic	DT estimated use less than 10%	not specified	DT estimated use less than 10%
<b>Cyprus</b>				
	Compulsory Auction Register	Enforcement Register	Societies Register	Debtors Register

#### D.4. Inducements

<b>D.4.1.</b> The following Member States offer inducements for the use of electronic access to registers to persons involved who are not part of the judicial system (parties, lawyers, etc.):	
<b>Estonia</b>	Commercial Register, non-profit association and foundation register: Pre-completed forms and advice are available when applications are made via the portal Commercial Register: more rapid examination (by law at the latest on the next working day, but it has been publicly promised that they will be examined in two hours)
<b>Austria</b>	Deeds in the Business Register and Land Register: Reduced fees for complete electronic transmission of Deeds.
<b>Portugal</b>	Commercial Register: Quicker registration and lower costs
<b>Sweden</b>	Swifter proceedings, better quality
<b>Slovakia</b>	Lower court fees
<b>Hungary</b>	Business Register: Cheaper and shorter proceedings
<b>Cyprus</b>	Commercial Register, Business Register: Free access for simple electronic search

#### D.5. Technical implementation

	<b>D.5.1.</b> Are there technical standards required for electronic application for, consultation of and transmission of register extracts?	<b>D.5.2.</b> Is compliance with technical standards required by law or other rules?
<b>Belgium</b>	⊘ No	
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes (XML)	✓ Yes
<b>Denmark</b>	⊘ No	
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Partly (XJustiz, ISIS-MTT, OSCI)	not uniformly regulated
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes	✓ Yes
<b>Finland</b>	⊘ No	

France	✓ Yes; except for commercial registers
Greece	not specified
United Kingdom	⊗ No
Ireland	⊗ No
Italy	✓ Yes
Latvia	✓ Yes
Lithuania	✓ Yes
Luxembourg	not specified
Malta	no data received
Netherlands	⊗ No
Austria	✓ Yes
Poland	✓ Yes
Portugal	✓ Yes
Romania	⊗ No
Sweden	✓ partially
Slovakia	⊗ No
Slovenia	⊗ No
Spain	⊗ No
Czech Republic	⊗ No
Hungary	✓ Yes
Cyprus	⊗ No

✓ Yes; except for commercial registers
not specified
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
⊗ No
not specified
no data received
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
not uniformly regulated
✓ Yes

**Overview for table D.5.1.**

In the following member states there are technical standards for electronic application for, consultation of and transmission of register extracts:

<b>Bulgaria</b>
<b>Germany</b>
<b>Estonia</b>
<b>France</b>
<b>Italy</b>
<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Lithuania</b>
<b>Austria</b>
<b>Poland</b>
<b>Portugal</b>
<b>Sweden</b>
<b>Hungary</b>

**Overview for table D.5.1.**

In the following member states no technical standards exist for electronic application for, consultation of and transmission of register extracts:

<b>Belgium</b>
<b>Denmark</b>
<b>Finland</b>
<b>United Kingdom</b>
<b>Ireland</b>
<b>Netherlands</b>
<b>Romania</b>
<b>Slovakia</b>
<b>Slovenia</b>
<b>Spain</b>
<b>Czech Republic</b>
<b>Cyprus</b>

**D.5.3. What technical solution is used in electronic application for, consultation of and transmission of register extracts?**

	Software developed specifically for judicial use	Standard market software	both
<b>Belgium</b>		✓	
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓		
<b>Denmark</b>	✓		
<b>Germany</b>			✓
<b>Estonia</b>		✓	
<b>Finland</b>			✓
<b>France</b>	✓		
<b>Greece</b>	✓		
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓		

Ireland	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
Italy			✓
Latvia		✓	
Lithuania	✓		
Luxembourg	not specified	not specified	not specified
Malta	no data received	no data received	no data received
Netherlands		✓	
Austria		✓	
Poland	✓		
Portugal	✓		
Romania	✓		
Sweden			✓
Slovakia	✓		
Slovenia	✓		
Spain	✓		
Czech Republic		✓	
Hungary	✓		
Cyprus	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable
<b>Total</b>	13	6	4

### D.6.1. Erfahrungen

D.6.1. What experience do you have of the use of electronic judicial registers?	
<b>Österreich</b>	Since the 1980s registers have been the pilot area for eJustice in Austria. Working smoothly, all concerns about potential technical errors and failure were disproven. An apprehended loss of legal certainty did not occur, to the contrary there were considerable improvements through easier access and more transparency.
<b>Finnland</b>	The land register and business register (company register) are being used intensively by private citizens, banks, insurance companies, real estate agents, etc.
<b>Slovenia</b>	Accessibility and usage of registers was raised dramatically - shortening of the procedures.
<b>Hungary</b>	Use of electronic method is rare in case of Business Register. Electronic proposal of entries amendments is possible in case of experts ( this way is used quite often)for authorized persons. In case of debtors, enforcement registers use of electronic way is rare.
<b>Italy</b>	The service`s accessibility has improved.
<b>Estonia</b>	The electronic presentation of documents is not sufficiently popular, when the relevant portal does not offer any new additional benefits to users (pre-completed documents, an automatic filter to prevent errors, a faster processing time). It would make sense to offer services other than e-searches in the register (and general services) on a commercial basis, which would ensure that client's needs were taken into account as effectively as possible.

### E. Presence on the internet of the judicial system

	E.1.1. Do the courts in your country post information on the internet?
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes
<b>France</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Greece</b>	planned
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes

	E.1.2. Does the Ministry of Justice in your country post information on the internet?
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes

Ireland	✓ Yes
Italy	✓ Yes
Latvia	✓ Yes
Lithuania	✓ Yes
Luxembourg	planned
Malta	no data received
Netherlands	✓ Yes
Austria	✓ Yes
Poland	✓ Yes
Portugal	✓ Yes
Romania	✓ Yes
Sweden	✓ Yes
Slovakia	✓ Yes
Slovenia	✓ Yes
Spain	✓ Yes
Czech Republic	✓ Yes
Hungary	✓ Yes
Cyprus	planned

<b>Total</b>	Yes: 23 Planned: 3
--------------	-----------------------

✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
no data received
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
planned
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes

Yes: 25 Planned: 1
-----------------------

	<b>E.2.1.</b> Is there a national home page on which the courts make information available?
<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	planned
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes
<b>France</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Greece</b>	⊘ No
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Italy</b>	planned
<b>Latvia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Lithuania</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Luxembourg</b>	planned
<b>Malta</b>	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Poland</b>	planned
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Romania</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	✓ Yes

	<b>E.2.2.</b> Is there a national home page on which the Ministry of Justice makes information available?
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	no data received
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes
	✓ Yes



<b>Spain</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Czech Republic</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Hungary</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Cyprus</b>	planned

✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes
✓ Yes

<b>Total</b>	Yes: 20 Planned: 5 No: 1
--------------	--------------------------------

Yes: 26
---------

E.2.3. If courts and the Ministry of Justice do have national home pages, the following information is made available electronically				
type of content		<input type="radio"/> No	own editorial contributions	links to foreign websites
Structure of the judicial system		2	21	3
Lists of courts			24	4
Lists of other judicial institutions			22	7
Legislative measures		2	21	9
Judgments		4	17	9
Literature (essays and the like)		11	9	
Register databases		5	12	5
Forms	For printing out	2	19	4
	For electronic transmission	8	10	2

E.3.1. Does the judicial system have a regional presence on the internet?	
<b>Belgium</b>	<input type="radio"/> No
<b>Bulgaria</b>	planned
<b>Denmark</b>	<input type="radio"/> No
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	<input type="radio"/> No
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes

France	✓ Yes
Greece	planned
United Kingdom	✓ Yes
Ireland	⊘ No
Italy	✓ Yes
Latvia	✓ Yes
Lithuania	✓ Yes
Luxembourg	planned
Malta	no data received
Netherlands	✓ Yes
Austria	⊘ No
Poland	✓ Yes
Portugal	⊘ No
Romania	⊘ No
Sweden	✓ Yes
Slovakia	⊘ No
Slovenia	✓ Yes
Spain	✓ Yes
Czech Republic	✓ Yes
Hungary	✓ Yes
Cyprus	planned

<b>Total</b>	Yes: 14 Planned: 4 No: 8
--------------	--------------------------------

**E.4.1.** Insofar as court judgments are posted on the internet, are they first rendered anonymous?

<b>Belgium</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Denmark</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Germany</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Finland</b>	✓ Yes
<b>France</b>	✓ partially
<b>Greece</b>	✓ Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	✓ partially
<b>Ireland</b>	✓ partially
<b>Italy</b>	⊗ No
<b>Latvia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Lithuania</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Luxembourg</b>	not specified
<b>Malta</b>	no data received
<b>Netherlands</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Austria</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Poland</b>	not applicable
<b>Portugal</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Romania</b>	⊗ No
<b>Sweden</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	✓ Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	✓ Yes

Spain	✓ Yes
Czech Republic	✓ Yes
Hungary	✓ Yes
Cyprus	⊘ No

<b>Total</b>	Yes: 18 Partially: 3 No: 3 Not specified: 2 Not applicable: 1
--------------	---

---