

ECHRdb European Court of Human Rights Database

COMPREHENSIVE DATASET

Version 1.0 Release 2017
CODEBOOK

To cite the European Court of Human Rights Database please use the following citation: Cichowski, Rachel A. and Elizabeth Chrun (2017). European Court of Human Rights Database, Version 1.0 Release 2017.
URL: <http://depts.washington.edu/echrdb/>

W
UNIVERSITY *of* WASHINGTON



COMPREHENSIVE Dataset Codebook Version 1.0 Release 2017

The European Court of Human Rights Database (ECHRdb) provides comprehensive data on ECHR litigation to promote justice, accountability and transparency through the legal process. The database identifies comprehensive judgment descriptors and interest and advocacy organization participation in all judgments from the ECHR 1960-2014, total of 15,147 judgments. The database provides easy filtering functions and complements the ECHR's full text judgment repository located at HUDOC: <http://www.echr.coe.int/>

It is the first publicly accessible database to systematically detail international court judgment data, alongside interest and advocacy organization participation, and the effects on domestic and international law. The database is cross-temporal, across legal domains, broadly cross-national and will enable researchers to map and analyze the human rights litigation in innovative ways. The data are accessible to students, researchers, practitioners and the general public.

TEAM AND FUNDING

ECHRdb was developed by Principal Investigator Rachel Cichowski, Associate Professor of Political Science and Law, Societies & Justice at the University of Washington. Elizabeth Chrun, Postdoctoral Fellow at the Department of Political Science at McGill University, serves as Lead Project Researcher and Web Developer. Christian Schmidt of Schema Design LLC serves as the Design Specialist. The project received funding from the University of Washington (Royalty Research Fund) and the National Science Foundation (SES 1322161, SES 1649863).

SUGGESTED CITATION

To cite the European Court of Human Rights Database, please use the following citation:
Cichowski, Rachel A. and Elizabeth Chrun (2017). European Court of Human Rights Database, Version 1.0 Release 2017.
URL: <http://depts.washington.edu/echrdb/>

DATA SOURCE

The data was collected and coded from the following source for the period 1960-2014.

- HUDOC, the online full-text database of the ECHR including all judgments from 1959 to the present. It can be accessed here: <http://www.echr.coe.int/>
Case numbers in HUDOC take the following form: aaa/bb, where aaa is a three- to five-digit application number as assigned by the ECHR and where bb is the year the application was lodged. Application numbers are not necessarily unique: a single application can lead to more than one judgment, and the ECHR sometimes assigns the same case number to different cases. Thus, in order to link observations to unique HUDOC entries, one has to take into consideration 4 different variables in conjunction: 1) the application number assigned to the case by the ECHR (app variable); 2) the defendant country (variable country); 3) the year the case was lodged (variable dtelgd); and 4) the year of the judgment (variable dtejmt).
- Interest and advocacy organization participation was retrieved by looking up each judgment from 1960-2014 in HUDOC. The Procedures section of the judgment was analyzed to retrieve information about whether organizations were the applicant in the case, whether they served as legal counsel and whether there was a third party intervention invited in the case. The text of the judgment provided information (through summaries, and inclusion of organizational arguments) to identify third party intervention support and engagement variables.

DATA TIME PERIOD

- 1960-2014

UNIT OF ANALYSIS

The unit of analysis is individual application that led to a judgment on merits. Just satisfaction judgments (i.e. Article 41 judgments), and applications that were deemed inadmissible by the Court are excluded from the dataset.

VARIABLES

app The application number assigned to the case by the ECHR.

dtejmt Year of the judgment.

dtelgd Year case was lodged with the Commission/Court.

country Defendant country (respondent state) at the time the application was lodged.

1 = Austria	25 = Azerbaijan
2 = Belgium	26 = Bulgaria
3 = Switzerland	27 = Croatia
4 = Cyprus	28 = Czech Republic
5 = Germany	29 = Estonia
6 = Denmark	30 = Georgia
7 = Spain	31 = Hungary
8 = France	32 = Latvia
9 = Greece	33 = Liechtenstein
10 = Italy	34 = Lithuania
11 = Ireland	35 = Moldova
12 = Iceland	36 = Poland
13 = Luxembourg	37 = Romania
14 = Malta	38 = Russia
15 = Norway	39 = San Marino
16 = Netherlands	40 = Slovakia
17 = Portugal	41 = Slovenia
18 = Sweden	42 = Macedonia
19 = Finland	43 = Ukraine
20 = Turkey	44 = Bosnia Herzegovina
21 = United Kingdom	45 = Serbia and Montenegro
22 = Albania	46 = Monaco
23 = Andorra	47 = Montenegro
24 = Armenia	48 = Serbia

country2 The second defendant country, when it applies.

impt The Bureau of the ECHR categorizes the decisions into level of importance.

- 1 = This includes cases that are published in the Case Reports (also called “key cases”), which are of highest importance and also those categorized as High Importance by the Bureau. This category

is defined as: all judgments, decisions and advisory opinions which make a significant contribution to the development, clarification or modification of its case-law, either generally or in relation to a particular State.

- 2 = This includes cases categorized as medium importance: Other judgments, decisions and advisory opinions which, while not making a significant contribution to the case-law, nevertheless go beyond merely applying existing case-law.
- 3 = This includes cases categorized as low importance: Judgments, decisions and advisory opinions of little legal interest, namely judgments and decisions that simply apply existing case-law, friendly settlements and strike outs (unless raising a particular point of interest). The importance levels are mentioned in the notice accompanying each document.

decision This is the global decision. If there are one or more violations of a Convention provision found in the decision, it is coded as a violation.
1 = no violation
2 = violation

art1 (art2, etc.) This details which articles of the Convention were in question in the decision and whether the ECHR found a violation or not.
0 = article not in question
1 = no violation
2 = violation

p1a1 (p1a2, etc.) This details the articles of particular protocols of the Convention that were in question in the decision and whether the ECHR found a violation or not. For example, **p1a1** is Protocol 1 Article 1.
0 = article not in question
1 = no violation
2 = violation

partid[1-25] This variable identifies organizations that participated in a judgment. Where there is no participation this variable **partid[1-25]** take the value of 0. Where there is participation, this variable assigns a unique identification number to every organization that participated. A single judgment may have more than one organization participating and in some cases up to 25, and each is coded as a separate variable (e.g. **partid1 partid2**, etc). Individuals who participated as third party interveners (amicus curiae) are also assigned an identification number. Appendix A (available on ECHRdb) provides a list of all organizations/individuals sorted by identification number. Appendix B (available on ECHRdb) provides a list of all organizations/individuals sorted by interest type.

inttype[1-25] This variable identifies the general type of the participating organization. For example, **inttype1** details the type of organization that was identified by **partid1**. Third party interveners can also be individuals (who may represent particular interests); they are included as a category in this variable.

- 1 = businesses
- 2 = rights organizations
- 3 = women's rights organizations
- 4 = minority rights
- 5 = freedom of speech organizations
- 6 = professional associations
- 7 = religious organizations
- 8 = community organizations
- 9 = media organizations
- 10 = state governments
- 11 = intergovernmental organizations
- 12 = labor unions
- 13 = environmental organizations
- 14 = state authorities
- 15 = pro-life lobbying organizations
- 16 = pro-choice lobbying organizations
- 17 = health organizations
- 18 = lobbying group
- 19 = political organizations
- 20 = legal aid organizations
- 21 = education/academic actors
- 100 = individuals

partmode[1-25] Mode of participation of an organization. For example, **partmode1** details the mode of participation by the organization identified by variable **partid1**.

- 1 = an applicant/direct victim, filing the case before the Court
- 2 = representing an applicant, acting as a counsel, solicitor or advisor;
- 3 = a third party intervener, submitting a written brief to advise the Court by offering expertise, insight or facts that have a bearing on issues in the case;
- 4 = a denied third party intervener that requested to submit a brief but that was denied by the Court;
- 5 = an invited third party intervener by the ECHR who declined to avail themselves of that right.

summ[1-25] If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) was summarized in the ECHR judgment.

- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
- 1 = third party intervention was not summarized in the decision
- 2 = third party intervention was summarized in the decision

engapp[1-25] If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) was engaged with (or mentioned by) the applicant.

- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
- 1 = third party intervention was not engaged by the applicant
- 2 = third party intervention was engaged by the applicant

- engstate[1-25]** If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) was engaged with (or mentioned) by the respondent state.
- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
 - 1 = third party intervention was not engaged by the respondent state
 - 2 = third party intervention was engaged by the respondent state
- engcourt[1-25]** If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) was engaged with (or mentioned) by the ECHR.
- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
 - 1 = third party intervention was not engaged by the ECHR
 - 2 = third party intervention was engaged by the ECHR
- engdiss[1-25]** If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) was engaged with (or mentioned) by the dissenting opinion.
- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
 - 1 = third party intervention was not engaged by the dissenting opinion
 - 2 = third party intervention was engaged by the dissenting opinion
- engcon[1-25]** If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) was engaged with (or mentioned) by the concurring opinion.
- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
 - 1 = third party intervention was not engaged by the concurring opinion
 - 2 = third party intervention was engaged by the concurring opinion
- suptpi[1-25]** If an organization participated as a third party intervener, this variable details whether the intervention (brief) supported the applicant or the respondent state.
- 0 = did not participate as a third party intervener
 - 1 = third party intervention supported the respondent state
 - 2 = third party intervention supported the applicant
 - 3 = third party intervention could not be coded as supporting either party (e.g. some cases provide general information or another perspective for the judges, other cases could not be coded due to what was included in the decision. Clearly, there are briefs in this category that may have supported the applicant or respondent state but could not be coded as such without further information).
- apptpi** Total number of third party interventions filed in the judgment supporting the applicant.
- statetpi** Total number of third party interventions filed in the judgment supporting the respondent state.
- othertpi** Total number of third party interventions filed in the judgment that could not be coded as supporting either party (e.g. some cases provide general information or another perspective for the judges, other cases could not be coded due to what was included in the decision. Clearly, there are briefs in this category that may have supported the applicant or respondent state but could not be coded as such without further information).