**EIN Training seminar for civil society organisations on implementing judgments of the European Court of Human Rights**

**Application Form**

|  |
| --- |
| **DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION: 17 AUGUST 2018**Please send completed application form to Anne-Katrin Speck (a.speck@mdx.ac.uk), with a copy to Agnes Ciccarone (aciccarone@einnetwork.org)  |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART A. CONTACT DETAILS**  |
| Family Name |       |
| First Name |       |
| Gender | Choose from the list |
| Nationality |       |
| Organisation name  |       |
| Website address |       |
| Your role in the organisation (function) |       |
| Country where you are based |       |
| Telephone  |       |
| Mobile phone |       |
| Email |       |
| Skype (if available) |       |
| If selected, will you need a visa to come to Strasbourg? |  [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
| Special needs: please tick the box where relevant | Dietary requirements: I am [ ]  vegetarian, [ ]  vegan, [ ]  I do not eat porkI have the following allergies:      Housing requirements: [ ]  I need a specific room for people with disabilitiesAny other needs, please specify:       |

|  |
| --- |
| **PART B. QUESTIONNAIRE** |

Applicants will be assessed on the basis of

1. The impact for human rights in their country resulting from the full and effective implementation of any cases their organisation is supporting which have been designated as a ‘leading case’ under the judgment execution process[[1]](#footnote-1);
2. Their potential for contributing to the workshop either by short presentations or by volunteering a case to be the subject of a group exercise. Out of approximately 20 participants, we would need 6 - 8 to assist in this way.
3. **For all applicants, please list any leading asylum/migration-related cases[[2]](#footnote-2) pending before the Committee of Ministers whose implementation your organisation is supporting, or wishes to support:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name of case andApplication no\* | Main thematic issue(s) raised by the case | Main ECHR articles | Date of judgment | Dates of any rule 9.2 submissions made by your organisation | Please explain – very briefly – why the case is important for human rights in your country. |
|       | Choose an item.Choose an item. |       | Click here to enter a date | Click here to enter a date |       |
|       | Choose an item.Choose an item. |       | Click here to enter a date | Click here to enter a date |       |
|       | Choose an item.Choose an item. |       | Click here to enter a date | Click here to enter a date |       |

1. **For applicants from organisations which have made Rule 9.2 submissions in asylum / migration cases before:**

We are seeking participants who would be able to make a short presentation sharing their organisation’s learning on how to achieve results through their interaction with the CM judgment execution process. Possible areas that could be addressed are:

1. If your organisation is engaged with the process from the very beginning of the judgment execution process, please explain – very briefly – to what extent, answering as many questions as possible in the box below. Please also provide the name(s) and application number(s) of the relevant case(s) (which may include cases that have been closed by a final CM resolution):
2. How did you go about identifying the general measures needed for effective implementation?
3. What evidence did you collect to support your argument concerning the need for these measures?
4. If you advocated for inclusion of these measures in your government’s initial Action Plan before the latter was submitted to the CM, how did you got about that; to what extent you were successful; and what contributed to that success?
5. In your first Rule 9.2 submission following the publication of the government’s Action Plan, what were the key points you wanted to make, the evidence you put forward, and how far were your recommendations reflected in the next CM decision (if the case was under the enhanced procedure), or at the ‘Case/View/Status of Execution’ page of the DEJ website (if it was under the standard procedure). How would you evaluate of the process and the results achieved?
6. To what extent did your Rule 9.2 submission and the position subsequently adopted by the Council of Europe influence government behaviour, e.g., in terms of improved general measures?

1. If your organisation made Rule 9.2 submissions after the first stage of the process, please list any learning points arising from those submissions, under the ideas listed in items iv. and v. above.

1. Any other lessons you think it would be useful to share:

1. **For applicants from organisations which have conducted advocacy targeting domestic actors on implementing a judgment (e.g., lobbying ministries, sensitising parliamentarians, working with other NGOs, bar associations, etc.):**

If you would be willing to contribute a presentation on your organisation’s experience, and particularly learning points on how to achieve results, please give a very brief outline of the actions your organisation took and the case(s) involved, including (if applicable) whether you made use of results from the CM judgment execution process (for example CM decisions).

1. **For applicants from organisations which are planning to make a Rule 9.2 submission on a new leading case just entering the CM judgment execution process, or an ‘old’ leading case where your organisation has not made submissions before:**

Would be willing for your case to be taken as the subject for a group exercise aimed at helping you to develop the general measures applicable to the case, and the content of your next Rule 9.2 submission? Yes [ ]  No [ ]  *You would be required to provide some limited information about the case*.
If yes, please indicate the case or cases concerned.

1. **For applicants from organisations with experience of advocating for establishing national structures to monitor implementation of judgments:**

If your organisation has been engaged in advocating for establishing national structures to monitor implementation of judgments (e.g. inter-ministerial committees, parliamentary oversight committees, civil society coordination), would you be willing to share your learning? Yes [ ]  No [ ]
If yes, please provide us with a short overview of what your organisation did and what it has achieved.

1. **For all applicants: The information under questions 1 – 5 above relates primarily to the experience of your organisation rather than you as an individual. Please now briefly describe your role in the organisation.**

Please summarise how far you have been involved in, e.g., preparing Rule 9.2 submissions and the CM judgment process generally, and any related domestic advocacy, mentioning the case(s) involved. Please also briefly describe plans for your future involvement with these questions.

**Finally, for participants offering to make presentations**, the next stage will be for EIN to contact you, discuss your case further, and then determine which case(s) to include in the programme. Thereafter, EIN looks forward to collaborating and providing any direction and assistance needed in the preparation of the presentations.

1. Where a state has two or more cases raising the same issue pending before the Committee of Ministers, the latter would usually designate one of these cases as the ‘leading’ case and group all other, ‘repetitive’, cases together under the leading cases for the purposes supervising the adoption of general measures. Whether the cases you are proposing are leading or repetitive cases can be ascertained through the HUDOC-Exec database of the Department of the Execution of Judgments, available at: <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng>. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If you have reason for supporting a repetitive case, please clearly indicate why. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)