

FIAS REGISTRY OF RESEARCH SPECIFICATIONS

French Judicial Decision Research-Citation Profile

REGISTRY IDENTIFIER

FOAR-CON2X-ED0JF68GZ

VERSION

0.9

OBJECT TYPE

Identifier or citation scheme

SUBJECT AREA

Information and library science

DOCUMENT MATURITY

Candidate for stable use

SUBMITTED

15 December 2016, 12:00 UTC

PUBLISHED

10 March 2017, 12:00 UTC

LICENCE

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

AUTHORITATIVE VERSION

Registration records the outcome of the Registry review for this version: the submission was sufficiently identified, documented, and internally determinate for the stated procedure. Scope, adoption, and competing conventions are documented separately where relevant.

REGISTRY STATUS**Registered**

10 March 2017, 12:00 UTC

Core description

SUBMISSION KIND

New registry concept

FULL TITLE

French Judicial Decision Research-Citation Profile

SHORT TITLE OR ACRONYM

FJDRCP

OBJECT TYPE

Identifier or citation scheme

STATUS CLAIMED BY THE SUBMITTER

Experimental specification

MATURITY OF THIS VERSION

Candidate for stable use

VERSION

0.9

PRINCIPAL SUBJECT AREA

Information and library science

KEYWORDS

- French case law
- ECLI
- corpus provenance
- legal citation
- research reproducibility

PROBLEM, SCOPE, AND EXCLUSIONS

Researchers often cite a judicial decision by docket number, a database URL, or an ECLI while leaving the exact digital representation used for extraction or coding unspecified. This profile prescribes a compact research citation for a public French judicial decision: its ECLI where available, the repository URL, retrieval date, a digest of the retrieved representation, and an optional paragraph locator. It covers citations inside corpus manifests and replication packages. Its scope is limited to research citation and replication packaging;

ECLI assignment, legal authority, brief citation, and republication rights remain governed by their own sources.

INTENDED USERS AND CONTEXTS

- Researchers assembling small corpora of French judicial decisions
- Legal-information teaching workshops
- Authors of reproducible empirical-law articles

RELATION TO EXISTING PRACTICE

Profiles an existing standard

SCIENTIFIC CONTEXT, SOURCES, AND SCHOLARLY DISCUSSION

This section describes the scientific background, underlying work, and sources of the specification, together with the research groups and scholarly settings in which the proposed solution or its formalisation was presented or discussed. It documents the context and nature of these scholarly exchanges.

Computational and empirical studies of judicial decisions need citations that identify both the decision and the digital text used for analysis. The ECLI framework introduced in 2011 provides a common decision identifier and metadata model. Court, chamber, date and docket references situate a decision in legal documentation, while retrieval details and a digest make a particular downloaded representation traceable within a research corpus.

The profile develops this documentary requirement in the setting of French judicial open data following the 2016 law. Research at CERSA on digital governance and privacy, including the volume edited by D. Bourcier and P. De Filippi (2016), examines the conditions under which open data can be reused. The Open Law programme, bringing together DILA, Etalab and other participants, provides a collective setting for work on access to legal information and the development of reusable resources.

The Open Case Law programme provided a collaborative setting for discussing the identification and dissemination of judicial decisions. Its workshops of 29 September and 5 October 2016 addressed anonymisation and pseudonymisation, followed by the application of ECLI to lower-court decisions. The latter included a DILA proposal on identifier construction. These discussions provide a concrete technical context for linking research citations to identifiable digital representations of decisions.

Version 0.9 combines ECLI where available with a repository address, retrieval date, digest and optional passage locator. The manifest retains the full SHA-256 value, while the compact display form uses a shorter prefix. This arrangement connects ordinary legal references with the evidence needed to reproduce a corpus extraction or inspect the text on which an analytical claim rests.

References:

- Council of the European Union, Conclusions inviting the introduction of ECLI and uniform case-law metadata, 2011/C 127/01: Source: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=OJ:C:2011:127:FULL>
- Loi n° 2016-1321 du 7 octobre 2016 pour une République numérique, arts. 20-21: Source: <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jorf/id/JORFTEXT000033202746>
- Danièle Bourcier and Primavera De Filippi, eds., Open Data & Big Data: Nouveaux défis pour la vie privée, Mare & Martin, 2016, ISBN 978-2-84934-238-1: Source: <https://www.lgdj.fr/open-data-big-data-9782849342381.html>
- Open Law. Open Case Law workshop 1, anonymisation and pseudonymisation, 29 September 2016. Presentation materials: <https://openlaw.fr/directory-communs/les-communs/atelier-1-du-programme-open-case-law-anonymisation-pseudonymisation-slides-de-presentation/>
- Open Law. Open Case Law workshop 2, ELI-ECLI and identifiers for lower-court decisions, 5 October 2016. Workshop report: <https://openlaw.fr/directory-communs/les-communs/atelier-2-du-programme-open-case-law-eli-ecli-quel-ecli-pour-les-decisions-du-fond/>

EXTERNAL STANDARDISATION STATUS

None intended

LICENCE FOR THE SUBMITTED SPECIFICATION

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0

PUBLICATION DECLARATION

Yes

Identifier or citation scheme

WHAT RECEIVES AN IDENTIFIER?

One retrieved public digital representation of one French judicial decision used as an evidential item in a defined research corpus. The ECLI identifies the decision; the added snapshot component identifies the representation actually analysed.

IDENTIFIER SYNTAX OR GRAMMAR

FJDRCP/0.9/<ECLI-or-NOECLI>/<repository>/<retrieved>/<digest>[/p<locator>]

ECLI-or-NOECLI := literal ECLI, including its colons, or

NOECLI-<court-code>-<docket-token>-<decision-date>.

repository := LEGIFRANCE | ARIANEWEB | COURDECASSATION | OTHER.

retrieved := YYYYMMDD.

digest := first 16 lowercase hexadecimal characters of the SHA-256 of the exact UTF-8 or downloaded binary representation.

locator := positive decimal paragraph number assigned by the source; it MUST be omitted when the source supplies no stable paragraphs.

ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY AND COLLISION PREVENTION

The corpus compiler assigns the wrapper after retrieving the public representation. ECLI components MUST be copied, never invented. A manifest validator prevents two wrappers with the same ECLI, repository, retrieval date and digest from being assigned to different files. NOECLI values are local fallbacks kept separate from official judicial identifiers.

PERSISTENCE AND REASSIGNMENT POLICY

A released wrapper is never reassigned. If the source representation changes, a new wrapper with a new retrieval date and digest is created; the old manifest remains citable. Correction of a copied ECLI creates a replacement wrapper and a machine-readable supersedes link.

RESOLUTION OR LOOKUP MECHANISM

Resolution is two-step: resolve the ECLI through the European e-Justice service or query the named national repository, then compare the retrieved representation with the digest retained in the research package. The wrapper itself need not be an HTTP URI in version 0.9.

CONCEPT, VERSION, EDITION, AND FRAGMENT GRANULARITY

ECLI denotes the judicial decision. The repository, retrieval date and digest denote a consulted digital representation. The optional locator denotes a source-defined paragraph

in that representation. Editorial summaries, translations and researcher annotations receive separate manifest records and never inherit the decision's ECLI as their own ID.

ALIAS, MERGE, SPLIT, AND DEPRECATION BEHAVIOUR

Aliases may record docket-number citations for discovery, but the canonical wrapper remains unchanged. A mistaken collision is resolved by deprecating the later wrapper, recording the reason, and minting a corrected one. Split or merged source files retain separate digests linked to the same ECLI.

VALID, INVALID, AND EDGE-CASE EXAMPLES

Valid structural example based on a real public ECLI:

FJDRCP/0.9/ECLI:FR:CCASS:2016:C101245/LEGIFRANCE/20161215/0123456789abcdef

Valid fallback pattern:

FJDRCP/0.9/NOECLI-CA-PARIS-15-00001-20161109/OTHER/20161215/fedcba9876543210

Invalid: FJDRCP/0.9/15-25.873/LEGIFRANCE/2016/abc

Reasons: no ECLI or typed NOECLI fallback, incomplete date, and digest shorter than 16 hexadecimal characters.

Edge case: a PDF and an HTML page containing the same decision **MUST** have distinct wrappers because their byte representations differ.

Registry review record

Submission received

15 December 2016, 12:00 UTC

Submission received.

Registered

10 March 2017, 12:00 UTC

Accepted as a research-citation profile for corpus replication. ECLI assignment rules and general French legal citation standards remain separate. Registration is conditional on labelling all NOECLI values as local and retaining the full SHA-256 in the manifest even though the display wrapper uses a 16-character prefix.