Contents

Part I The EU as a *Sui Generis* Human Rights Law Organization: Situating the Roots of the Accession Question

1 Introduction to the Book 3
1.1 Delimitating the Questions of the Book and the Scope of Substance Analyzed 3
1.2 A Note on the Methodology 8
1.3 Setting the Scene for the Book's Structure 12
1.4 Introduction to the Individual Chapters of the Book 17
1.5 A Theoretical Survey on Competing International Jurisdictions and Treaty Laws: Opening the Literature Box on the Wider Topic of the Book 22
1.5.1 Proliferation of International Treaty Regimes and International Courts: What About a 'New-Fangled' International Law? 22
1.5.2 Towards a Global Law Rule? 27
1.5.3 EU and ECHR (Under the Title of European Continent) Slice in the Global Law Landscape? 30
References 33

2 EU Becoming a Human Rights Law Organization: Starting from Nowhere with a '*gouvernment des juges*' 35
2.1 Introduction 35
2.2 The Origins of EU Becoming a Human Rights Law Organization with Reference to the ECHR 36
2.3 Strasbourg Looking Towards Luxembourg: What About a Refined Legal Arrangement? 49
2.4 EU Charter on Fundamental Rights and Its Normative Relationship with the ECHR 57
2.5 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 65
References 67

3 EU Law Autonomy: Where Does the Viewpoint for 'Competition' of Luxembourg Start From? 71
3.1 Introduction 71
3.2 'EU Law Autonomy': What Does It Actually Mean? 72
3.3 Autonomy in the 'European Way': Tracing Its Origins and Discussing Its Rationale 73
3.3.1 Costa ENEL: 'EU Law Autonomy' Where the Whole Story Began 73
3.3.2 Opinion 1/91: CJEU Says *No* for Two Courts Under the Same Roof 74
3.3.3 MOX Plant: When Jurisdictions Collide CJEU Should Decide 75
3.3.4 Kadi: CJEU Policing EU External Borders 78
3.4 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 82
References 84

Part II The Draft Accession Agreement of the EU Accession to the ECHR: An Examination of the Central Mechanisms in Light of EU Law *Pecularities*

4 A New Start for the Accession of the EU to the ECHR 89
4.1 Introduction 89
4.2 Background on EU Accession to ECHR from a Treaty and Human Rights Law Perspective 90
4.3 Can EU Be a Master of Treaty in ECHR? 95
4.4 ECHR Becomes a Hybrid and Complex Treaty System? 98
4.5 Accession Enables the EU to Enjoy the Benefit of a *primus inter pares* Position 99
4.6 The Accession Model and Possible Implications 103
4.7 Outline of the Draft Accession Agreement of the EU to the ECHR: What Substantial Issues Does It Address? 108
4.8 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 126
References 128

5 Status of ECHR and DAA in EU Legal Order 133
5.1 Introduction 133
5.2 Examining the Status of ECHR and DAA in EU Legal Order 134
5.2.1 The Status of International Agreements in EU Legal Order 134
5.2.2 Analyzing the Hierarchical Position of the Convention and Accession Agreement in EU Legal Order 141
5.2.3 Five Specific Arguments: Shaping More Concretely This Undeveloped Relationship 145
5.3 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 157
References 158

6 Attribution of Liability Under the Co-respondent Mechanism 163
6.1 Introduction 163
6.2 A Background on the Complex Task of Attributing Liability in a Post-accession Scenario 165
6.3 EU Treaty-Based Provisions: Which Were the Initial 'Peculiar'-Related Instructions for DAA? 168
6.4 The Differences Between Third-Party Interventions and the Co-respondent Mechanism: Where Does the DAA Go Blurry? 179
6.5 The Core Function of the Co-respondent Mechanism: What Is It Made for? 181
6.6 A Comparison Note Between DAA's Co-respondent Mechanism and DARIO 187
6.7 Friendly Settlements and Unilateral Declarations: Any Interference in the EU Law Autonomy? 192
6.8 EU and Member States as Co-respondents 195
6.8.1 EU as Co-respondent: Examining Its Normative Architecture and Potential Implicative Legal Outcomes 195
6.8.2 Member State(s) as Co-respondent(s): Examining the Normative Architecture and Potential Implicative Legal Outcomes 203
6.8.3 EU and Member State(s) as Joint Respondents: Still a Possible Scenario 213
6.9 Ambiguities in the Co-respondent Mechanism: Why Is It So Blurred? 214
6.9.1 Ambiguity 1: The Discretionary Nature of the Co-respondent Mechanism 215
6.9.2 Ambiguity 2: Strasbourg Court's Plausibility 218
6.9.3 Ambiguity 3: Share of Burden Between the EU and Member States When They Appear as (Co)respondents Jointly 220
6.9.4 Ambiguity 4: Lack of the Right Addressee—No Answer—Political Consensus 226
6.10 Referral to the Grand Chamber: Is There Space for Divorce Between (Co)-respondents? 227
6.11 A Comparison on the Model of Sharing the Liability Between DAA, UNCLOS and UNCILDCSO: Which Are the Strengths and Weaknesses of DAA? 230
6.12 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 234
References 236

7 Inter-Party Mechanism and the EU: Possible Implications from the Strasbourg's Jurisdiction? 241
7.1 Introduction 241
7.2 A Background on the Inter-Party Complaint Mechanism with a View to EU-ECHR Peculiar Context 242
7.3 The Possible Impairment of the Luxembourg Court's Exclusive Jurisdiction by the DAA: A Perspective on the Inter-Party Mechanism 246
7.4 Prohibition of Protocol 8(3) and Art 344 TFEU: Is There an 'Intended' Understanding? 247
7.5 'Escaped' Exclusivity in Inter-Party Complaints: Art 344 TFEU in Light of Art 19(1) TEU and with Reference to Art 275 TFEU: What Would This Entail in Terms of the DAA? 250
7.6 Inter-Party Cases in Light of *Mox Plant* and Art 344 TFEU: Which Standards Derive Thereof? 253
7.6.1 The First Test: Mix Agreement or Not: Defining the Attribution of Competence? 255
7.6.2 The Second Test: Parallel (Mirrored) Provisions 259
7.6.3 The Third Test: It Is for the Luxembourg Court to Delineate Its External Jurisdiction Borders in Each Case 260
7.6.4 The Fourth Test: Use of *Assurances* Not Allowed . . . 261
7.7 Beyond the Conventional Concept on Competing Jurisdictions of the Two European Courts: 'Reconciling' Art 55 ECHR with Art 344 TFEU 262
7.7.1 Conditions for the Special Agreement: What About More Details? 265
7.7.2 Questioning Whether EU Treaties Could Serve as a Special Agreement in Light of Art 55 ECHR? 267
7.7.3 Accession Agreement as a 'Special Agreement' Under Art 55 ECHR? A Second Try 270
7.7.4 The Effect of Art 5 (Second Clause) of the DAA to the Relationship Between Art 344 TFEU and Art 55 ECHR: Why Is the 'Special Agreement' Special? 272
7.7.5 An Additional, More Hypothetical Explanation on the Effect of Art 5 of the DAA on Art 344 TFEU (*A Second, More Constructive Scenario*)? 276
7.8 Testing the Inter-Party Procedure to Ireland v. UK: What Does It Mean in Practice? From Theoretical to a Practical Scenario . . . 282
7.8.1 Testing the Case 284
7.9 Inter-Party Procedure as Room for the Strasbourg Court to Interpret EU Law: Where Does the Risk for EU Law Autonomy Stand *in Exceptional* Cases? 287
7.10 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 290
References 292

8 EU Prior-Involvement Review 295
8.1 Introduction 295
8.2 A Background on the Subsidiary Nature of the Convention System from the Perspective of EU as a Party to the Latter . . . 297
8.2.1 Limited Access to Justice Under EU-Law Direct Actions: In the Borders of Violation of the Right to Access the Court Through an Effective Legal Remedy 299
8.2.2 Whether Preliminary Reference Procedure Under Art. 267 TFEU Complies with the ECHR Standard on Access to Court Through Efficient Legal Remedies? . . . 303
8.3 An Examination of the Prior Involvement Mechanism and Its Intended Function 317
8.4 Conditions to Initiate the Prior Involvement: A Rather Complex Task That May Inhibit Jurisdictional Allergies Between the Two Courts 324
8.5 Prior Involvement of the Luxembourg Court: A Procedural Assessment 330
8.6 Refraining from Undue Delay: How Can This Be Met? 337
8.7 Legal Effects of the Prior Involvement Procedure on the Reviewed EU-Law Provisions 340
8.8 Is Prior Involvement a New Remedy: Defending the Non-defendable? 343
8.9 Does Prior Involvement Produce the Effect of a Hidden Amendment to the Treaties? 347
8.10 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 349
References 350

Part III A Strasbourg Perspective on Applications of EU-Law Origin

9 Testing the Co-respondent Mechanism from the Strasbourg Court's Perspective: Three Distinctive Cases with Three Distinctive Scenarios 357
9.1 Introduction 357
9.2 A Starting Note to the Three Tests 358
9.2.1 Testing *Bosphorus* with the Co-respondent Mechanism 358
9.2.2 Testing *Mathews* with the Co-respondent Mechanism 363
9.2.3 Testing *Kokkelvisserij* with the Co-respondent Mechanism 367
9.3 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 375
References 376

10 Admissibility Before the Strasbourg Court: An Outlook on the EU-Law-Originated Applications 379
10.1 Introduction 379
10.2 A Notional Start: What Does One Need to Do to Reach the Strasbourg Court? 380
10.2.1 The Victim Status of the Claimant 381
10.3 Exceptions to the Rule on Exhaustion of Domestic Legal Remedies 383
10.3.1 Strasbourg's Elastic Approach to the Rule on Exhaustion: The EU System of Remedies May Become Surpassed 384
10.3.2 There Are Several EU Remedies in Place: Which One to Exhaust? A Question of Rationality and Effectiveness 387
10.3.3 The Complaint Must Have Been Substantively Raised Through the Domestic Legal Remedies: Does This Apply to the Preliminary Reference Procedure? 389
10.4 The Nature of the Strasbourg Court's Rulings on EU-Related Matters: Is There Space for the Supremacy of Strasbourg on Luxembourg? 392
10.5 Violations Originating in EU Primary Law: A Question of Possibility to Challenge the Treaties at Strasbourg? 395
10.6 The New Life of *Bosphorus* Post-accession: A Rational Viewpoint from the Strasbourg's Lens 398
10.7 Chapter's Summary of Conclusions 400
References 401

Part IV Approaching the Final 'Station'

11 Before the Conclusion: Luxembourg Court's Opinion 2/13 on the DAA's Compatibility with the EU Treaties 407
11.1 Introduction 407
11.2 Accession Shall (Should Not?!) Bring Significant Constitutional Changes to the Treaty System 410
11.3 Art. 53 of the Charter (Un)coordinated with Art. 53 of the Convention: Fighting for Internal Primacy? 411
11.4 Uniform Interpretation of EU Law and Mutual Trust Between EU Member States May Not Be Jeopardized by the Convention System 414
11.5 Risks from the Application of Protocol 16 ECHR: Too Many Doubts Being Raised? 416
11.6 Art. 344 TFEU in Risk from the DAA: What About Excluding Inter-Party Mechanism? 418
11.7 Two Small Threats from the Co-respondent Mechanism That Need Be Addressed 419

11.8 Prior Involvement Mechanism: The Need to Add Another Layer of Safeguard . . . 422
11.9 CFSP Measures Before the Strasbourg Court: Luxembourg Court in a Panic . . . 423
11.10 The Technical Changes That Need Be Addressed in the Draft Accession Agreement to Make It Compliant with Opinion 2/13 Requirements . . . 424
11.11 A Closing Summary . . . 426
References . . . 426

12 An Overall Conclusion . . . 427
12.1 A General Overview . . . 427
12.2 Conclusion on the Overall Functionality of the Accession Agreement and Its Outputs . . . 428
12.3 Searching for a Theoretical Model to Explicate the Accession Output . . . 434
12.4 Post-accession (Forthcoming) Perspectives: What About a New Normative Order in Europe? . . . 435
References . . . 438

Bibliography . . . 439