

 **UCLM**



Centro de Estudios Europeos
Luis Ortega Álvarez



Nº 2 FEBRERO 2019

Boletín de Sumarios de Revistas



Tel: 925 268 800
Ext. 5018 - 5022 - 5199

C/ Cardenal Lorenzana, 1
45071 - TOLEDO

Web:
<http://www.uclm.es/centro/ceuropeos/>
E-mail: Cde@uclm.es

RELACIÓN DE REVISTAS FEBRERO 2019

1. Review of European Administrative Law. Volume 11/ 2018-2

2. Journal for European Environmental & Planning Law. Volume 15
Number 3-4

Review of European Administrative Law

Articles

- A comparative analysis of limitations in administrative appeals in Europe: the case of Poland and Slovakia
Wojciech Piątek and Matej Horvat
- Good Governance in the Development of Network Codes for the EU Internal Electricity Market
Thomas Kohlbacher and Saskia Lavrijssen
- The Past, Present and Future of the *Ne Bis In Idem* Dialogue between the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights: The Cases of *Menci*, *Carlsson* and *Di Puma*
Max Vetzo
- Hidden Signposts: The Normative Framework of the EU E-Customs Initiative
Eljalil Tauschinsky
- **Book Reviews**
- Joana Mendes and Ingo Venzke (eds.), *Allocating Authority. Who Should Do What in European and International Law?* (Bloomsbury, 2018)
Miroslava Scholten
- Armin von Bogdandy, Peter Michael Huber and Sabino Cassese (eds.), *The Administrative State, Volume I, The Max Planck Handbooks in European Public Law* (Oxford University Press, 2017)
Natassa Athanasiadou



CONTENTS

Editorial	1
-----------	---

Articles

A comparative analysis of limitations in administrative appeals in Europe: the case of Poland and Slovakia

<i>Wojciech Piątek and Matej Horvat</i>	5
---	---

1. Introduction	5
2. The essence of administrative appeals	7
3. Possible limitations to an administrative appeal	15
3.1. Initiation of the appeal procedure	15
3.2. Course of the proceeding	17
3.3. Termination of proceeding	19
4. Proposals in the academic literature for the limitation of an administrative procedure	21
5. Final considerations	24

Good Governance in the Development of Network Codes for the EU Internal Electricity Market

<i>Thomas Kohlbacher and Saskia Lavrijsen</i>	27
---	----

1. Introduction	28
1.1. The need for good governance principles and stakeholder responsiveness to ensure legitimacy of network codes	29
2. The process of the development of network codes	32
2.1. Elements of the regulatory network	33
2.2. Procedures establishing network codes	37
2.2.1. The network code development process	37
2.2.2. The Implementation Phase of Network Codes	40
3. Good Governance and Safeguards for Stakeholder Responsiveness	41
3.1. Good Governance Principles of Openness, Participation and Accountability	41
3.2. Related General Principles of EU administrative Law	42
4. Assessment	45
4.1. Adoption of Framework Guidelines, opinions and recommendations by ACER	45
4.2. Adoption of draft network codes by ENTSO-E	47
4.3. The Commission's decision adopting a network code	48

REVIEW OF EUROPEAN ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

4-4-	The Implementation Phase	50
4-5-	Stakeholder Committees and ACER as a way to improve of stakeholder responsiveness	51
5-	Conclusions	53

The Past, Present and Future of the *Ne Bis In Idem* Dialogue between the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Human Rights: The Cases of *Menci*, *Garlsson* and *Di Puma*

Max Vetzo

55

1.	Introduction	55
1.1.	Setting the scene: the European <i>ne bis in idem</i> dialogue	55
1.2.	Judicial dialogue: preliminary observations	57
1.3.	The past of the <i>ne bis in idem</i> dialogue between the CJEU and ECtHR	59
1.3.1.	<i>Ne bis in idem</i> in Europe: an example of convergence	59
1.3.2.	The ECtHR's revirement in <i>A and B v Norway</i>	63
2.	The facts of the cases	65
3.	The Advocate General's Opinions	66
4.	Judgments	67
5.	Analysis	70
5.1.	The current state of the <i>ne bis in idem</i> principle in the EU	70
5.1.1.	Similarities	70
5.1.2.	Differences	71
5.1.3.	Evaluating the substantial alignment between both European Courts	75
5.2.	The cases framed in the broader judicial dialogue between the CJEU and ECtHR	78
5.3.	The future of the <i>ne bis in idem</i> dialogue between the CJEU and ECtHR	81
6.	Conclusion	83

Hidden Signposts: The Normative Framework of the EU E-Customs Initiative

Eljalil Tauschinsky

85

1.	Introduction	85
2.	Research Approach	88
3.	The Digitalisation of the EU Customs Regime	90

CONTENTS

3.1.	Historic development	90
3.2.	Technical Aspects	92
3.3.	Digital Customs vs Paperless Customs	95
4.	Norms and Values Employed in the Customs Regime	98
4.1.	Efficiency	99
4.2.	Service Orientation	102
4.3.	Uniformity and Integration	104
5.	No escape from Federalism	107
6.	Equality, Transparency and Participation	109
6.1.	Equality	111
6.2.	Transparency	115
6.3.	Participation	118
7.	Data Subject's Rights, Confidentiality and Data Security	120
8.	Conclusions	124

Book Reviews

Joana Mendes and Ingo Venzke (eds.), *Allocating Authority. Who Should Do What in European and International Law?* (Bloomsbury, 2018)

Miroslava Scholten 129

Armin von Bogdandy, Peter Michael Huber and Sabino Cassese (eds.), *The Administrative State, Volume I, The Max Planck Handbooks in European Public Law* (Oxford University Press, 2017)

Natassa Athanasiadou 132

Volume 15 | Number 3-4

JEEPL 15 | 2018

JOURNAL
FOR EUROPEAN
ENVIRONMENTAL &
PLANNING
LAW

BRILL | NIJHOFF

JOURNAL FOR EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENTAL & PLANNING LAW
Vol. 15 No. 3–4 2018 ISSN: 1613-7272 / E-ISSN: 1876-0104

CONTENTS

Editorial	273
Contributors	275

OPINION

LORENZO SQUINTANI, Tort-Law based Environmental Litigation: a Victory or a Warning?	277
---	-----

FOCUS – RIGHTS OF NATURE AS A PERSPECTIVE FOR EU ENVIRONMENTAL LAW?

KATARINA HOVDEN, The Best Is Not Good Enough: Ecological (Il)literation and the Rights of Nature in the European Union	281
HENDRIK SCHOUKENS, Granting Legal Personhood to Nature in the European Union: Contemplating a Legal (R)evolution to Avoid an Ecological Collapse? (Part 1)	309

ARTICLE

STEPHANIE DE SOMER, Taking Aesthetics Seriously in Planning Law: Seeking Inspiration for Flanders in France, the Netherlands and the UK	333
---	-----

CASE LAW SECTIONS

LORENZO SQUINTANI, Case Law of the Court of Justice of the European Union and the General Court: Reported Period 17.04.2018–31.08.2018	359
LUDWIG KRÄMER, Precautionary Principle, Cost-Benefit Analysis and Impact Assessment – Comment on General Court of 17-5-2018, Case T-584/13, BASF Agro a.o. v. Commission	376
Volume Contents	385

RELACIÓN DE REVISTAS FEBRERO 2019

