



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Expert Group Meeting on Gender-Related Judicial Integrity Issues

Seoul, Republic of Korea, 6 and 7 December 2018

Summary Report



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
Purpose and aims of the Expert Group Meeting.....	3
Structure of the present report.....	3
The concept of “gender-related judicial integrity issues”	4
Opening presentations.....	5
Summary of the ensuing expert group discussions.....	7
Annex I: Agenda.....	13
Annex II: List of Participants	15

Introduction

This report represents a summary of the discussions and the key outcomes of the Expert Group Meeting on Gender-Related Judicial Integrity Issues that took place on 6 and 7 December 2018 in Seoul, Republic of Korea, and that was organized under the umbrella of the Global Judicial Integrity Network.

The Global Judicial Integrity Network is a new initiative and a key outcome of the Judicial Integrity component of UNODC's [Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration](#). Officially launched in April 2018 at a high-level event in Vienna, the Network aims to create networking opportunities for judges, facilitate information-sharing and dissemination of existing resources, and to respond to existing and emerging challenges related to judicial integrity, for example through the development of various knowledge products. More information about the Global Judicial Integrity Network, its activities, services, and events can be found at: www.unodc.org/ji.

The launch event of the Global Judicial Integrity Network concluded with the adoption of a landmark [Declaration on Judicial Integrity](#), which set the priorities for the future work of the Network. In paragraph 7 of the Declaration, the launch participants decided that *“without prejudice to judicial independence, [participants should] support initiatives that promote continuous judicial education and in particular training on effectively complying with relevant standards of conduct and on gender-related topics, such as sextortion and sexual harassment, recognizing that judicial training is essential for objective, impartial and competent performance of judicial functions and for securing public trust and confidence”*.

With the Declaration in mind, the [Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network](#) developed the Network's 2018-2019 work plan and decided, among other areas, to use the potential of the Network to raise awareness among judges and judiciaries about gender-related integrity issues, such as sextortion and sexual harassment. To this end, the Advisory Board envisaged the development of a dedicated issue paper on existing practices, cases, and experiences in training and accountability, as well as expert consultations in the context of the Network.

Consequently, the present Expert Group Meeting was organized as part of the implementation of the work plan and the Network's efforts to address the key topic of gender-related judicial integrity issues. The meeting brought together over 30 participants from 16 countries and five relevant judicial associations and international organizations to discuss and make recommendations on how to best address the various issues at stake at the national, regional, and international levels.

Purpose and aims of the Expert Group Meeting

The purpose of the Expert Group Meeting was threefold: (i) to discuss a first draft of the issue paper on the topic that was drafted by UNODC's expert consultant; (ii) to help gather additional cases and resources, with a view to not only enrich the issue paper, but also to disseminate the resources through the Network's [online library](#) and other channels; and (iii) to make recommendations on how to develop national and regional standards on gender-related judicial integrity issues and, in particular, how the Global Judicial Integrity Network could assist judiciaries in this endeavour.

In particular, the expert group was charged with undertaking an examination of the ways in which gender-related issues may affect judicial integrity and the adequacy of existing safeguards at the national, regional, and international levels in promoting appropriate conduct and taking corrective action with respect to inappropriate conduct. That inquiry began with consideration of what should be encompassed by the term "gender-related judicial integrity issues" and what the ways in which gender-related misconduct manifests itself in the courts are. After assessing the scope and nature of the problem, the next step was to consider the adequacy of existing safeguards in preventing and addressing gender-related judicial integrity issues.

Three primary safeguards for promoting and protecting judicial integrity were discussed:

- (i) the judicial codes of conduct and other policies that provide guidance about what constitutes inappropriate conduct;
- (ii) the judicial accountability and disciplinary mechanisms that provide procedures for identifying and correcting misconduct; and
- (iii) the educational and training programmes that raise awareness about gender-related integrity issues and promote appropriate conduct.

The Expert Group Meeting provided an opportunity to discuss each of these tools and to consider how they might be tailored to better address the various gender-related judicial integrity issues.

Structure of the present report

The Expert Group Meeting consisted of eight substantive sessions focusing on different aspects of the issue, such as: the ways in which gender-related issues implicate judicial integrity, existing practices in addressing gender-related judicial integrity issues, judicial disciplinary and accountability mechanisms, monitoring and implementing gender guidelines and policies, and judicial education and training. (*The meeting agenda can be found in annex I.*) Each session started with a presentation by one of the participants to set the scene and then provided a space for an open debate and exchange among the whole group.

It is not the objective of the present report to summarize each session separately, especially due to the complexity and the interlinked nature of the topics discussed. Neither does the report strive to capture all the individual contributions and experiences shared, as that will be achieved in the updated version of the issue

paper that will be prepared following the Expert Group Meeting. Rather, the report captures the key points of the discussions and gives a sense of the range of issues raised by the expert group. As such, the report does not follow the order of the sessions as per the meeting agenda, but:

1. explains the concept of “gender-related judicial integrity issues” and its importance, as presented at the beginning of the Expert Group Meeting;
2. gives an overview of the opening presentations delivered at the beginning of each session; and
3. provides a concise summary of the expert group discussions.

The concept of “gender-related judicial integrity issues”

As explained by UNODC’s expert consultant, **Ms. Nancy Hendry**, in her initial remarks, an important aspect of judicial integrity is the duty to treat everyone with respect, not to allow personal bias or prejudice to affect professional relationships or duties, and not to discriminate against anyone for invidious reasons.

There are, of course, many ways in which societies have used gender to draw invidious distinctions and treat some people differently from others. The justice system is a product of its society and often reflects these social norms. Some gender biases and stereotypes are so deeply entrenched, that they are not even recognized as biased or inaccurate. When conscious or unconscious biases, stereotypes, and prejudices are allowed to shape the way judges administer their courts, comport themselves in the courtroom, and interpret the law, the justice system becomes a mechanism for preserving inequality rather than protecting equal rights and human dignity.

In addition, it is important to consider the role gender plays when looking at the corruption aspect of judicial integrity. In many corruption cases and especially – although not exclusively – when women are involved, the request may be for sexual favours rather than monetary advantages. These “payments” may not be covered by corruption statutes that often require – or are construed as requiring – evidence of financial harm. In addition, they may be excused as “romantic” relationships rather than viewed as an abuse of power for purposes of sexual exploitation. The result has been that, until recently, this sexualized form of corruption received scant attention and was not measured, reported, or addressed in the same way as financial corruption. However, from the standpoint of good governance, transparency, and accountability, it does not matter whether a judge – or other official – renders a favourable decision in exchange for cash or in exchange for sex. Both are equally lacking in integrity. To address the issue, the International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ) coined the term “sextortion” to describe these *quid pro quo* exchanges of sex for the favourable exercise of power. While sextortion is a pervasive phenomenon not limited to the judiciary, some of the examples that first led the IAWJ to focus on this issue involved the judiciary.

Judicial integrity also involves adhering to certain standards of propriety in the judge’s professional and personal life. Judges have been disciplined for engaging in consensual sexual conduct that is, nonetheless, inappropriate for a range of reasons, for example, conduct that occurs in the judge’s chambers or conduct that occurs with counsel appearing before the judge.



Judicial integrity begins with a judge’s treatment of those before the court – litigants, witnesses, counsel, and other professionals – and the judge’s responsibility to assure that they treat each other with respect as well. However, judicial integrity is not limited to courtroom conduct and judicial decision-making. Judges also have the responsibility to administer their courts and assure the integrity not only of the way they, as judges, deal with their colleagues and subordinates, but also the way court personnel deal with each other and with the public. Finally, judicial integrity reflects the way judges conduct their personal lives and interact with others in their community.

While much of the above-mentioned gender-related conduct has a disparate impact on women, the term “gender” encompasses conduct that adversely affects men or any individuals on the basis of their gender orientation or sexual preference.

There is a lot of ways in which gender might inappropriately influence judicial conduct and it is important to look at what judiciaries can do to strengthen the safeguards for preventing, detecting, and correcting it.

Good data is not available about the prevalence of gender-related integrity issues in the judiciary. Allegations of misconduct, investigations, and disciplinary proceedings are often shrouded in confidentiality, and the information that is publicly available may not be easy to access or search. In addition, judges facing a disciplinary proceeding may choose to resign, which typically halts the proceeding and any further inquiry into or release of information about the alleged misconduct. However, what the existing research does reveal is persistent and widespread problems in society, in the legal profession, and in the courts.

Opening presentations

Mr. Kieran Pender (Legal Advisor, International Bar Association) presented the preliminary results of the global survey of the International Bar Association on bullying and sexual harassment in the legal profession, which also captured data about the judiciary. The official report of the survey will be released in May 2019. It can be concluded from the preliminary results that there is a high prevalence of bullying in the judiciary. Nearly three out of four female respondents were bullied in comparison to one out of four male respondents. In many cases bullying was not reported, or, when reported, the subsequent action was insufficient or negligible. The perpetrator was often not sanctioned, and the situation regularly remained unchanged. In many instances the conduct contributed to the victim leaving or intending to leave the judiciary. With regard to sexual harassment, based on the responses from the judiciary, one in two females experienced sexual harassment in comparison to zero male respondents. Again, in many cases sexual harassment was not reported. The survey also focused on the use of policies on bullying and sexual harassment. It appears that those in judicial workplaces with relevant policies are no less likely to have experienced bullying or sexual harassment. However, the survey shows that those in judicial workplaces with training in place are less likely to be bullied or sexually harassed and are more likely to report the incidents.

Hon. Ms. Judith Jones (Justice, Trinidad and Tobago) described the journey to Trinidad and Tobago’s [Gender Equality Protocol for Judicial Officers](#). The aim of the Protocol, consisting of seven sections, is to encourage judicial officers to embark upon adjudication using a gender perspective. It does not deal with personal judicial

relationships. Some of the content includes: a historical overview of gender in the Caribbean which explains some of the current gender issues; key definitions that underpin the crucial concepts of gender; and the elements of procedural fairness in Trinidad and Tobago. The Protocol also includes special considerations for the treatment of non-traditional gender identities, and establishes the principles of equality, non-discrimination, and State obligation to incorporate and interpret domestic law in accordance with international treaties. In addition, the Protocol dedicates four sections to practical advice for judicial officers on domestic violence, sexual offences, child custody and maintenance, and human trafficking. The Protocol also includes pull-out instruction cards – checklists – which provide concrete and practical guidance on the adjudication of particular matters.

Mr. David Sachar (Executive Director, Judicial Discipline and Disability, United States of America) shared information about the Judicial Conduct Commissions in the United States of America and best practices in the complaint process, investigation powers, cyber investigations, and public relations. In particular, he shared some concrete experiences in investigating cases related to gender-based bias and sextortion. He explained the lessons learned and challenges faced with regard to empowering victims, preventing witness tampering, collecting and maintaining evidence, developing communication strategies with the public, providing appropriate reporting channels, and deciding upon appropriate disciplinary and criminal sanctions for perpetrators.

Hon. Ms. Teresita Leonardo de Castro (Chief Justice (ret.), Philippines) introduced the judicial disciplinary and accountability mechanism in the Philippines, including the role of the Supreme Court, the Office of the Ombudsman, the Civil Service Commission, the Judicial Integrity Board, and the Corruption Prevention and Investigation Office. A number of laws and regulations are relevant in this regard, including the Constitution, the Sandiganbayan Act, the Anti-Graft and Corrupt Practices Act, the Rules of Court and, importantly, the recently adopted Code of Judicial Conduct and the Code of Conduct for Court Personnel. The Committee on Gender Responsiveness in the Judiciary was established to prepare a comprehensive gender and development plan on mainstreaming gender within policies, programmes, and structures. The Committee's Sub-Committee of Training engages in the nationwide training of judges, lawyers, and personnel on gender responsiveness and sensitivity. Outcome-based training modules and facilitators' manuals were developed for the training. Between 2010-2016, a gender audit of Court of Appeals' decisions was pioneered with the objective to assess their gender responsiveness and inform the Supreme Court's efforts towards gender mainstreaming. In addition, the Supreme Court developed the Rule on Administrative Procedure in Sexual Harassment Cases and Guidelines on Proper Work Decorum in the Judiciary, which led to the creation of the Committee on Decorum and Investigation pursuant to the Act Defining Sexual Harassment Unlawful in the Employment, Education or Training Environment. The Supreme Court also held multi-sectoral workshops on effective and expeditious disposition of gender-related cases. Several gender-related administrative cases were decided by the Supreme Court that led to the dismissal of the perpetrators.

Ms. Kathryn Beck (President of the Law Society of New Zealand) presented the experiences of the New Zealand's Law Society regarding the prevention of bullying and harassment in the legal profession. She explained that bullying and harassment were often not viewed through the lens of professional conduct. To help tackle these phenomena, the Law Society appointed a regulatory working group to review existing

legislation, created free webinars, established the LawCare line for reporting purposes, organized meetings with various legal stakeholders, encouraged peer support groups, delivered lectures on ethics in law schools, provided access to relevant resources on the website, and disseminated a survey to legal workplace environments. The results of the survey will also inform judicial training in New Zealand in the near future. The Law Society has also set up a dedicated task force with the aim to train and educate, normalize acceptable behaviour, encourage conversations, and address culture in the legal community. In addition, a project on re-writing judgments with a gender perspective was launched, and 25 judgments were published in 2017 as a result of the work of academics and judges with expertise on bullying and harassment.

Hon. Ms. Eusebia Munuo (Justice, United Republic of Tanzania) focused on sextortion, including its elements and behavioural circumstances, and emphasized the negative impact of sextortion on society, such as poor performance in workplaces, low morale, and unequal treatment. Under the legal framework of the United Republic of Tanzania, sextortion is considered an act of corruption and it must be proven that someone in authority took advantage of that authority in exchange for sexual favours. Of paramount importance when tackling sextortion should be: existence of reliable and confidential reporting mechanisms; dissemination of knowledge about the issue within the judiciary; and involvement of education centres, media and society at large. For example, the printing of brochures for schools and public institutions or the organization of moot courts can be seen as a good practice.

Hon. Ms. Adisa Zahiragic (Judge, Bosnia and Herzegovina) emphasized that a range of behaviour within judiciaries should be tackled, including sexual harassment, sexual abuse, sexual discrimination, gender bias, gender stereotyping, mobbing, and sextortion. The current Penal Code of Bosnia and Herzegovina criminalizes “sexual intercourse by abuse of position”. As such, sextortion is criminalized in the country. However, awareness about the crime is low and sextortion is often not reported, for example because of the victim’s fear of losing their acquired or expected status. In addition, the roundtables previously organized on the issue with prosecutors, judges, and police officers indicated that the phenomenon was not properly understood. The Association of Women Judges in Bosnia and Herzegovina is active on the issue, and, for example, carries out research and organizes training activities within the judiciary. Several handbooks have been developed and are in place for the judiciary of Bosnia and Herzegovina, including: the 2016 Guidelines for Prevention of Sexual and Gender-Based Violence in Judicial Institutions; the 2014 Judicial Benchbook: Considerations for Domestic Violence Cases; the 2016 Domestic Violence Practice Guide; and the 2017 Prosecutor’s Domestic Violence Handbook. Ongoing activities include the development of further handbooks on gender bias and stereotypes for judges and prosecutors and the re-reading of judgments in criminal offences of domestic violence with a gender perspective.

Summary of the ensuing expert group discussions

The expert group participants welcomed the efforts of the **Global Judicial Integrity Network** to address gender-related judicial integrity issues and were convinced that there was a tremendous value in starting a global discussion on this key topic, sharing good practices, and identifying effective ways forward. The organization of the Expert Group Meeting was appreciated by all participants, as were the other avenues for peer-learning and information-exchange that the Network offers, such as the dedicated issue paper, the [online](#)

[library of resources](#), the [podcast](#) and [views](#) series, and further virtual or in-person consultations within the Network.

The expert group agreed to take a holistic approach to addressing the term “**gender-related judicial integrity issues**”, and not to limit the discussions only to certain types of conduct or persons involved. The same conclusion was reached by the participants with regard to any further efforts of the Global Judicial Integrity Network to address the topic. The participants noted that there were many ways in which gender-related conduct implicates judicial integrity – be it sextortion, sexual harassment, sexual discrimination, gender bias, gender stereotyping, or inappropriate sexual misconduct– and concluded that even if the main outcome of the discussions was to raise awareness about the breadth and scope of the problem, it would already be a significant step forward. The participants agreed that even though some conduct can be seen as more offensive or egregious than others, none of it is compatible with the principles of judicial ethics and should be avoided and addressed. In addition, while the participants differentiated between behaviour that could be characterized as an illegal act or misconduct on one hand and behaviour that is a result of lack of knowledge or the presence of existing unconscious biases on the other, they again recommended to focus the attention on all types of behaviour as they all inevitably lead to harmful effects and unequal treatment.

The expert group further stressed that a comprehensive **approach to the topic** should consider the following:

- Gender-related judicial integrity issues are not limited to women, but also concern men and members of the LGBTQI community.
- Gender-related judicial integrity issues can involve/affect a broad range of persons – judges, other judicial office holders, prosecutors, victims, witnesses, litigants, court personnel, court registrars, others involved in court administration, bailiffs, police officers, and society as a whole as the issues impact trust and confidence in the judiciary.
- Gender-related judicial integrity issues can happen at all levels of the judiciary, including all instances of the courts, court administration, judicial councils, or regional and international courts.
- Gender-related judicial integrity issues can arise in many aspects of judges’ professional or personal lives, including decision-making, presiding over a courtroom, interacting with court personnel and judicial colleagues, fulfilling administrative duties, making work assignments, providing professional opportunities, or behaving in one’s private social life.
- Gender-related judicial integrity issues may affect the appointment, selection, recruitment, retention, promotion, and retirement of judges and other justice officer holders and court personnel.

The participants recalled the fundamental belief that it was in the nature of the judicial office that the **standards of behaviour** are set higher for judges than for the rest of society and that judges should lead by example for other professions and citizens. Even if a certain conduct is not unlawful *per se*, judges should avoid any behaviour that undermines trust in the judiciary and lacks integrity.

In particular, the expert group referred to the internationally accepted **Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct** and underscored that judges should: (i) promote high standards of conduct in and out of court in order to reinforce public confidence in the judiciary (Principles 1.6., 2.2. and 3.2.); (ii) perform duties without

favour, bias or prejudice (Principles 2.1. and 5.2.); (iii) ensure that their conduct is above reproach in the view of a reasonable observer and should accept personal restrictions that might be viewed as burdensome by an ordinary citizen (Principles 3.1. and 4.2.); (iv) and carry out duties with appropriate consideration for all persons and without differentiation on any irrelevant ground (Principles 5.3.-5.5.).

While there was a general agreement among the participants that if judges observed all of the above-mentioned principles, most of the gender-related violations would be prevented, many participants recognized that the Bangalore Principles (and the Commentary on the Bangalore Principles) would benefit from being enriched and made more explicit on gender-related issues. The Bangalore Principles could take the lead in recognizing the complexity of the problem and addressing it, and could play a key role in raising awareness, providing guidance to judges and judiciaries around the world and positively influencing domestic and regional standards in this regard.

Due to the limited time available during the Expert Group Meeting, the participants did not focus on concrete proposals for possibly updating the Bangalore Principles (and the Commentary); however, it was emphasized by many that gender-related judicial integrity issues were of a cross-cutting nature and touched upon all six values underpinned by the Bangalore Principles. The UNODC secretariat noted that the 2018-2019 work plan of the Network envisages for the Network to support the Judicial Integrity Group's review of the Bangalore Principles (and the Commentary) and that the outcomes of the present discussions would be conveyed to the Judicial Integrity Group for their consideration.

Speaking from experience, the participants expressed their concern that safeguards for **preventing and addressing** gender-related judicial integrity issues were most often either non-existent or insufficient in their countries and regions. It was noted by many participants that usually only limited measures had been implemented with the ability to effectively promote appropriate conduct and to take corrective action with respect to inappropriate gender-related conduct.

With regard to what constitutes **inappropriate conduct**, the participants were conscious of the fact that most national codes of conduct for judges and judicial officers were silent on gender-related issues. While some of the gender-related behaviour was in some countries covered by existing criminal laws, "subtle" forms of inappropriate conduct were in most cases left unregulated. As a result, (i) a lot of gender-related misconduct goes unnoticed and unpunished; and (ii) there is a low awareness as to what constitutes behaviour that is incompatible with judicial integrity and judicial ethics. The participants therefore stressed the need for clear rules in national codes of conduct, as well as for the adoption and implementation of effective, gender-sensitive policies and gender protocols. As pointed out by one participant, it is important to "mainstream gender into integrity and integrity into gender".

Related to the above, the importance of having **legal concepts** in place that can be acted upon, as well as clear definitions and a uniform interpretation were emphasized by the participants. For instance, regarding sextortion, the participants welcomed the efforts of the International Association of Women Judges to define its parameters and recommend that countries find a way to criminalize it.

The importance of embedding the discussion in the existing **broader international standards** and blueprints, in particular the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women and Goals 5 and 16 of the Sustainable Development Goals, was highlighted.

Several participants raised the issue of **cultural relativism** and the importance of conceptualization when developing guidance and standards on gender-related judicial integrity issues. Different countries and regions face different challenges and may need to take different measures to build upon their existing frameworks. However, it was noted that culture and traditions should not be used as an excuse for not addressing the issues and that all efforts should be made to maintain human rights and eliminate discrimination, inequality, violence, gender biases, and stereotyping. Understanding of the root causes for these phenomena, as well as their impact on the delivery of justice was emphasized.

The participants raised the question of **consent** and contemplated whether the abuse of power always vitiates consent because of the power imbalance, or whether there may be situations that are considered regular interpersonal relationships and as such would not be considered as inappropriate sexual conduct or sextortion. In this regard, one participant shared a case where a court did not take consent into account because the atmosphere in the courtroom was intimidating enough to show that the act committed was not consensual. Several participants noted the need to provide specific and precise guidelines in laws, codes of conduct, or other regulations with a view to giving judges a clear framework to follow. Not all behaviour necessarily amounts to an integrity violation and judges should be clear about the boundaries.

What constitutes an **effective corrective action** was discussed throughout the meeting. The participants shared several concrete cases where judges had been disciplined and held accountable for their gender-related violations, and it was agreed that information about these cases would be included in the final version of the issue paper.

Effective, fair, well-informed, and transparent **disciplinary bodies and mechanisms** were emphasized as key. The participants were cognizant of the fact that disciplinary mechanisms operated differently in different countries and what might work well in one country might not work well in another. However, the participants agreed that some considerations should apply everywhere. First, clear rules and regulations (and, if possible, also statutory foundations) and disciplinary procedures should be in place. Judges, and also the public, need to be informed of what is expected of them. The disciplinary bodies should be independent, with equal representation, and their members should be chosen based on objective and impartial selection criteria, sufficiently resourced to fulfil their role and conduct meaningful investigations, and their work and decisions should be fair and transparent. There should be a sufficiently broad range of disciplinary sanctions available that would be able to proportionately apply to circumstances in particular cases. For example, one participant mentioned that having only dismissal or removal as available remedies may discourage victims to come forward and that the existence of middle ways to discipline judges, such as suspension, may be a more effective avenue for certain degrees of unethical behaviour. The importance of **access to information** was highlighted by many, including through making ethical opinions publicly accessible (such as through online case databases), establishing bodies or persons with advisory functions for both judges and the public, and

disseminating information through all available channels (such as frequently asked ethical questions and answers online, information brochures, etc.).

Limited **reporting of gender-related misconduct** was noted as a continuous challenge. Many cases of gender-related violations are not reported - neither by victims nor by those who observe the violations. This not only hampers the effort to fully understand the scope and extent of the existing challenges and thus develop effective responses, but it also means that perpetrators are allowed to continue with such conduct with impunity and victims are not heard or protected. Several reasons for low reporting rates were noted by the participants, such as the subtle nature of some of the acts and consequent uncertainty of victims about what to do and what their rights are, distrust in the system and that action would be taken, feelings of shame or fear, fear that the possible outcomes would be too harmful for either the victim or the perpetrator, not wanting to be seen as a victim and have their career negatively impacted, or lack of measures to ensure confidentiality and protection against retaliation. The expert group agreed that it was of paramount importance to fully support victims and affected persons. As one participant noted, the issue should not be about courage, but about creating a good environment where one feels safe to report misconduct. Legal, medical, and psychosocial assistance, as well as protective measures and supporting systems should be available. Importantly, the reporting should be encouraged through, first, establishing clear, confidential and reliable reporting channels, and second, through awareness-raising campaigns, information materials, or training programmes.

Targeted **educational and training programmes** that raise awareness about gender-related judicial integrity issues and promote appropriate conduct were seen by the participants as one of the primary tools to tackle the existing challenges. The expert group emphasized the crucial role of adequate **judicial training** and several participants shared their national experiences where gender-sensitivity issues were incorporated into trainings. Some of the concrete challenges faced in the existing judicial trainings included, for example, the non-compulsory nature of the training programmes and lack of interest of judges to participate, and, in one case, the reluctance of male judges to participate as they felt being treated like potential offenders. To overcome these challenges, the participants suggested that, wherever possible, training on gender issues should be compulsory for judges. In addition, the support of the judicial leadership was seen as key and senior judges and judges with supervisory functions should lead by example in the promotion of the issues and taking the training courses. It was also emphasized that training needs to be comprehensive, interactive, and involve theoretical knowledge (reports, statistics, etc.) as well as practical information (case studies, exercises, etc.) with a view to allowing for engaging and reflective learning. One participant, who also had experience as a trainer on the topic, suggested involving male trainers to show that this is a problem for everyone and to include real-life scenarios and exercises. Effective and proper evaluation of the training activities was mentioned, including using evaluation forms, ongoing peer-review, observations, submissions of judgments for assessment, independent surveys of court users, etc. The participants agreed that training should be provided to all newly appointed judges as well as to serving judges as part of their continuous training. However, some participants noted that different approaches and methodologies may be needed for common and civil law countries. It was also agreed that education on judicial ethics should already begin at law schools, as they are in a position to teach and sensitize future judges from the outset about the various gender-related judicial integrity issues - this approach would be compatible with both the common and civil law systems.



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

The participants noted that only very limited **research** had been conducted on the topic (and if conducted, it had rather been quantitative than qualitative), and that there was generally little understanding of and information available about gender-related judicial integrity issues. Many participants stressed the importance of removing the rhetoric that gender-related issues are a “women’s problem”, as men may suffer too, including from sexual harassment. In addition, it was stressed that gender-related issues should be seen and treated as professional conduct issues. The participants encouraged the use of surveys and further research to generate data and qualitative information. They also called for using all channels available to educate the public about the role of judges and what is expected of them, including through public campaigns, information materials, civics education at schools, frequently asked questions on websites, etc.

The participants agreed that everyone should be involved in the **dialogue** – non-governmental organizations, academia, legal profession, associations, researchers, media - and that there was an immense value in forging partnerships domestically, regionally, and internationally.

Annex I: Agenda

Day One – 6 December 2018	
08.30 – 09.00	Registration
09.00 – 9.30	<p>Welcome Remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brandolino, Director, Division of Treaty Affairs, UNODC • Hyun Joong Kang, President, Judicial Policy Research Institute, Supreme Court, Republic of Korea
9.30 – 9.45	<p>Introductions and overview of the Global Judicial Integrity Network and UNODC's work on judicial integrity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roberta Solis, Team Leader, Judicial Integrity, UNODC
9.45 – 11.00	<p>Session I: Overview of the ways in which gender-related issues implicate judicial integrity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker: Nancy Hendry, UNODC Consultant • Open discussion and short presentations by the participants, providing some examples on the topic.
11.00 – 11.15	<i>Coffee Break</i>
11.15 – 12.30	<p>Session II: Exploring the scope of the problem: How do gender-related issues, including sexual harassment and sextortion, manifest themselves in the justice system?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Speaker: Kieran Pender, Legal Advisor, International Bar Association • Open discussion
12.30 – 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 – 15.15	<p>Session III: Existing national, regional and international rules, guidelines and policies on gender-related integrity issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Speaker: Judith Jones, Justice, Trinidad and Tobago • Open Discussion
15.15 – 15.30	<i>Coffee Break</i>
15.30 – 17.00	<p>Session IV – How do existing judicial codes of conduct address gender-related judicial integrity issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker: David Sachar, Executive Director, Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission in Arkansas, United States of America • Open Discussion
17.00 – 17.30	Summary of the Day and Outline of Proposed Programme for Day Two

Day Two – 7 December 2018

09.30 – 11.00	<p>Session V – Judicial disciplinary and accountability mechanisms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Speaker: Teresita Leonardo de Castro, Chief Justice (ret.), Philippines • Open Discussion
11.00 – 11.15	<i>Coffee Break</i>
11.15 – 12.30	<p>Session VI – Monitoring and implementing gender guidelines and policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Speaker: Kathryn Beck, President, New Zealand Law Society • Open Discussion
12.30 – 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 – 15.30	<p>Session VII – Judicial education and training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator • Speaker: Eusebia Munuo, Justice, Tanzania • Speaker: Adisa Zahiragic, Judge, Bosnia and Herzegovina • Open Discussion
15.30 – 15.45	<i>Coffee Break</i>
15.45 – 17.30	<p>Session VIII – Incorporating gender-related integrity standards and guidelines into accountability mechanisms and judicial standards of conduct and ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Open Discussion
17.30 – 18.00	<p>Key outcomes and summary of the discussions. Conclusions and the way forward</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC

Annex II: List of Participants

Countries

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Adisa Zahiragic, Judge, Appeals Section, Cantonal Court, Sarajevo, President, Association of Women Judges of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Botswana

Sanji Monageng, Former Justice, International Criminal Court

Brazil

Rodrigo Capez, Assistant Judge, Presidency, National Judicial Council

China

Liu Qing, Deputy Division Director, Ministry of Justice

Guyana

Roxanne George, Acting Chief Justice, Member, Caribbean Association of Judicial Officers (CAJO)

Indonesia

Artha Theresia, Judge, High Court, Palembang

Mexico

Yezka Garza, Prosecutor, Office of the Prosecutor for Children and Families, Coahuila
Alejandro Llama Rodriguez, Prosecutor, Office of the Municipal Prosecutor for Children and Families, Coahuila

New Zealand

Kathryn Beck, President, New Zealand Law Society, Partner, SBM Legal

Philippines

Teresita Leonardo de Castro, Former Chief Justice, Member, International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ)

Spain

Luis De Arcos, Senior Judge, Department International Relations, General Council of the Judiciary

Republic of Korea

Hyun Joong Kang, President, Judicial Policy Research Institute (JPRI)

Young Su Kang, Presiding Judge, Seoul High Court, Chief Researcher, Judicial Policy Research Institute (JPRI)

Hojun Yeom, Presiding Judge, Incheon District Court, Senior Researcher, Judicial Policy Research Institute (JPRI)

Jiyong Jang, Judge, Seoul Central District Court, Researcher, Judicial Policy Research Institute (JPRI)

Sungan Cha, Judge, Suwon District Court, Researcher, Judicial Policy Research Institute (JPRI)

Seungohn Son, Presiding Judge, Incheon District Court

Jin A Jung, Presiding Judge, Ulsan District Court

Hyunhee Han, Judge, Suwon District Court, Seongnam Branch

Minhye Cho, Judge, Daejeon District Court

Mikyung Lim, Judge, Seoul Central District Court

Tanzania

Eusebia Munuo, Justice, Court of Appeal, Member, International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ)

Thailand

Suntariya Muanpawong, Research Judge, Research Justice Division

Trinidad and Tobago

Judith Ann Jones, Justice, Court of Appeal, Member, Caribbean Association of Judicial Officers (CAJO)

Uganda

Lillian Tibatemwa, Justice, Supreme Court

United States of America

David Sachar, Executive Director, Judicial Discipline and Disability Commission in Arkansas, President, Association of Judicial Disciplinary Counsel, Member, Advisory Board, National Center for State Courts – Center for Judicial Ethics (NCSC)

Kathleen Coogan, Senior Advisor for Atrocities Prevention and Gender, Department of State, Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL)

International Organisations

UNDP, United Nations Development Programme

Fatahillah Abdul Syukur, Sector Coordinator, Support for Reform of the Justice Sector in Indonesia Project (SUSTAIN)

UN Women, The United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

Beatrice Duncan, Policy Advisor, Rule of Law



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Judicial Associations and Non-Governmental Organizations

International Association of Judges (IAJ)

Grace Yin-Lun Lin, Justice, Member of the IAJ

International Bar Association (IBA)

Kieran Pender, Legal Advisor, Legal Policy & Research Unit

Institute for African Women in Law

Josephine Dawuni, Professor of Political Science, Howard University, Executive Director, Institute for African Women in Law

United Nations Secretariat

Roberta Solis, Judicial Integrity Team Leader, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC

Tatiana Balisova, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC

Doohun Choi, Associate Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC

Natalija Seke, Programme Management Assistant, UNODC

Mengting Li, Associate Public Information Officer, UNODC

Nancy Hendry, Consultant, UNODC