



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Expert Group Meeting on the Role of Judicial Immunities in Safeguarding Judicial Integrity

Vienna, Austria, 26-27 August 2019

Summary Report

This report has been prepared by the United Nations Office on Drug and Crime (UNODC), in its role as the Secretariat of the Global Judicial Integrity Network, as a summary of the discussions during the international Expert Group Meeting, held in Vienna from 26 to 27 August 2019.



Contents

BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS WORK OF THE GLOBAL JUDICIAL INTEGRITY NETWORK ON JUDICIAL IMMUNITIES 3

OBJECTIVES OF THE EXPERT GROUP MEETING 3

SUMMARY 5

 WELCOME REMARKS, INTRODUCTION, AND OVERVIEW OF THE WORK ON THE ROLE OF JUDICIAL IMMUNITIES IN SAFEGUARDING JUDICIAL INTEGRITY BY THE GLOBAL JUDICIAL INTEGRITY NETWORK 5

SESSION I: WHY IS IT RELEVANT TO LOOK AT THE ROLE OF JUDICIAL IMMUNITIES IN SAFEGUARDING JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE? 6

SESSION II AND III: JUDICIAL IMMUNITIES IN NARROW SENSE. ACCOUNTABILITY VERSUS INDEPENDENCE. INDEPENDENCE FROM POLITICAL INTERFERENCE. 7

SESSION IV: APPOINTMENT. SECURITY OF TENURE. PROMOTION. TRANSFER. SUSPENSION. REMOVAL OR CESSATION OF FUNCTIONS. 8

SESSION V: ADEQUATE WORKING CONDITIONS. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES. JUDICIAL SALARIES. JUDICIAL PENSIONS. 9

SESSION VI: SECURITY AND PHYSICAL PROTECTION. CRITICISM FROM MEDIA. OTHER ISSUES, SUCH AS: SYSTEMS PUT IN PLACE TO ENSURE THE INDEPENDENCE OF STATE PROSECUTION SERVICES. DISCOURAGEMENT OF OVERLY CLOSED GROUP MENTALITY OF JUDGES THAT CAN GENERATE INCENTIVES TO PROTECT ONE ANOTHER IMPROPERLY. 10

SESSION VII: REVISION OF THE COMMENTARY ON THE BANGALORE PRINCIPLES OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT 11

FINAL SESSION: KEY OUTCOMES AND SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS. CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD. 11

ANNEX I AGENDA 12

ANNEX II – LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 14



Background and Previous Work of the Global Judicial Integrity Network on Judicial Immunities

This report represents a summary of the discussions and the key outcomes of the Expert Group Meeting on the Role of Judicial Immunities in Safeguarding Judicial Integrity which took place from 26 to 27 August 2019 in Vienna, Austria, and that was organized under the umbrella of the Global Judicial Integrity Network.

The Global Judicial Integrity Network is a platform which provides assistance to judiciaries in strengthening judicial integrity and preventing corruption in the justice system. The Network promotes peer learning and support activities among judges and other justice sector stakeholders, facilitates access to relevant tools and resources on various issues relating to judicial integrity, and supports the further development and effective implementation of principles of judicial conduct and the prevention of corruption within the justice system.

At their meeting in January 2019 in Doha, the Advisory Board agreed that one of the areas that the Network could look at in more detail is judicial immunities and their role in safeguarding judicial integrity. In particular, the Board members agreed to develop a discussion paper that would analyse the elements that constitute the building blocks of judicial integrity and judicial independence, and how immunities, for example immunity from a suit for damages for a judicial act, security of tenure, rights of judges and conditions of work, contribute in safeguarding the fundamental principles of judicial conduct. Subsequently, a first draft of a discussion paper on the topic was developed.

The purpose of the present Expert Group Meeting was to discuss the discussion paper and help gather additional input and information on existing practices, experiences and challenges. The Expert Group Meeting brought together judicial and legal experts from different regions to discuss the topic and make recommendations.

Objectives of the Expert Group Meeting

The *Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct* set out the six core conduct characteristics that should underpin an effective and principled judiciary, namely independence, impartiality, integrity, equality, propriety, competence and diligence. Many judiciaries and judicial councils across the world have declared their allegiance to these *Principles* through the development of binding judicial oaths, codes of conduct and accompanying disciplinary sanctions for any breaches thereof. However, there remain many instances of individual judges falling short of the high standards of conduct engrained in the *Principles*, with a serious consequential reduction of public trust in the institution of the judiciary as a whole.¹ Exposure of judicial corruption, misbehaviour or malfeasance serves only to weaken public

¹ See for example *Judicial Systems and Corruption, IBA Judicial Integrity initiative* May 2016, conducted in partnership with the Basel Institute on Governance; Messick R. and Schutte A. (eds) *Corruption Risks in the*

confidence in the integrity of judges.² There are equally many examples of malign external pressure being placed on judges in an attempt to subvert their independence that create immense difficulty for them to adhere consistently to the *Principles*.³

There is a value to look behind these issues and offer a productive route to address them in a way that will help strengthen judicial integrity and restore wider confidence in the judiciary, where such confidence may currently be lacking.

The thesis of the discussion paper is that for the Principles to be effectively and universally practised, each State must ensure there is a commensurate Framework for Judicial Protection in place that is sufficiently robust to ensure that judges are less vulnerable to malign influences. Such a Framework should include the range of recognized judicial immunities, together with a series of constitutional or legal protections from negative external pressures. This would be entirely in line with Bangalore Principle 1.1, which states that: *“A judge shall exercise the judicial function independently on the basis of the judge’s assessment of the facts and in accordance with a conscientious understanding of the law, free of any extraneous influences, inducements, pressures, threats or interference, direct or indirect, from any quarter or for any reason.”*

The primary objective of the meeting was to garner judges’ feedback on the key protections outlined in the discussion paper. The meeting also sought to collect input for the work of the Judicial Integrity Group in reviewing and updating the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and/or its Commentary, in order to address emerging challenges to judicial integrity.

Criminal Justice Chain and Tools for Assessment (U4 Issue 2015; 6, Chr Michelsen Institute 2015); *Assessment of the Integrity and Capacity of the Justice System in Three Nigerian States: Technical Assessment, 2006*, UNODC http://bit.ly/assessment_nigerian_states; *Policy Framework for Preventing and Eliminating Corruption and Ensuring the Impartiality of the Judicial System*, ICJ 2000 <https://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/CIJL-Policy-Framework-for-preventing-and-eliminating-corruption-and-ensuring-impartiality-of-the-judicial-system-2000.pdf>.

² Examples include judges accepting bribes; judges allowing undue political influence and interference in their judicial work or influence through closed informal networks; judicial manipulation of budget allocations; cases of sextortion involving judges; political manipulation of judicial appointments and security of tenure.

³ The international organization Judges for Judges, based in the Netherlands, has catalogued innumerable instances of such interference over the past decade: <https://www.rechtersvoorrechters.nl/english/>. The organisation was established in 1998 to support fellow judges abroad who have experienced or may experience problems whilst practising their profession for example, their independence is being violated or threatened or they are being put under pressure.



Summary

Welcome remarks, introduction, and overview of the work on the role of judicial immunities in safeguarding judicial integrity by the Global Judicial Integrity Network

The welcome remarks were provided by **Mr. John Brandolino, Director of the Division for Treaty Affairs at UNODC**. He welcomed the participants and explained the background of the initiative and the Global Judicial Integrity Network. He thanked the participants for their work and the State of Qatar for its generous contribution, which funds the Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration.

Hon. Dr Hassan bin Lahdan Alhassan Almohanadi, Chief Justice, President of the Court of Cassation and the Supreme Judiciary Council of the State of Qatar, Member of the Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network also provided opening remarks. He expressed thanks to UNODC for organizing the meeting to discuss and enrich the theme of judicial immunities. He noted that the issue of judicial immunities could be interpreted with both negative and positive connotations; while some may consider immunity as a doctrine shielding judges from accountability for corruption, others understand it as a guarantee for the judges to be protected from arbitrary measures, especially as a way for some executive branches to exert undue pressure on the judiciary. Hon. Almohanadi explained that it would be beneficial to analogize judicial immunities with diplomatic or parliamentary immunities, which are doctrines that serve to enable the immunity holders to proceed with their work without being hindered or arbitrarily prosecuted for carrying out their lawful duties. Thus, the immunities doctrine should be seen as a tool to protect the independence of the judiciary from the legislative and executive branches of the states. He concluded with these main ideas:

1. Immunities should protect individual professional independence without shielding judges from abiding with laws.
2. When investigating and even prosecuting judges, it is important to protect the image and the brand of judiciary in the public opinion.
3. It would be useful to develop a global term of reference on judicial immunities.

Dr. Nihal Jayawickrama, Coordinator of the Judicial Integrity Group and Member of the Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network also provided opening remarks. He underlined the key role of the Network in addressing emerging challenges to judicial integrity and creating a space for judges to share their experiences. He explained the importance of the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct in providing a universally acknowledged set of principles to guide the work and life of judges. However, he also noted that the world has changed since the adoption of the Bangalore Principles and the Judicial Integrity Group was therefore undertaking efforts to review and update the Bangalore Principles or the accompanying Commentary to address emerging challenges to judicial integrity, such as the use of social media by judges and gender-related judicial integrity issues.



Mr. Marco Teixeira, Global Coordinator of the Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration also provided opening remarks and introduced the work, values and plans of the Global Programme.

Ms. Roberta Solis, Judicial Integrity Team Leader, UNODC Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration provided a background presentation on UNODC's work in judicial integrity and introduced in more concrete terms the Global Judicial Integrity Network's objectives, services, and planned activities.

Session I: Why is it relevant to look at the role of judicial immunities in safeguarding judicial independence?

Mr. Jeremy Cooper, Expert Consultant, UNODC introduced in more detail why the issue of judicial immunities in safeguarding judicial independence is relevant for the work of the Global Judicial Integrity Network, and introduced the scope and structure of the draft discussion paper on the topic. Mr. Jeremy Cooper provided a general definition of the principle of immunity: a doctrine to protect judges from the harassment of personal litigation in respect of their judicial functions, precluding lawsuit or prosecution except under an authorization of an appropriate judicial authority. At the same time, there are substantial limitations to the principle of immunity, including: (1) the judge acts in a private rather than professional capacity; (2) where evidence exists of corruption, the judge cannot claim immunity; (3) following certain violations of international human rights norms; and (4) serious judicial misconduct. Mr. Cooper emphasized that 'protection' may provide better framing for the doctrine than 'immunity' as the latter suggests to the general public that judges may act with impunity. Rather, the goal should be to communicate that judges enjoy greater independence when protected from threats or fear that their professional opinions may incur liability. Such a protective framework must include multiple components touching on various practical aspects of judicial work, such as:

- A state's explicit guarantee for the independence of the judiciary, and actual respect for that guarantee;
- Agreed procedures and qualifications for the appointment of judges, promotion, transfer, suspension, and cessation;
- Guarantees relating to judges security of tenure either until a mandatory retirement or the expiry of their term of office. This may sound trivial, but turns out to be a very easy way to get rid of judges, e.g. by arbitrarily lowering the retirement age;
- Judicial work conditions and salaries should be commensurate with the status and responsibility of the work of a judge;
- Security and physical protection of judges and their families in the event of threats being made against them, shall be ensured;
- Pensions;
- Independent fora capable of defending judges against inaccurate and malign criticism from the media, including social media.



- Reduction in the complexity of procedures which can be used to mask corrupt behavior or imprecise/lax decision-making;
- Independence from undue influence of state prosecution services; and
- Discouragement of an overly closed group mentality of judges that might generate incentives to protect one another improperly.

Session II and III: Judicial immunities in narrow sense. Accountability versus independence. Independence from political interference.

Hon. Adrian Saunders, President of the Caribbean Court of Justice and Member of the Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network opened the session with a presentation on the Caribbean region's perspective on judicial immunities. He noted that independence and accountability should be treated as two sides of the same coin, listing three principles aimed at improving accountability: (1) judges should abide by a code of conduct, which should be based on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct; (2) judiciaries should be responsible for devising, publishing, and ensuring adherence to performance standards; (3) judiciaries should facilitate ongoing judicial training. Judicial immunity is not to shield judges, but to ensure judges's impartial decision-making, independence and integrity. He provided further examples illustrating some lessons from the region. In one case, a judge who made an allegedly good-faith attempt at determining guardianship over a juvenile ward was ultimately sued for damages when the judge found that the prison was the only suitable option for her care. In a second example, a judge was sued after imprisoning a barrister for contempt without proper notice. Both examples highlighted an underlying question of whether liability when immunity is removed should be borne by the individual judge or by the state.

In the ensuing discussion, participants identified the following themes, questions, and conclusions:

- On the topic of framing the purpose of immunity, participants agreed that it was important for the public to understand the value of judicial immunities and that the doctrine is not an entitlement to insulate judges for their poor behavior, and must not conflate immunity with impunity. Rather, immunity must be seen as a positive value to assure litigants that their cases will be considered by officers empowered to reach independent decisions without fear of retaliation. The relationship between judicial immunities, transparency, independence and accountability should be explored and understood.
- Participants noted the importance of understanding the extent and limitations of judicial immunities and setting the conversations into national contexts. An example of an issue to deal with is whether judicial immunities extend to administrative actions of judges (e.g. questions of recusals, initiating proceedings against judges, etc.).
- Participants discussed the status and value of various existing textual sources that touch upon judicial immunities, including the Basic Principles on the Independence of the Judiciary (Article 16), Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct (and its accompanying Commentary and Implementation Measures), United Nations Convention against Corruption (Articles 11 and

30(2)), Opinions No. 3 and 21 of the Consultative Council of European Judges, various reports of the Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers and the Universal Charter of the Judge.

- Participants noted the importance of discussing the procedures for lifting of immunities and the issue of sequencing in inquiries of a judge's conduct. For example, what entities and under what circumstances can lift judicial immunities? What would be the procedural steps? To what standard must violations be proven? How can the process be started and progressed while minimizing negative public perception of the judiciary as a whole? Do standards change for part-time judges? More nuance may be necessary based on the type of violation—civil, criminal, administrative. In addition, participants acknowledged that national contexts matter and that guidance should be developed bearing in mind the differences in various legal systems.
- Some participants noted that processes meant to protect independence could be applied in an ineffective or purposely harmful manner. For example, constitutional guarantees of independence may do little in political systems with corruption. Performance reviews and interviews may unduly expose judges to public embarrassment, thus, also undermining credibility and trust in the judiciary.
- Judges should be held accountable through effective mechanisms of disciplinary sanctions. Caution must be exercised concerning the nature and publicity of disciplinary proceedings. The level of transparency should be clearly defined for all disciplinary proceedings. In addition, it was noted with concern that in some countries the executive branch exerts influence over disciplinary proceedings.
- Participants noted that the structure of some jurisdictions allows the prosecution to exert a large amount of influence over the judiciary, for example, with threats to prosecute judges for reaching unfavourable decisions.
- Participants discussed the relationship between judicial immunities and human rights violations and agreed that the issue should be carefully considered. It was noted that it is the manner and degree of a human rights violation that should be taken into consideration in a decision to lift immunity. For example, some errors constitute violations of human rights law (denial of speedy trial), but are remedied by processes including review on appeal. Likely, the principle applies such that immunity will not protect judges committing serious crimes (war crimes, crimes against humanity). On criminal charges, judges should be treated the same way as other citizens.

Session IV: Appointment. Security of tenure. Promotion. Transfer. Suspension. Removal or cessation of functions.

Hon. Carl Olav Smith, Judge, National Judicial Council, Brazil provided an overview of the Brazilian system's approaches to the appointment and removal of judges. He explained the structure of the Brazilian Federal Jurisdiction (Supreme Court; Superior Court of Justice; Regional Federal High Courts; and Federal Judges) and explained the rules on appointment and promotions at the various degrees

of the Federal Jurisdiction.

The ensuing discussion centered around the principles for the selection and appointment of judges. Participants discussed their practical experiences and views with regard to transparency, impartiality, objectivity, professionalism, equality, merit-based selection and fairness. Participants also discussed the role of appointment authorities and judicial councils, as well as the composition of panels responsible for appointing and promoting judges.

Session V: Adequate working conditions. Administrative support services. Judicial salaries. Judicial pensions.

Hon. Jose Igreja Matos, Judge, Court of Appeal of Porto, Vice President of the International Association of Judges and Member of the Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network opened with remarks on the topic of salaries, pensions, and court funding. Broadly, he proposed that judicial salaries and working conditions could be thought of as a reflection of how much that society values the principle of justice.

The discussion largely focused on what objective standards and measures could be applied in order to set compensation levels which are fair, promote independence, and meet the practical needs of the judicial institution, including funding for facilities and staff. It was noted that there is no one-size-fits-all model; however, certain general criteria and minimum requirements should be established to ensure effective allocation and management of monetary resources and to achieve financial autonomy of the judiciary. Remuneration schemes should always be based on the principles of objectivity, transparency and equality.

Some ideas discussed included: (a) earmarking judicial funding as a percentage of the country's GDP; (b) setting judicial compensation to be competitive with similarly-ranked positions—representatives of the other two branches of government or prosecutors; (c) allowing the judicial branch to independently invest its funding, which could allow for the branch to operate in a more self-sufficient manner; and (d) allocating judges under a service delivery model, that is, calculating how many judges in an area are required based on population statistics (an approach which for example has been used to calculate the necessary number of police in a jurisdiction).

One topic of strong interest was how the judiciary could advocate for itself and convince the public that its functions are crucial, and thus requires adequate and consistent funding. In general, increased funding for the judiciary is not considered a compelling priority for the public. However, this should not be the case—the public must understand the utility of funding justice, such as speedy resolution of disputes and the maintenance of the quality of judgements and the link between resources spent on judiciary and economic progress. One participant also noted that courts must strive to maintain their own standards for hiring of both judges and service staff, whose poor performance in some jurisdictions is negatively affecting the reputation of the courts.

Some participants alluded to several studies, such as by the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, that explain the link between judicial salaries and efficiency. In addition, participants noted the lack of understanding and research regarding the assumption that higher paid judges are less likely to be corrupt/corruptible.

Session VI: Security and physical protection. Criticism from media. Other issues, such as: Systems put in place to ensure the independence of state prosecution services. Discouragement of overly closed group mentality of judges that can generate incentives to protect one another improperly.

Hon. Mathilda Twomey, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Seychelles addressed questions such as why judges need to feel safe, where do physical threats originate, the potential impact on judicial independence and the need for support from all institutions, such as police, parliament or media. She presented statistics showing that a large proportion of judges were concerned about safety both within and outside the courtroom, and noted that generally there was a lack of research done on this topic. In particular, it would be important to know the precise nature and extent of threats against the judiciary, and to additionally conduct surveys of attitudes before the occurrence of a major breach or attack on a judge. Most existing data comes from surveys of post-attack attitudes. While media and social media can contribute to improved transparency and openness, she also noted that poor or biased media coverage can undermine public trust in the judiciary and that social media can be a channel for online abuse and threats.

Participants agreed upon the necessity of precautionary measures, such as building-wide security plans and the use of trained security personnel. Participants were concerned about various intangible threats which mobilize public opinion against the judiciary, thus increasing the risk of including physical harm against judges. These threats can arise from explicit campaigns against the judiciary, backed by other branches of government; sensationalized and inaccurate press coverage, particularly in high-profile and politically sensitive cases; and even disputes among different groups of judges in a judiciary.

In response to such threats, participants stressed the need for the judiciary to be more willing to enter conflicts to defend its interests, but also noted that the judiciary often could not resort to similar tactics without compromising its own reputation. For example, the judiciary cannot simply run billboard campaigns against their attackers, or respond directly to critics on social media.

Participants agreed that, at a minimum, judiciaries need to have more a robust public information apparatus, which should publish accurate information about cases and controversies before the media has a chance to editorialize. As this information may be 'dry' in comparison to news media, it would be valuable to have judges publish summaries of their decisions in a version more easily understandable by the public.



Other public information solutions include direct interaction at the primary and secondary school level; producing written and computer materials which can be used in teaching; and providing training programs for media representatives. In addition, alliances may be formed with the national or local bar associations, who are able to speak out against abuses on the judiciary.

Session VII: Revision of the Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct

Dr. Nihal Jayawickrama opened the session with a brief overview of the drafting and adoption of the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct. He listed possible areas for further elaboration and updating, which include: the use of social media by judges; gender-related judicial integrity issues; recusal of judges; and a new value of ‘courage’.

In general, participants agreed that large-scale revision of the Bangalore Principles would be a time-consuming and potentially ineffective process, and that it would be preferable to make targeted updates to the Commentary or add annexes to the Commentary rather than opening the six values for discussion.

On the issue of gender, participants agreed that the topics of discrimination, bias, harassment, gender identity, and sexual orientation could be addressed with more depth and nuance, such as by describing specific prohibited behaviors, identifying risks arising in certain types of cases (e.g., rape cases), and identifying institutional sources of discrimination (e.g. only female judges are assigned to family law cases). There could be more attention on how the relative power differences between judges and litigants, or senior judges and junior judges, can frustrate the resolution of claims of abuse.

Participants discussed a number of challenges related to the mechanics of recusal and noted the differences in approaches based on the different legal systems and traditions. As such, it may be challenging to develop international guidance that would be applicable to all countries.

Participants found that it would be difficult to justify a new value of courage. Participants sought to understand how courage may be unique from integrity and impartiality. There was concern that courage could be misinterpreted to overextend the role of the judge, whose core function is to apply the law to reach decisions. If judicial officers need deep personal courage to make difficult or unpopular decisions, this situation implies that the judiciary is acting within a flawed system and does not receive enough support from other branches of government or international institutions. On the other hand, courage may simply be a commitment to upholding “higher principles” beyond straightforward application of the national law. This is already contained somewhat in the phrasing “judges should be aware of international law”.

Final session: Key outcomes and summary of the discussions. Conclusions and the way forward.

Mr. Marco Teixeira provided concluding remarks. He noted the quality of the discussion to understand the value, extent, and limitations of the immunities and thanked all participants for sharing their views and experiences. He noted that this discussion was a starting point and could open many avenues for future consideration of the topics discussed. He explained that there were many components discussed under the umbrella of immunities, and that the discussion succeeded in identifying interlinking issues which should not be dealt with in isolation. He expressed that the Network should serve as a platform to address each of these issues in greater detail.

Annex I Agenda

Day One – 26 August 2019	
08.00 – 09.00	Registration
09.00 – 09.30	<p>Welcome remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brandolino, Director, Division of Treaty Affairs, UNODC • Chief Justice Dr. Hassan Bin Lahdan Alhassan Almohanadi, President of the Supreme Judiciary Council and President of the Court of Cassation of the State of Qatar and Member of the Advisory Board, Global Judicial Integrity Network • Dr. Nihal Jayawickrama, Coordinator of the Judicial Integrity Group and Member of the Advisory Board, Global Judicial Integrity Network
09.30 – 09.45	<p>Introduction and overview of the Global Judicial Integrity Network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNODC
09.45 – 10.30	<p>Session I: Why is it relevant to look at the role of judicial immunities in safeguarding judicial independence?</p> <p><i>The session will introduce in more detail why the issue of the role of judicial immunities in safeguarding judicial independence is relevant for the work of the Global Judicial Integrity Network and will introduce the scope and structure of the draft discussion paper on the topic. Participants will be invited to briefly share their initial thoughts, comments and feedback on the discussion paper.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker: Jeremy Cooper, Expert Consultant, UNODC • Moderator: UNODC • Open discussion

10.30 – 11.00	Group Photo Coffee Break
11.00 – 12.00	<p>Session II: Judicial immunities in narrow sense. Accountability versus independence. Independence from political interference.</p> <p><i>Some of the topics will include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explicit recognition of the range and limits of traditional judicial immunities. - An explicit guarantee by the state of the independence of the judiciary from political interference by the executive branch and legislature. - Establishment of independent fora capable of defending judges against inaccurate and malign criticism from the media, including social media. - Removal of undue influence of groups and individuals outside the judiciary (politicians, wealthy individuals, organised crime networks). - Reduction in the opaque complexity of procedures that can be used to mask corrupt behaviour. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Open discussion
12.00 – 14.00	<p>12.00 -12.30 Doha Global Programme Poster Exhibit</p> <p>Lunch</p>
14.00 – 15.30	<p>Session III: Judicial immunities in narrow sense. Accountability versus independence. Independence from political interference. (cont.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Open discussion
15.30 – 15.45	Coffee Break
15.45 – 17.00	<p>Session IV: Appointment. Security of tenure. Promotion. Transfer. Suspension. Removal or cessation of functions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Open discussion
17.00 – 17.30	Summary of the day and outline of proposed programme for Day Two

Day Two – 27 August 2019	
09.30 – 10.45	<p>Session V: Adequate working conditions. Administrative support services. Judicial salaries. Judicial pensions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Open Discussion

10.45 – 11.15	<i>Coffee Break</i>
11.15 – 12.30	<p>Session VI: Security and physical protection. Criticism from media. Other issues, such as: Systems put in place to ensure the independence of state prosecution services. Discouragement of overly closed group mentality of judges that can generate incentives to protect one another improperly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Open Discussion
12.30 – 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 – 16.00	<p>Session VII: Revision of the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker – Nihal Jayawickrama, Coordinator of the Judicial Integrity Group • Moderator: UNODC • Open Discussion
16.00 – 16.15	<i>Coffee Break</i>
16.15 – 17.15	<p>Final session: Key outcomes and summary of the discussions. Conclusions and the way forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: UNODC • Conclusions: Marco Teixeira, Global Programme Coordinator, Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration
17.00 – 17.15	<p>Closing remarks. End of the Meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brigitte Strobel-Shaw, Chief, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, UNODC

Annex II – List of Participants

Members of the Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network

Maria Thereza Rocha de Assis Moura, Minister, Vice-President, Superior Court of Justice, Brazil



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Accompanied by Carl Olav Smith, Judge, National Judicial Council, Brazil

Duro Sessa, Chief Justice, Croatia

Kashim Zannah, Chief Judge, High Court, Borno State and Member of National Judicial Council, Nigeria

Hassan bin Lahdan Alhassan Almohanadi, Chief Justice, President, Court of Cassation and Supreme Judiciary Council, Qatar

Accompanied by Omar Ganim Mohamed, Director of International Cooperation Unit, Office of the Chief Justice, Qatar

Adrian Saunders, President, Caribbean Court of Justice, Chairman, Caribbean Association of Judicial Officers

Lynne Leitch, Justice, Superior Court of Justice, Ontario, Chair of Gender Section of the Commonwealth Magistrates' and Judges' Association

José Igreja Matos, Judge, Court of Appeal of Porto, Vice President of the International Association of Judges

Nihal Jayawickrama, Sri Lanka, Coordinator of the Judicial Integrity Group

Diego Garcia-Sayán, United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers

Countries

Roland Kempfle, Judge, Munich Regional Court I, Germany

Patrick Kiage, Justice, Court of Appeal of Kenya, Kenya

Mazni binti Nawī, Director of Integrity Unit, Chief Registrar's Office, Federal Court of Malaysia, Malaysia

Vivian Lopez Nunez, Judge, First Instance Civil Court of Asunción, Paraguay, Member, International Association of Women Judges

Grzegorz Stanislas Borkowski, International Legal Expert, Poland

Maria Filomena Singh, Associate Justice, Court of Appeals of the Philippines, Philippines

Rashid Albadr, Judge, Qatar

Khalifa Almuslimani, Judge, Qatar

Mathilda Twomey, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Seychelles, Seychelles

Shiranee Tilakawardane, Justice, Supreme Court of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka

Judicial Associations and Regional and International Organizations

Andrea Huber, Deputy Chief, Rule of Law Unit, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

Matt Pollard, Senior Legal Advisor, International Commission of Jurists

Kees Sterk, President, European Network of Councils for the Judiciary

Jan Van Zyl Smit, Senior Research Fellow, Bingham Centre for the Rule of Law

Edith Zeller, President, Association of European Administrative Judges

Hugh Corder, Chair, Advisory Board of the Democratic Governance and Rights Unit, University of Cape Town

United Nations Secretariat

Marco Teixeira, Senior Programme Officer, UNODC

Roberta Solis, Judicial Integrity Team Leader, UNODC

Tatiana Balisova, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC

Jeremy Cooper, Consultant, UNODC