



The Doha Declaration:  
PROMOTING A CULTURE  
OF LAWFULNESS

Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Launch of a  
Global Judicial Integrity Network

24-25 August 2017

Vienna International Centre

**Summary Report**



Email: [Roberta.solis@unodc.org](mailto:Roberta.solis@unodc.org)

Website: [www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)

Copyright © United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2017

This report is intended for internal use by law enforcement, regulatory and other relevant government agencies and is not intended for public distribution.

This report was made possible through the generous financial support by the Government of Qatar.

## Table of Contents

1. WORKSHOP DETAILS .....	3
2. BACKGROUND .....	5
3. OBJECTIVES .....	6
4. SUMMARY.....	6
Appendix 1: Agenda .....	17
Appendix 2: List of Participants .....	23

## 1. MEETING DETAILS

<b>Title</b>	Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Launch of a Global Judicial Integrity Network.
<b>Venue</b>	Vienna International Centre, Vienna, Austria
<b>Date</b>	24-25 August 2017
<b>Participants</b>	<p>Total of 34 judicial participants including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judicial Delegations from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Albania</li> <li>(ii) Azerbaijan</li> <li>(iii) Belarus</li> <li>(iv) Bosnia and Herzegovina</li> <li>(v) Bulgaria</li> <li>(vi) Croatia</li> <li>(vii) Estonia</li> <li>(viii) Georgia</li> <li>(ix) Lithuania</li> <li>(x) Luxembourg</li> <li>(xi) Malta</li> <li>(xii) Montenegro</li> <li>(xiii) Poland</li> <li>(xiv) Qatar</li> <li>(xv) Republic of Moldova</li> <li>(xvi) Romania</li> <li>(xvii) Russian Federation</li> <li>(xviii) Serbia</li> <li>(xix) Slovakia</li> <li>(xx) Spain</li> <li>(xxi) Turkey</li> <li>(xxii) Ukraine</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>An additional 10 participants attended to represent judicial networks, think-tanks and associations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Research Institute of Judicial Systems (IRSIG)</li> <li>(ii) European Network of Councils For the Judiciary (ENCJ)</li> <li>(iii) Commonwealth Magistrates' and Judges' Association (CMJA)</li> <li>(iv) International Association of Judges (IAJ)</li> <li>(v) International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ)</li> <li>(vi) Judicial Integrity Group (JIG)</li> <li>(vii) Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO)</li> <li>(viii) Venice Commission</li> </ul>

	<p>2 Chief Justices attended the meeting (Azerbaijan and Croatia).</p> <p>The Permanent Missions of Belarus, France, Qatar and Turkey sent representatives to observe the deliberations.</p> <p>6 members of UNODC HQ staff attended to provide secretariat support and assist in delivery of the conference.</p>
<b>Moderators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mr Oliver Stolpe, Senior Programme Officer, UNODC</li> <li>• Justice Marin Mrcela, President, GRECO</li> <li>• Justice Rudolf Mellinghoff, JIG</li> <li>• Judge Jose Igreja Matos, IAJ</li> <li>• Ms Candice Welsch, Chief, Implementation Support Section, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, UNODC.</li> </ul>
<b>Coordinating Agencies</b>	UNODC Headquarters in Vienna, Austria.
<b>Funding</b>	GLOZ 82



## 2. BACKGROUND

Assessments conducted by UNODC and others throughout all regions of the world have time and again confirmed that many citizens perceive their countries' justice systems as opaque, difficult to access and prone to corruption. As such, corruption in the justice sector is a major impediment to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, aimed at the promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, the provision of access to justice for all, and building effective, accountable institutions at all levels.

International standards have been developed to support judicial integrity and prevention of corruption in the Judiciary. The **Bangalore Principles on Judicial Conduct** provide a framework for judicial conduct and establish important standards for ethical conduct of judges. Article 11 of the **United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC)** emphasizes the crucial role of the judiciary in combating corruption and recognizes that in order to play this role effectively, the judiciary itself must be free of corruption and its members must act with integrity. Accordingly, it requires each State Party to (a) take measures to strengthen integrity among members of the judiciary, and (b) take measures to prevent opportunities for corruption among members of the judiciary.

The Doha Declaration<sup>1</sup>, adopted at the UN Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice in April 2015, underlined the principles of judiciary integrity and corruption prevention in the justice system and reaffirmed the commitment of States to “make every effort to prevent and counter corruption, and to implement measures aimed at enhancing transparency in public administration and promoting the integrity and accountability of our criminal justice systems, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption.”

The **United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)**, as guardian of the Convention, serves as Secretariat to the Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC. In this role, UNODC services the Implementation Review Mechanism (IRM) for the Convention. The Second Cycle of the Review Mechanism, launched in 2016, addresses the implementation of Chapter II of the Convention, which includes Article 11.

In 2016, following the adoption of the Doha Declaration, UNODC with the support of the Government of the State of Qatar, launched the *Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration: Towards the Promotion of a Culture of Lawfulness*. The Global Programme focuses on four inter-related components: strengthening **judicial integrity** and the prevention of corruption; fostering **prisoner rehabilitation** and social integration; **preventing youth crime** through sports; and encouraging a culture of the rule of law in schools and universities through the initiative ‘**Education for Justice**’.

With a view to strengthening judicial integrity and preventing opportunities in the justice system, the project aims to launch a **Global Judicial Integrity Network**. The objective of Network is to advance the networking of judges around the topic of judicial integrity, provide an easily accessible database of resources, good practices and other materials, develop new tools for judiciaries, and facilitate the provision of technical cooperation to assist judiciaries in the development and implementation of specific measures and systems aimed at enhancing judicial integrity and prevention of corruption in the justice system. Against this background,

---

<sup>1</sup>The Doha Declaration was adopted at the UN Crime Congress in 2015 to integrate crime prevention and criminal justice into the wider United Nations agenda to address social and economic challenges and to promote the rule of law at the national and international level.

UNODC convened a one-day workshop with representatives of the Supreme Courts from the European region to prepare the launch of a Global Judicial Integrity Network.

### 3. OBJECTIVES

The workshop was conducted with the following objectives -

- Raise awareness among members of the judiciary regarding the proposal for the creation of a Global Judicial Integrity Network;
- Collect the ongoing efforts, good practices and priorities of judiciaries across regions in terms of strengthening judicial integrity;
- Assess the needs and expectations of judiciaries in terms of capacity-building support, advisory services, tools, networking opportunities and other resources which could be provided through a Global Judicial Integrity Network and related platform of resources and services, and to identify members of the judiciary and judicial administration who would be interested to join the Network once launched; and
- Identify members of the judiciary and judicial administration who would be interested in joining the network.

The workshop was designed to promote dialogue and exchange of ideas between the judiciaries of European countries, on a broad range to topics of interest to the region, these included:

- Risk mapping, qualitative assessments, surveys, court inspections, performance evaluations, vetting and appointment, public outreach, court transparency.
- Enforcing Codes of Conduct, establishing complaints mechanisms, protecting reporting persons, integrating professional ethics and integrity into judicial education.

### 4. SUMMARY

#### Welcoming and Opening Remarks



The regional workshop was held on 24-25 August 2017 in Vienna, Austria with welcoming remarks from **Mr John Brandolino**, Director, UNODC Division of Treaty Affairs. Mr Brandolino informed participants that the judicial integrity component of the Global Programme to implement the Doha Declaration aims to turn principles into practice and to assist judiciaries in the implementation of measures to promote integrity. He

further explained that the goal is to bring together judiciaries to consolidate and disseminate the knowledge that already exists.

### Session I – Regional Development in Judicial Integrity

In this session participants were provided with a background to UNODC's work in the area of judicial integrity. Country delegations were then given the opportunity to address the plenary to highlight important steps being taken to enhance judicial integrity or existing challenges as well expectations of the event.



**Mr Oliver Stolpe**, UNODC Senior Programme Officer of the Global Programme, provided the background to UNODC's work on judicial integrity and explained in more detail the goals of the current judicial integrity initiative. He explained that UNODC's work in this area began around the year 2000 to help to address issues concerning violations of judicial office, corruption and misconduct. Through this work, it became clear that there was a need for better channels to connect judges and judiciaries and to give judges a much stronger voice in the work being undertaken. He explained that the planned network aims to address requests from judiciaries for guidance and access to tools, standards and training.

The floor was then opened to participants to provide regional perspectives:

- *In recent years many countries in the region have undergone rigorous judicial reform that has included for example: the removal of military courts, a systematic review of regulatory acts, the enactment of judicial codes of conduct, ethics handbooks, and monitoring and evaluation of court staff.*
- *Several participants underlined the need to maintain a strong focus on the importance of judicial independence, in particular from state pressure and outside influence.*
- *It was also noted that strengthening integrity must include magistrates, prosecutors, lawyers and other justice sector stakeholders.*



Further insight was provided by representatives of judicial associations and anti-corruption bodies:



- *GRECO explained that it is an anti-corruption monitoring body within Europe. The participants were informed that since 2012 GRECO has been assessing what measures have been put in place by members states to combat corruption. GRECO has concluded approximately 45 evaluations and is currently assessing what recommendations have been implemented. Thematic areas identified include: framework tools and mechanisms, recruitment, conflict of interest, asset declarations, gifts and benefits, confidentiality and interaction, and immunities.*
- *The IAWJ emphasized the need to be inclusive and to overcome sexism and gender stereotypes, to this end the IAWJ is committed to building bridges and networks to work together.*
- *The ENCJ expressed concern that in some countries there are many safeguards for independence but they do not work properly. ENCJ also raised the issue of the ‘revolving door’ between politics and judicial office as a threat to the image and trust that the public has of the judiciary.*
- *The IAJ explained that they are cooperating with the UNODC project which they consider to be crucial for the future of the judiciary. They expressed concern that their recent European survey revealed that in the last 5 years 68% of survey takers considered the state of institutional integrity to have worsened. A major problem is undue influence upon judicial appointments.*
- *The CCJE also underlined that a major problem for the region is how the state can infringe the integrity of the judiciary.*

## Session II: Strengthening Integrity and Preventing Corruption in the Judiciary

**Justice Duro Sessa**, President of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Croatia and Vice President of the CCJE presented on practices in Council of Europe Member States for evaluating judges. He explained that the current trend in Europe is to have more frequent evaluations, and that there is a variation between formal and informal evaluation methods in Member States. He continued to express CCJE's view that formal evaluations should be established by primary legislation. He highlighted the fundamental risk with judicial evaluations, which is that any individual evaluation of judges must maintain respect for judicial independence. When an individual evaluation has consequences for a judge's promotion, salary and pension, or may even lead to his or her removal from office, there is a risk that the evaluated judge will not decide cases according to his or her objective interpretation of the facts and the law, but in a way that may be thought to please the evaluators.

**Judge Rodica Aida Popa**, Criminal Division of the High Court of Cassation and Justice of Romania, presented on 'integrity in the public and private space', in particular the necessity for ensuring trust in social relationships. She provided the example of the practice in Romania where an 'Inter-professional Charter' of Judges, Prosecutors and Lawyers has been signed (2015). The Charter addresses in separate Chapters: the rule of law and justice, the specificity of functions, ethics and deontology, the formation of judges, prosecutors, and lawyers and continuous inter-professional dialogue between practitioners. The Charter contains 24 'principles' reaffirming the need to respect the judicial authority, recognizing the significant role of lawyers in enforcing the law and respecting the fundamental rights and guarantees of the judiciary. Judge Popa also informed participants that as a result of recent reforms conflict of interest is now an offence under the Romanian Criminal Code.

**Prof. Dr. Aurelijus Gutasukas**, Judge of the Criminal Law Division of Supreme Court of Lithuania, presented on the principle provisions of judge's ethics in Lithuanian. Judge Gutasukas drew upon his experience as Chairperson of the Lithuanian Ethics and Discipline Commission to provide an insight into the composition, functions, and formation of the Commission. Under Lithuanian law, disciplinary liability can arise where an action demeaning the judicial office is present, such as an act incompatible with judge's honour, in conflict with the code of ethics, or that constitutes misconduct in office (negligent performance of any specific duty of a judge or omission to act without a good cause). He provided an overview of the principles that are applied to investigations into violations, namely that the investigation must be objective and impartial, whilst remaining comprehensive and versatile.

**Mr Francesco Contini**, Researcher, IRSIG, delivered a presentation on his thoughts as to 'the age of judicial transformation'. In particular he discussed what the advancement of technology and digitization means for judicial transformation and the potential systemic risks such as: the pursuit of efficiency savings leading to less time for proper consideration of cases and judicial action being delegated to electronic devices. He suggested that, where administrative functions are delegated to a technological system, it is important to carefully monitor how such systems are operating and what effect this might have on independent adjudication.

The floor was then opened for discussion:

- *Participants highlighted, that despite the existence of international norms, and although many countries have enacted Judicial Codes of Conduct - the reality in practice is different.*
- *Participants agreed that monitoring and evaluating in country practice and implementation was crucial.*
- *The Venice Commission explained their function with regard to the internal independence of judges. It was highlighted that in the region, the vetting of the judiciary has become a major issue. The Commission has developed a checklist to provide a fair and comparative assessment of the various factors relevant to independence of the judiciary and the rule of law ([http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-AD\(2016\)007-e](http://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-AD(2016)007-e))*
- *During discussions the view was expressed that 'integrity' should not be used as a weapon or tool for politicians who are seeking to influence the judiciary.*

### Session III - Strengthening Integrity and Preventing Corruption in the Judiciary



**Judge Sergey Rudakov**, Deputy Chief Justice, President of the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court of Russia, focused in particular on the topic of conflict of interest. He expressed the view that settling conflicts of interest is one of the most important anti-corruption tasks to ensure the proper functioning of the legal system. Judge Rudakov suggested that benefit would be gained by publishing a list of potential situations that could result in a conflict of interest and ways in which to resolve such conflicts. Such a tool would assist judges and judiciaries in early identification of potential conflicts of interest. Judge Rudakov suggested some key principles for the settlement of conflicts of interest:

- (i) Protection of ‘interests of the law’ – a judge must adopt decisions based only upon the law.
- (ii) Ensuring the open nature of justice.
- (iii) Personal responsibility of the Judge - the Judge must be personally responsible for upholding the balance between lawful and personal interests.
- (iv) Introduction of principles of honesty and impartiality into the system of adoption of decisions.

**Ms Nuria Diaz Abad**, President of the ENCJ, described the work of the ENCJ, in particular the series of reports produced during the last 10-15 years. The 2004-05 Report on Evaluation of Judges (<https://www.encj.eu/images/stories/pdf/workinggroups/judgesevaluation2005.pdf>) was highlighted. This report came to the conclusion that few countries address ethical aspects in the evaluation of judges and, where this is taken into consideration, it is related principally to professional activities. The 2014-15 Report on Disciplinary Proceedings and Liability of Judges (<https://www.csm1909.ro/ViewFile.ashx?guid=056d4248-5448-4277-ae64-f6e10a758acd%7CInfoCSM>) was also cited; in this report links between disciplinary frameworks and judicial ethics were analyzed, and minimum standards and indicators regarding these areas are established. In concluding, Ms Abad pointed out that she believes that a ‘culture of integrity’ is possible and called for participants to work together to achieve it.

**Judge Susana Ester Medina**, President of the IAWJ, provided an informative presentation on the topic of sextortion; ‘the abuse of power to obtain sexual benefit or advantage’. Her view was that the anti-corruption community focuses mainly on financial impropriety whereas little attention is paid to situations whereby sex rather than money is the demand. She explained that sextortion has a sexual component and a corruption component. She suggested that in order to change attitudes and behavior ‘visibility’ must be increased, this includes: naming the problem, identifying barriers, identifying legal remedies, and formulating an action plan.

**Judge Galina Toneva-Dacheva**, Judge of the Supreme Court of Cassation of Bulgaria described the court inspection system which was set up in 2007. Inspections take place on the issues of conflict of interest and asset declarations. Inspections are finalized with a report which contains a concrete position on whether integrity principles have been violated. The report is submitted to the Judicial Council, which decides on the further course of action. Individuals are granted the opportunity for a hearing and to make submissions on their behalf.

**Judge Wenceslao Olea Godoy**, Judge President of the Disciplinary Commission of the General Council for the Judiciary of Spain, provided an insight into the judicial integrity framework and issues in Spain. Here, the behaviour of Judges is addressed by a code of conduct, and the General Council of the Judiciary has appointed a committee to draft a code of ethics. The difficulty being experienced is the ongoing debate as to what the impact of the codes should be, in particular whether breaches of the codes should be punishable.

The Question and answer session provided the following insights:

- *Differing views exist as to whether a code of ethics should form the basis for disciplinary proceedings.*
- *It is vital that the development of codes is conducted by judges, a code of ethics or conduct cannot be seen by Judges as something imposed upon them.*
- *There is a variation between judiciaries in the region regarding enactment of codes of ethics and codes of conduct and also the existence of an independent body for monitoring and enforcement.*



## Session IV - The Global Judicial Integrity Network

**Ms. Roberta Solis**, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC, presented an outline of the proposed objectives and functions of the Global Judicial Integrity Network.



### Networking for Integrity

Connecting judges to support each other in upholding judicial integrity and preventing corruption in the justice system:



- Regular in-person network meetings
- Virtual meetings
- Thematic discussion fora

#### 1) Networking for Integrity

The Network is proposed to connect judges to support each other in upholding judicial integrity and preventing corruption in the justice system by-

- Holding regular in-person meetings;
- Holding virtual meetings;
- Establishing thematic discussion for a.

#### 2) Resources for Integrity

The Network is proposed to provide judges and other stakeholders with a one-stop-shop database and website consisting of -

- Knowledge products (research and analysis, policy documents, guidelines, standards and norms);
- Resource materials (training manuals, computer-based training tools, checklists and database of disciplinary decisions).

#### 3) Technical and Policy Advice for Integrity

The Network will also provide judges with technical assistance, including -

- Assessments, surveys and studies;
- Legal and policy drafting support (strategies and action plans, codes of conduct, performance evaluation, income and asset declaration systems, court inspections, complaint and disciplinary mechanisms, etc.);
- Capacity-building, peer-to-peer learning and training, etc.

#### 4) Next Steps

A successful implementation of the Global Judicial Integrity Network implies the following next steps -

- Additional Regional preparatory meetings for the Launch of the Network;

- Further stakeholder scoping and needs assessments;
- Continued outreach to various judicial stakeholders;
- Research on existing materials and resources;
- Development of tools, such as a judicial ethics training package for newly appointed judges;
- Global Judicial Integrity Network launch in April 2018.

Ms Solis also presented the preliminary results of a recently launched online survey (which can be accessed and completed [here](http://icts-surveys.unog.ch/index.php/569437?newtest=Y&lang=en) <http://icts-surveys.unog.ch/index.php/569437?newtest=Y&lang=en>) to gather inputs from judges and different stakeholders about priority issues, emerging topics, as well as tools and resources to be developed through the Global Judicial Integrity Network.

**Judge José Igreja Matos**, of the IAJ shared his thoughts on the importance of the Global Judicial Integrity Network:

- 1) Structural – judicial integrity is a key issue for Judges, since it is central to what Baroness Hale described as the four cornerstones of judicial office (independence, quality, diversity and incorruptibility).***
- 2) Global Dimension – the question of ethics is transnational.***
- 3) Technical Resources –there is strong demand for a great variety of technical tools and resources in support of the development and implementation of measures to strengthen judicial integrity, for example, resource databases and practical guidance are important, as judicial work is often solitary.***

Divided in smaller groups the participants discussed -

- 1) Priority challenges and emerging issues;
- 2) Development of technical tools and training materials; and
- 3) Opportunities for exchanging experiences and the structure of the Network.

*Through these discussions, a series of recommendations for the Global Network emerged.*

## PRIORITY CHALLENGES AND EMERGING ISSUES

- **Language and translation** is a key issue. The work and products of the network should be universally accessible and thus, where possible, should be available within all UN languages. Also, individual jurisdictions could undertake (through a designated national point of contact) to translate key documents.
- **Training** is a key need, particularly at the beginning of a judicial career.
- The threat to independence presented by the **‘revolving door’** between political and judicial careers is a significant challenge.
- Consideration should be given to a stronger incorporation of the term **‘independence’** within the Network.
- **Some countries** have **constitutions** that do not protect the independence of individual judges.
- Careful consideration must continue to be given to the **security of the online platform** (server).

## DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNICAL TOOLS & TRAINING MATERIALS

- A **periodic newsletter** should be produced – this could include for example, case law or recent developments in the field of judicial integrity.
- Consideration could be given to developing a **‘measuring tool’** to measure and evaluate judicial integrity.
- A **‘glossary’ of conflict of interest** scenarios and how best to resolve them could assist the participants of the Network.

## NETWORK STRUCTURE

- The **research community** should be involved to provide valuable insight into emerging issues.
- **Thematic working groups** could be established focussing on specialist areas (the mandate for which would be provided by the Network and might include, for example, technology and digitization).
- Formation of the network should include a **signed charter or a set of guidelines**, to include principles and a working system.
- **Development** of the network should be **phased**, it is not practicable for all features to be operational immediately.
- The **structure should be ‘inclusive’** so as to allow judges, judicial associations and other justice sector stakeholders to participate.
- The network should make use of **various channels of communications**: online platform, video conferencing and face to face connections and conferences.
- Judges should be able to **connect with the network directly** on an individual level. However the existence of a **national point of contact may assist** in co-ordinating national, regional and international network activities and help with language barriers.

## THE ADVISORY FUNCTION OF THE NETWORK

- There was considerable discussion on creating both a policy advisory function and an ethics advisory function in the Network.
- The policy advisory function would assist judges in management functions, for example, assisting chief justices or other heads of court in designing, implementing and evaluating measures to strengthen judicial integrity.
- The ethics function would seek to assist individual judges in resolving ethical dilemma.



- Suggestions included:
  - The function should allow for direct engagement by individual members.
  - Engagement through a national point of contact should be for general policy matters.
  - As it may not be feasible to provide case specific advice for judges, the Network could consider advising on available resources or information to assist judges in dealing with ethical issues.

### Session V – The Way Ahead

**Mr Oliver Stolpe**, UNODC Senior Programme Officer of the Global Programme, provided an overview of the planned next steps for development of the Network, these included:

- (i) 3-4 October 2017, Regional Preparatory Meeting for francophone African judiciaries – Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso.
- (ii) 16-17 October 2017, Regional Preparatory Meeting for anglophone African judiciaries – Swakopmund, Namibia.
- (iii) April 2018, Launch of the Global Judicial Integrity Network – Vienna, Austria.

He also explained that the intention is to create a network that has an effective working structure, but remains inclusive and open. At the launch event in April partners will have an opportunity to contribute to the discussions on a wide range of themes and work streams.

Mr Stolpe ended by thanking participants for their valued input at the meeting.

## Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Launch of a Global Judicial Integrity Network

Vienna, Austria

Vienna International Centre

Conference Room C1, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor, Building C

24-25 August 2017

### **Programme**



## Introduction

Article 11 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) emphasizes the crucial role of the judiciary in combating corruption and recognizes that in order to play this role effectively, the judiciary itself must be free of corruption and its members must act with integrity. Accordingly, it requires each State Party to (a) take measures to strengthen integrity among members of the judiciary, and (b) take measures to prevent opportunities for corruption among members of the judiciary.

The term “integrity” in article 11, in its application to members of the judiciary, may be defined as a holistic concept that refers to the ability of the judicial system or an individual member of the judiciary to resist corruption, while fully respecting the core values of independence, impartiality, personal integrity, propriety, equality, competence and diligence. These values are identified in the *Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct*, and elaborated comprehensively in the *Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct*.

In 2016, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) launched a global project to provide sustained support and delivery of technical assistance to Member States in specific areas covered by the Doha Declaration, adopted at the United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justices in 2015, including strengthening judicial integrity and the prevention of corruption in the justice system. In particular, the Doha Declaration reaffirmed the commitment of States to “make every effort to prevent and counter corruption, and to implement measures aimed at enhancing transparency in public administration and promoting the integrity and accountability of our criminal justice systems, in accordance with the United Nations Convention against Corruption.”

The implementation of the Doha Declaration will be an important enabler for the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030, particularly for Goal 16 to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.” Relevant targets under Goal 16 include 16.3 (Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all), 16.5 (Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all their forms) and 16.6 (Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels).

UNODC, as guardian of the Convention, serves as Secretariat to the Conference of the States Parties to UNCAC. In this role, UNODC services the Implementation Review Mechanism for the Convention. The Second Cycle of the Review Mechanism, launched in 2016, addresses the implementation of Chapter II of the Convention, which includes article 11. The Global Judicial Integrity Network, described further below, will provide a platform for accessing relevant resources, good practices and other materials that will assist in the successful participation in, and follow-up to, the review process.

## The Global Judicial Integrity Network

To support States and their judiciaries to fully implement article 11 of UNCAC, in line with the *Bangalore Principles*, the judicial integrity project aims to establish a Global Judicial Integrity Network of members of judiciaries throughout the world, harnessing the expertise and experience of judges, national and regional associations of judges, judicial administration officials and other stakeholders. The Global Judicial Integrity Network will become a platform to support Judiciaries in the following areas:

- Exchange of best practices and lessons learned on priority challenges and emerging issues in judicial integrity and the prevention of corruption through regular in-person and virtual meetings of the Global Network;
- Creation of a database of relevant resources;
- Development of tools, practical guidance manuals and training programmes, that can be tailored to the relevant legal system, professional cultures and national challenges;
- Provision of peer-to-peer advisory services, training and other capacity-building support in the area of judicial integrity and professionalism;
- Assessments of integrity risks in the criminal justice chain and in the development of effective responses to the risks identified; and
- Development and implementation of codes of conduct and the establishment of effective oversight and accountability mechanisms for Judiciaries and judicial support staff. Advising in legislative drafting, the preparation and implementation of codes of conduct, the development of training programmes and the establishment of effective accountability and oversight mechanisms.

In order to establish the Global Judicial Integrity Network, as a foundational pillar of the judicial integrity project, UNODC proposes to hold a series of regional expert-level meetings of senior members of the judiciary to identify global priorities in judicial integrity and the prevention of corruption, with a view to:

- Raise awareness among members of the judiciary regarding the proposal for the creation of a Global Judicial Integrity Network;
- Collect the ongoing efforts, good practices and priorities of judiciaries across regions in terms of strengthening judicial integrity;
- Assess the needs and expectations of judiciaries in terms of capacity-building support, advisory services, tools, networking opportunities and other resources which could be provided through a Global Judicial Integrity Network and related platform of resources and services, and to identify members of the judiciary and judicial administration who would be interested to join the Network once launched; and
- Identify members of the judiciary and judicial administration who would be interested in joining the network.

UNODC plans to support the Global Judicial Integrity Network through effective secretariat support services, including the development of a website, resource database, outreach and administration, culminating in a High-Level Launch of the Global Judicial Integrity Network with an inaugural conference in 2018.

## Agenda

Day One: 24 August 2017	
08.00 – 09.30	Registration
09.30 – 09.45	<b>Opening Session</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome remarks by John Brandolino, Director, Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC</li> </ul>
09.45 – 11.00	<b>Session I: Presentation of Regional Developments in Judicial Integrity</b> <p><i>Each country delegation will have the opportunity to address the plenary to highlight important steps being taken to enhance judicial integrity or existing challenges as well expectations from the event</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderator: Oliver Stolpe, Senior Programme Officer, UNODC</li> </ul>
11.00 – 11.15	Coffee Break
11.15 – 12.30	<b>Session II: Strengthening Integrity and Preventing Corruption in the Judiciary</b> <p><i>Panellists will focus in their presentations on specific measures adopted in their jurisdictions with regard to issues such as using assessment tools, risk mapping, qualitative assessments, surveys, courts inspections as well as performance evaluations as tools to monitor and identify integrity challenges; integrating integrity related aspects into vetting and appointments procedures; using public outreach and court transparency measures to strengthen external monitoring of integrity by the public and to instil public confidence in the judiciary.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderator: Justice Marin Mrčela, President, Group of States against Corruption, Council of Europe</li> <li>Panel:           <p>Duro Sessa, Chief Justice, Croatia; Vice-President, Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE)</p> <p>Rodica Popa, Judge, Criminal Chamber of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, Romania</p> <p>Aurelijus Getauskas, Judge, Criminal Case Division, Supreme Court, Chairman, Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission, Lithuania</p> <p>Francesco Contini, Research Institute of Judicial Systems (IRSIG)</p> </li> <li>Open Discussion</li> </ul>
12.30 – 14.30	Lunch

<b>14.30 – 16.00</b>	<p><b>Session III: Strengthening Integrity and Preventing Corruption in the Judiciary (cont.)</b></p> <p><i>Panellists will focus in their presentations on specific measures adopted in their jurisdictions with regard to issues such as strengthening and enforcing Codes of Conduct; establishing complaints mechanisms and protecting reporting persons; and integrating professional ethics, integrity and the prevention of corruption into judicial education.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Moderator:</b> Justice Rudolf Mellinghoff, Judicial Integrity Group (JIG)</li> <li>• <b>Panel:</b>  Sergey Rudakov, Deputy Chief Justice, President of the Disciplinary Chamber of the Supreme Court, Russia  Wenceslao Olea Godoy, Judge, President, Disciplinary Commission, General Council for the Judiciary, Spain  Galina Toneva-Dacheva, Judge, Supreme Court of Cassation, Bulgaria  Nuria Abad, European Networks of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ)  Susana Medina, Judge, International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ)</li> <li>• <b>Open Discussion</b></li> </ul>
<b>16.00– 16.10</b>	<b>Coffee Break</b>
<b>16.10 –17.30</b>	<p><b>Session IV: Introduction on the Global Judicial Integrity Network</b></p> <p><i>Presentation of the proposed features, objectives and structure of the Network by UNODC</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Moderator:</b> Judge José Igreja Matos, International Association of Judges (IAJ)</li> <li>• <b>Presentation by</b> Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC</li> </ul>
<b>17.30 – 19.30</b>	<b>Social Event</b>

<b>Day Two: 25 August 2017</b>	
<b>10.00 – 11.00</b>	<p><b>Session V: The Global Judicial Integrity Network - Group Discussion</b></p> <p><i>The session aims to identify concrete and actionable steps for the development of the Global Judicial Integrity Network. Based on the presentation by UNODC, participants, divided into smaller groups, will discuss how to make the Network a reality, including priorities, proposed activities and governance.</i></p> <p><i>UNODC will facilitate the discussions, and groups will identify a moderator and a rapporteur.</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small Groups Discussions on: i) priority challenges and emerging issues; ii) development of technical tools and training materials; and iii) opportunities for exchanging experiences and structure of the Network.</li> </ul>
11.00 – 11.15	Coffee Break
11.15 – 12.15	<p><b>Session VI: The Global Judicial Integrity Network – Expectations and Needs</b></p> <p><i>The rapporteurs of the smaller groups present in a moderated panel the ideas formulated during the previous session, and the plenary debates these conclusions in order to produce recommendations for the development of the Network.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderator: Candice Welsch, Chief, Implementation Support Section, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch, UNODC</li> <li>• Panel: Rapporteurs of the smaller groups</li> <li>• Open discussion regarding the Network, its services, functions and resources</li> </ul>
12.15 – 12.45	<p><b>Session VII: The Way Ahead</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of the next steps and General Discussion</li> <li>• Facilitator: Oliver Stolpe, Senior Programme Officer, UNODC</li> </ul>
12.45 – 13.00	Closing Session

## **Regional Preparatory Meeting for the Launch of the Global Judicial Integrity Network Vienna, 24 - 25 August 2017**

---

### **LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

#### **Albania**

Manjola XHAXHO, Judge

#### **Azerbaijan**

Ramiz RZAYEV, Chief Justice, Supreme Court

Farid MADATLI, Head, International Relations Department, Supreme Court

#### **Belarus**

Irina TYLETS, Judge, Supreme Court

Igor MISHKORUDNY, Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the United Nations

#### **Bosnia and Herzegovina**

Slavica CINDRAK, Judge, Supreme Court

#### **Bulgaria**

Galina Nikolaeva TONEVA-DACHEVA, Judge, Supreme Court of Cassation

#### **Croatia**

Duro SESSA, Chief Justice, Vice-President, Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE)

#### **Estonia**

Karin LEICHTER, Judicial Training Advisor, Supreme Court

#### **France**



Mathilde OLLIVIER, Attachée, Permanent Mission to the United Nations

### **Georgia**

Aleksandre IASHVILI, Judge, Criminal Cases Panel, Tbilisi City Court

### **Greece**

Sofia MAGOULA, Judge, Supreme Court

### **Lithuania**

Aurelijus GUTAUSKAS, Judge, Criminal Case Division, Supreme Court, Chairman, Judicial Ethics and Discipline Commission

### **Luxembourg**

Lotty PRUSSEN, President of the Chamber, Court of Appeal

### **Malta**

Danielle PACE GRIMA, Training Administrator, Judicial Studies Committee, Courts of Justice Department

### **Montenegro**

Marina KALEZIC, Advisor, Supreme Court

### **Poland**

Malgorzata WASEK-WIADEREK, Head, Criminal Division, Research and Analysis Office, Supreme Court

### **Qatar**

Hassan AL-MOHANNADI, President, Court of Appeal

Omar GHANIM, Director, International Cooperation Unit, Office of the Chief Justice

Ahmed Hassan AL-KUWARI, Chief of Staff, Office of the Chief Justice

### **Republic of Moldova**

Valeriu DOAGA, Judge, Supreme Court of Justice

### **Romania**

Rodica-Aida POPA, Judge, Criminal Chamber, High Court of Cassation and Justice

### **Russian Federation**

Sergey RUDAKOV, Deputy Chief Justice, President, Disciplinary Judicial Chamber, Supreme Court

Georgy BORISOV, Leading Consultant, International Cooperation, Supreme Court

### **Serbia**

Biljana SINANOVIC, Justice, Supreme Court of Cassation

### **Slovakia**

Andrej WOLF, Assistant to Judge, Criminal Division, Supreme Court

Peter ŠUTARÍK, Assistant to Judge, Criminal Division, Supreme Court

### **Spain**

Wenceslao Francisco OLEA GODOY, General Council of the Judiciary

### **Switzerland**

Katharina FREY BOSSONI, Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the United Nations

### **Turkey**

Mustafa SALDIRIM, Assistant General Secretary, Court of Cassation

Halil AKKIZ, Judge, Council of Judges and Prosecutors

Huseyin Cem EREN, Judge, Council of Judges and Prosecutors

Huseyin HANCER, Counsellor, Permanent Mission to the United Nations

### **Ukraine**

Bohdan POSHVA, Judge, Supreme Court

## **Other Organizations**

### **Research Institute of Judicial Systems (IRSIG)**

Francesco CONTINI, Researcher

### **European Network of Councils For the Judiciary (ENCJ)**

Nuria DIAZ ABAD, President

**Commonwealth Magistrates' and Judges' Association (CMJA)**

Keith Martin John HOLLIS, Judge (retired)

**International Association of Judges (IAJ)**

Jose Manuel IGREJA MARTINS MATOS, Judge

Gerhard REISSNER, Judge

**International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ)**

Susana Ester MEDINA, Judge

**Judicial Integrity Group (JIG)**

Rudolf MELLINGHOFF, President, Federal Supreme Finance Court

**Group of States Against Corruption (GRECO)**

Marin MRCELA, Justice, President, Group of States against Corruption (GRECO), Council of Europe

Laura SANZ LEVIA, Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs, Council of Europe

**Venice Commission**

Simona GRANATA-MENGHINI, Deputy Secretary

**United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime**

**UNODC**

John BRANDOLINO, Director, Division for Treaty Affairs

Candice Welsch, Chief, Implementation Support Section, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch  
candice.welsch@unodc.org

Oliver STOLPE, Senior Programme Officer, Corruption and Economic Crime Branch  
oliver.stolpe@unodc.org

Roberta SOLIS RIBEIRO MARTINS, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer  
roberta.solis@unodc.org

Francis BURAK, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer  
francis.burak@unodc.org

