



Strasbourg, 9 December 2008

CCJE(2008)12

CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL EUROPEAN JUDGES (CCJE)

9th meeting
Strasbourg, 12-14 November 2008

MEETING REPORT

1. The Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) held its 9th meeting in Strasbourg from 12 to 14 November 2008, under the Chairmanship of Ms Julia LAFFRANQUE (Estonia). The agenda and list of participants will be found in Appendices I and II respectively.

1. Information provided by the Chair and the Secretariat

2. Mrs Margaret KILLERBY, Director for Co-operation in the Directorate General of Legal Affairs and Human Rights, stressed in particular in her opening address that the work of the CCJE was eagerly awaited by the European legal community, whether the work in progress on the quality of judicial decisions or the future work on relations between judges and prosecutors. The CCJE Chair thanked Mrs KILLERBY for her support for the Council's activities.

3. She also thanked the Portuguese authorities, and in particular the Portuguese Judicial Service Commission (JSC), which had invited the CCJE to hold the 14th meeting of its CCJE-GT Working Group at its headquarters in Lisbon on 22 and 23 April 2008. That meeting had been followed by a conference organised on 24 April 2008 by the Supreme Court of Justice and the Portuguese JSC on "judicial timing and the quality of the decisions", in the course of which the CCJE-GT members had had an opportunity to meet the Portuguese judicial community. The Secretariat thanked the CCJE Vice-Chairman, Mr Orlando AFONSO, for his active role in organising these events.

4. The CCJE Secretariat also expressed its gratitude to the Estonian authorities, and more particularly to the judges at the Supreme Court of Estonia including its President, Mr Märt RASK and Mrs Julia LAFFRANQUE, who had splendidly hosted the 15th meeting of the CCJE-GT (Tartu, 16-17 June 2008) and had organised a conference on 18 June 2008 on "the quality of judicial decisions and their evaluation".

5. The CCJE Chair then welcomed the new members of the CCJE: Mrs Tatyana GOLDMAN (Azerbaijan), Mrs Linda LAURITSEN (Denmark) accompanying Mr DAHL, Mr John MACMENAMIN (Ireland), Mr Carlo RANZONI (Liechtenstein), Mrs Valentina PAVLICIC (Montenegro), Mr Reinier van ZUTPHEN (Netherlands) accompanying Mr VAN LIEROP, Mrs Inger Kjersti DØRSTAD (Norway) accompanying Mr ENGSTAD, Mr Nikolay ROMANENKOV (Russia) and Mr Mehmet Murat YARDIMCI (Turkey). She also congratulated those judges who had recently received promotions in their own states. Finally, she welcomed the observers, and in particular the large delegations from Mexico and Japan.

6. Since the 8th plenary meeting, the past or current work of the CCJE had been referred to by CCJE members or the Secretariat, in particular at the following meetings or events:

a meeting of the Association of Bulgarian Judges (22 January 2008) at which Mrs ROUSSEVA (Bulgaria) had presented Opinion no. 10, in the presence *inter alia* of the Prime Minister and the President of the Supreme Court of Bulgaria;

the Iberian Congress of the Judiciary (25 January 2008) in respect of Opinions no. 3 and 10 and the Justice Committee of the Congress of Spanish Disputes (10 June 2008) (J. F. COBO SAENZ);

training sessions for Italian judges led by R. Sabato (Naples, 20 September 2008 concerning reasonable time and Rome, 8 October 2008 concerning Opinion no. 3 and the Bangalore principles);

the 4th International Justice Forum (FOR-JUS) which took place from 15 to 17 October 2008 at Mato Grosso do Sul in Brazil, attended by O. AFONSO and R. SABATO;

the 2nd Congress of Polish Judges (22-23 October 2008), at which O. AFONSO presented the work of the CCJE;

a conference held in Riga on the ethics of judges (October 2008);

a conference held by the Supreme Administrative Authority of Norway to mark its 5th anniversary;

a meeting of the Association of German Judges on independence, held in Frankfurt;

a joint conference of the JSCs of FYROM and Bosnia and Herzegovina.

7. Mrs Aida POPA (Romania) thanked the CCJE for the help it had given to the Judicial Service Commission with respect to the extra-judicial activities of judges (questionnaire sent to CCJE members to ascertain national practice in this matter) and said that the Commission had adopted a decision on the assessment of judges and prosecutors in which CCJE Opinions nos 3 and 4 were mentioned. In Latvia, Opinion no. 10 had been the subject of a specific study in connection with the debate on a bill relating to judicial powers. In Luxembourg, Opinion no. 10 had been cited as an example in work organised by the Association of Judges and the Ministry of Justice on the establishment of a JSC. Articles about the CCJE had also appeared in the press in Denmark and Sweden on the occasion of national debates about High Councils of the Judiciary.

8. The CCJE noted that most opinions had been translated into German, Bulgarian, Spanish, Estonian, Italian, Macedonian, Romanian and Russian, welcomed this effort of translation which was often owed to the CCJE member from the state in question, and invited those delegations which had not yet done so to have opinions translated into their national languages as soon as possible.

2. Draft Opinion no. 11 entitled “The quality of judicial decisions”

9. The CCJE Chair thanked the (absent) scientific expert, Mrs M. G. CIVININI (Italy) for her preliminary report (see document (2008)4) which she had prepared for the CCJE-GT and for her attendance at the 14th meeting in Lisbon. She also thanked A. LACARABATS (France), P. MAFFEI (Belgium) and O. AFONSO (Portugal) for having taken part in the ad hoc meeting in Paris on 25 September 2008, at which a new draft opinion had been drawn up in the light of the many comments from delegations which had been sent since the first version of the draft opinion had been circulated in July.

10. Delegations were also warmly thanked for their numerous replies to the questionnaire on the quality of judicial decisions (see document CCJE(2008)1) and for the many comments sent to the Secretariat on the various drafts (see document CCJE(2008)8 for the comments on the latest version).

11. The meeting was reminded that the Opinion did not set out to create a single, rigid model to be followed by every judge in order to hand down quality decisions. It aimed to set precise standards enabling a quality decision to be reached, on the basis of the quality standards laid down in Article 6 of the ECHR.

12. The first part of the text listed the different factors enabling a quality decision to be reached, whether they be factors external to the process of administering justice, such as legislation or economic and social context, or internal ones such as the judge’s professionalism, the procedure, the hearing or the decision itself. The difficulty with regard to this first part was how to recognise the paramount role of the judge’s work (clarity, motivation of the decision, conduct of the hearing, etc.) in the quality of decisions, while striking the right balance with external factors which directly affected the quality of decisions but which justice system professionals could not normally influence.

13. The second part of the Opinion was concerned with assessment of the quality of judicial decisions, its purpose and methods. This part, and in particular the desirability of mentioning individual assessment of judges, gave rise to lengthy discussions, as did the enumeration of assessment criteria and methods.

14. In view of the numerous amendments proposed just before or during the meeting, the CCJE was not able to reach agreement on the text during the meeting. Difficulties of agreement between the French and English versions were also mentioned.

15. The CCJE invited its members to send their comments on draft Opinion no. 11 (2008) on “the quality of judicial decisions” to the Secretariat by 28 November; it instructed its Bureau to prepare a new draft taking the comments into account; it instructed the Secretariat to send the new, finalised text to all CCJE members for the purpose of adoption by written procedure before the end of the year. The CCJE agreed to submit this Opinion to the Committee of Ministers once it was adopted, so that it could take the necessary steps, and in particular transmit the Opinion to the competent authorities in the member states and where appropriate arrange for its translation into the corresponding languages; it also invited the Committee of Ministers to transmit this Opinion in particular to the CEPEJ, the CCPE and the CDDH so that those bodies could take it into account in the framework of their own activities.

3. Work programme 2009-2010

a. Preparation of the 2009 Opinion on relations between judges and prosecutors

16. The CCJE held an exchange of views on the Opinion to be prepared in 2009 on relations between judges and prosecutors, in accordance with its terms of reference (see document CCJE(2007)7). This Opinion would have to be prepared in close conjunction with the CCPE; the CCJE believed that, as far as possible, a single text should be jointly adopted by the CCPE and the CCJE. The text could be adopted in November 2009 at the end of the plenary meetings of the two Councils, which could be held on the same dates.

17. In view of the subject, it was agreed that an initial questionnaire would not necessarily be helpful. The working Group instructed to draw up the draft Opinion would have the wealth of data already available to the Council of Europe on this subject at its disposal. The Secretariat was instructed to collate the necessary material and make it available to the two experts (a judge and a prosecutor), who would be appointed to prepare an initial report¹ describing the situation in the states with regard to relations between judges and prosecutors, without going into detailed accounts of differing prosecutor status.

18. The CCJE invited its members to send the Secretariat by 1 December 2008 a list of points they wished to be dealt with in the framework of this draft Opinion. Some members pointed out the substantial differences between continental systems and the common law systems, in which judge/prosecutor relations were virtually non-existent, calling the very expediency of the subject into question. It was agreed that an exact account of these differences should indeed be given at the working Group’s first meeting so that they could be taken into account.

19. In the absence of a questionnaire, it was decided to organise the first meeting of the working Group as early as February, on the same dates as those for the CCPE working Group, so as to have an opportunity of holding a joint meeting of the two.

20. The second meeting of the CCJE-GT and CCPE-GT should also take place on the same dates, in June, and would be preceded by a conference on relations between judges and prosecutors; the conference proceedings should constitute a valuable additional basis on which to draw up the relevant Opinion.

21. The CCJE appointed Mr Paul MAFFEI to coordinate the work between the two councils, especially between meetings.

b. Preliminary discussion on the CCJE’s terms of reference for 2010-2011

22. The CCJE Chair suggested holding a preliminary exchange of views on the subjects likely to be dealt with by the CCJE in future. Draft terms of reference should be prepared by the Bureau and then put to the Committee of Ministers at the end of 2009.

¹ Subsequently to the meeting, the CCJE and CCPE Bureaux stated a preference for a joint scientific expert with an academic background.

23. With reference to the Global Action Plan for Judges in Europe, and to the discussions held during the plenary meeting in 2006, a number of subjects were envisaged, viz:

- execution of judicial decisions;
- specialist judges;
- relations with the police;
- relations with legal officials and in particular barristers;
- inspection services;
- the role of court registrars;
- the powers of judges and the efficiency of the justice system.

The CCJE instructed its Bureau to prepare a general paper on the CCJE's future tasks.

4. Working structure of the CCJE

a. The CCJE Bureau

24. The CCJE moved on to the election of its Chair and Vice-Chair in accordance with Resolution (2005)47 "on committees and subordinate bodies, their terms of reference and working methods". The CCJE re-elected by acclamation Mrs Julia LAFFRANQUE (Estonia) as Chairperson of the CCJE and Mr Orlando AFONSO (Portugal) as Vice-Chairman of the CCJE for the year 2009; it also re-elected Mr Gerhard REISSNER (Austria) and elected Mr Raffaele SABATO (Italy) as members of the Bureau for a two-year period, from 1 January 2009. Mr A. LACARABATS did not wish to stand again as a member of the Bureau, having too full a schedule.

b. The CCJE Working Group for 2009 (CCJE-GT)

25. In accordance with Article 14.b. of Resolution (2005)47, which reads: "Where necessary, in order to expedite the progress of their work, committees may entrust a limited number of committee members with a specific task to be fulfilled by their next meeting", the CCJE decided to set up a working group with instructions to prepare the draft Opinion on relations between judges and prosecutors for its 10th meeting.

26. The CCJE also restated its wish that, as far as possible, meetings of the CCJE-GT might be dovetailed with those of the Bureau, so that Bureau members could attend CCJE-GT meetings.

27. The CCJE appointed Ms Aneta ARNAUDOVSKA ("the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia"), Mr José Francisco COBO SÀENZ (Spain), Mr Nils ENGSTAD (Norway), Mr John MACMENAMIN (Ireland), Mr Paul MAFFEI (Belgium), Mr Stelios NATHANAEL (Cyprus), Mr Duro SESSA (Croatia), Mr Bart VAN LIEROP (the Netherlands) and Mr Perikli ZAHARIA (Albania) as members of the 2009 Working Group and Mr Alain LACABARATS (France), Mr Jonathan MANCE (United Kingdom) and Mr Jean-Claude WIWINIUS (Luxembourg) as deputy members.

5. Situation in the member states concerning judges

a. Establishment of a pool of experts

28. In accordance with the decisions taken by the CCJE at its 8th plenary meeting (November 2007) and by its Bureau at its 3rd meeting (April 2008), it was proposed that the establishment of a pool of judges with instructions to examine the situation in the member states concerning judges be confirmed. This pool should in particular ease the task of the CCJE, which held only one plenary meeting each year. It would be instructed to examine the situation in the state concerned, to take note of existing work by other bodies to which this question had also been referred, to decide on the expediency of meeting certain of those bodies, and/or visiting the country in question, and prepare a draft text reflecting the CCJE's opinion on the matter.

29. Some members wondered what the precise status and tasks of this pool would be. If a particular problem concerning judges arose, and if the CCJE were officially seized of it, the job of the pool of experts would be to carry out a more detailed analysis than merely restating the CCJE's past opinions and to give tangible assistance to the state concerned. The CCJE regretted that there was no specific budget for the functioning of this pool of experts, which would have given it legitimacy, and reiterated the Bureau's proposal to appeal to the generosity of the member states, through the CCJE's members, by way of voluntary contributions. It was decided that at the present stage the pool of experts was constituted on an informal basis by those members of the CCJE who had volunteered. The CCJE Chair proposed that the opportunity be taken at the CCJE's 10th plenary meeting in 2009 to try to establish such a body within the CCJE in an official and more organised way.

b. Re-election of judges in Serbia

30. The CCJE members for Serbia provided the Council with information on the draft Serbian legislation on the re-appointment of judges. She said that, following the constitutional law recently passed and the controversial interpretation of certain of its provisions relating to the judiciary, a bill had been drawn up by the government which provided for all Serbian judges to be re-elected under a procedure supervised by the Judicial Service Commission.

31. The CCJE also welcomed Mr T. MARKERT, Deputy Secretary to the Venice Commission, to take stock of the situation and learn about the work already done by the Commission in this field. The Venice Commission had been consulted on the constitutional law and on bills relating to judges and the organisation of the judiciary, but not on the bill currently under discussion.

32. Some persons thought that all the judges should be reappointed, in particular in order to combat corruption. Others considered that a process of re-election of all the judges ran counter to the principle of irremovability of judges, without however guaranteeing that the new judges would be appointed in accordance with clear criteria. The CCJE instructed the Task Force to prepare a declaration referring to Council of Europe standards on the irremovability of judges, expressing the CCJE's doubts about the content of the bill and proposing that the Serbian authorities organise a meeting on the subject. The CCJE instructed its Bureau to finalise the declaration and communicate it to the competent Serbian authorities.

33. The CCJE decided to keep this item on its agenda.

c. Possible intelligence activities in Italy

34. The CCJE member for Italy provided the Council with information on developments in the judicial procedure relating to possible intelligence activities concerning judges. The CCJE decided to keep this item on its agenda.

d. Status of judges in Romania

The CCJE member for Romania provided the Council with information on the legislation relating to the status of judges in that country; because of the general elections scheduled for late November, discussion of the draft legislation had been delayed and were still on the agenda of the JSC. The CCJE decided to keep this item on its agenda.

e. Refusal of the President of Poland to appoint judges

36. The CCJE member for Poland provided the Council with information on the refusal of the President of the Republic to appoint 9 judges; an appeal had been lodged with the Constitutional Court, which had not yet ruled on whether this was a constitutional dispute. The CCJE Task Force decided to prepare a declaration addressed to the Polish authorities referring to the relevant Council of Europe texts concerning selection of judges and offering practical help with the proper application of the relevant European standards. The CCJE instructed its Bureau to finalise the declaration and communicate it to the competent Polish authorities. The CCJE decided to keep this item on its agenda.

f. Draft unified code of ethics in Bulgaria

37. The CCJE member for Bulgaria provided the Council with information on the preparation by the Bulgarian JSC of a unified code of ethics for judges, prosecutors and investigating magistrates. According to the Association of Bulgarian Judges, which had referred this question to the CCJE, the draft might constitute a breach of European standards and of national law governing competence to adopt codes of ethics. The Bulgarian representative said that the pertinent content of the CCJE's Opinions had already been conveyed to the Bulgarian JSC. The CCJE instructed its Bureau to send a document to the Bulgarian authorities by the end of November restating the fundamental principles of judges' ethics as already laid down by the Council of Europe and the CCJE, and offering the Bulgarian authorities specific help from the CCJE in the implementation of this reform. The CCJE decided to keep this item on its agenda.

6. Communication strategy of the CCJE and visibility of its work

38. On a proposal by its Chair, the CCJE examined a list of European bodies concerning judges and justice (see document CCJE(2008)6) prepared by the Secretariat. This document was a tool for improving information on the work of the CCJE: every year the Secretariat would use it to send the newly adopted Opinion to all the bodies listed. The CCJE invited delegations to make additions to the list and thanked the ENCJ for its offer to add its own, already established and complete, list.

7. Relations between the CCJE and other bodies

a. Consultative Council of European Prosecutors (CCPE)

39. The CCPE Secretariat said that the CCPE had just adopted its Opinion no. 2 (2008) on "alternatives to prosecution" (CCPE(2008)2) and Opinion no. 3(2008) on "the role of prosecuting authorities outside the criminal law field".

40. The CCJE expressed the hope that its planned co-operation with the CCPE in drawing up a joint opinion on relations between judges and prosecutors would prove fruitful.

b. European Committee on Legal Co-operation (CDCJ)

41. Mr E. KILBY, representing the CDCJ, provided information about current CDCJ work on the revision of Recommendation Rec(94)12 on the independence, efficiency and role of judges. He reminded the meeting that a working group (CJ-S-JUST) had been instructed, under his chairmanship, to prepare a revised text of the Recommendation and its explanatory report, but that this text had not been adopted by the CDCJ, which had decided at its plenary meeting in June 2008 that it was necessary to examine afresh some of the principles in the revised text. For that purpose a new, larger, working group was to be set up, and would meet three times in 2009 so that a new text could be submitted to the CDCJ quickly. The CCJE would be invited to have an observer on the new working group, just as it had on the CJ-S-JUST (at all of whose meetings it had been represented).

42. Among the questions which called for further exploration were the following:

Should the recommendation apply to international courts?
The role of the JSC (or any other independent body)
The civil and penal liability of judges
The desirability of bringing judges' remuneration within national legislation.

43. In the course of its exchange of views with Mr KILBY, the CCJE pointed out the importance and impact of the recommendation in the states, and stated its desire that a new, more precise, text should be adopted while ensuring that judges' independence was not infringed.
44. The CCJE saluted the work already accomplished and assured the CDCJ of its ongoing interest in participating in future work on the revision of Recommendation Rec(94)12, in particular (i) by offering to draw up a document setting out the CCJE's proposals for updating the recommendation and (ii) by preparing to attend all meetings of the new group as an observer.

8. Observers

45. The CCJE decided, subject to a formal request to be submitted to the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, to grant observer status with the CCJE to the Federal Association of Brazilian Judges (ANV) for a renewable period of one year.

9. Any other business

a. Bangalore Principles

46. The CCJE agreed to continue following developments in connection with the Bangalore Principles on judicial ethics.

Meetings in 2009

47. The CCJE proposed holding its next plenary meeting from 18 to 20 February 2009. With regard to the 10th meeting, the Chair suggested that the event should be marked and invited CCJE members to make proposals accordingly.
48. Meetings of the Working Group (CCJE-GT) were scheduled for 10 to 12 February 2009 and 22 to 25 June 2009. A European Conference of Judges and Prosecutors could take place on 23 and 24 June 2009.

***[Note by the Secretariat: Since the plenary meeting, the dates have changed as follows:
16th meeting of the CCJE-GT: 16-18 February 2009 (Strasbourg)
Conference: 30 June - 1 July 2009 (Bordeaux, France)
17th meeting of the CCJE-GT: 1-3 July 2009]***

APPENDIX I

AGENDA

1. Opening of the meeting

2. Adoption of the agenda

3. Information by the President and the Secretariat

4. Draft Opinion No.11 of the CCJE for 2008

- Examination with a view to its adoption of the draft Opinion No.11 on “The quality of judicial decision”

5. 2009-2010 working programme

- Preparation of the 2009 Opinion “on relationship between judges and prosecutors” (questionnaire, scientific expert(s), etc.)
- Possible organisation of a joint Conference with the CCPE in 2009 (date, place, programme, etc.)
- Designation of the CCJE co-ordinator for the joint work with CCPE in 2009
- Discussion and adoption of the draft terms of reference for 2010-2011

6. Working structure of the CCJE

- Election of the Chair and the Vice-Chair of the CCJE
- Renewal of the Bureau of the CCJE
- Nomination of the Working Group of the CCJE for 2009

7. Pool of experts concerning the situation in member States concerning judges

- State of the situation concerning the pool of experts
- Member States concerned:
 - Romania (recent legislative developments on the status of judges)
 - Italy (situation discussed in a letter from MEDEL on possible unlawful intelligence activities vis-à-vis judges and prosecutors)
 - Serbia (re-election of judges)

8. Communication strategy of the CCJE and visibility of its work

- Setting up of a list of European bodies concerning judges and justice, aiming at improving their information concerning the work of the CCJE

9. Relations between the CCJE and other bodies of the Council of Europe

- Exchange of views with the Consultative Council of European Prosecutors (CCPE)
- Exchange of views with the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ)
- Exchange of views with the Lisbon Network

10. Calendar of future meetings of the CCJE and the CCJE-GT in 2009

11. Any other business – Information items

- Bangalore principles – Follow-up
- Justice Forum

APPENDIX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBER STATES

ALBANIA/ALBANIE :

Mr Perikli ZAHARIA, Judge of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Albania, Gjykata e Larte, Rr. "Myslym Shyrrri", TIRANA

ARMENIA/ARMENIE :

Mr Stepan MIKAELIAN, Judge of the Malatya-Sebastya Community Court of Armenia, YEREVAN (Apologised/ Excusé)

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE :

Mr Gerhard REISSNER, Vice-President of the Austrian Association of Judges, President of the District Court of Floridsdorf, VIENNA

Mr Heinz WIETRZYK, President of the Superior Court of Appeal of Graz, GRAZ

AZERBAIJAN/AZERBAÏDJAN :

Ms Tatyana GOLDMAN, Judge Supreme Court, BAKU

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE :

M. Paul MAFFEI, Conseiller à la Cour de Cassation, Palais de Justice, BRUXELLES

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA/BOSNIE-HERZEGOVINE :

Ms Meddzida KRESO, Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina, SARAJEVO

BULGARIA/BULGARIE :

Ms Maiia ROUSSEVA, Judge, Sofia City Court, SOFIA

CROATIA/CROATIE :

Mr Duro SESSA, Justice of Supreme Court, ZAGREB

CYPRUS/CHYPRE :

Mr Stelios NATHANAEL, Judge, Supreme Court of Cyprus, NICOSIA

CZECH REPUBLIC/REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE :

Mr. Jiří LNENICKA, Presiding Judge of the High Court in Prague, PRAGUE

DENMARK/DANEMARK :

Mr Børge DAHL, Justice of the Supreme Court, COPENHAGEN

Ms Linda LAURITSEN, Judge, City Court of Roskilde

ESTONIA/ESTONIE :

Mrs Julia LAFFRANQUE, Judge, Supreme Court, TARTU (Chair of the CCJE/Présidente du CCJE)

FINLAND/FINLANDE :

Mr Timo ESKO, Justice, Supreme Court of Finland, HELSINKI

FRANCE :

M. Alain LACABARATS, Conseiller à la Cour de Cassation, Directeur du Service de Documentation et d'Etudes de la Cour de Cassation, PARIS

GEORGIA/GEORGIE :

Mr Irakli ADEISHVILI, Judge, Chairman of the Chamber of Civil Cases, Tbilisi City Court, TBILISI

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE :

Mr Otto MALLMANN, Presiding Judge, Federal Administrative Court, LEIPZIG

HUNGARY/HONGRIE :

Mr Károly HORECZKY, Justice, Supreme Court, President of Chamber of the Supreme Court, Legfelsőbb Bisóság, BUDAPEST

ICELAND/ISLANDE :

Ms Justice Hjördís HÁKONARDÓTTIR Justice of the Supreme Court of Iceland, Supreme Court Building, REYKJAVÍK

IRELAND/IRLANDE :

The Hon. Mr Justice John MACMENAMIN, Judge of the High Court, DUBLIN

ITALY/ITALIE :

M. Raffaele SABATO, Juge à la Cour d'Appel, CASTELLAMMARE DI STABIA – NAPLES

LATVIA/LETTONIE :

Ms Aija BRANTA, Judge, Constitutional Court of the Republic of Latvia, RIGA

LIECHTENSTEIN :

M. Carlo RANZONI, Juge, Cour de Justice, Fürstliches Landgericht, VADUZ

LITHUANIA/LITUANIE :

Mr Virgilijus VALANČIUS, President of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, President of the European Association of Judges, VILNIUS

LUXEMBOURG :

M. Jean-Claude WWINIUS, Président de Chambre, Cour Supérieure de Justice, LUXEMBOURG

M. Jean-Marie HENGEN, Juge de Paix Directeur, Justice de Paix, ESCH-SUR-ALZETTE

MALTA/MALTE :

Hon. Mr Justice Geoffrey VALENCIA, ATTARD

MONACO :

M. Jérôme FOUGERAS-LAVERGNOLLE, Juge d'Instruction, Juge tutélaire, Palais de Justice MONACO

MONTENEGRO/MONTENEGRO :

Ms Valentina PAVLICIC, Judge, High Court of Podgorica, PODGORICA

NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS :

Mr Bart VAN LIEROP, Conseiller Gerechtshof Den Haag, DEN HAAG

Mr Reinier van ZUTPHEN, Chairman of the Dutch Association of Judges and Prosecutors (NVVR) and Vice-President of the District Court of Utrecht

NORWAY/NORVEGE :

Mr Nils A. ENGSTAD, Judge, Hålogaland Court of Appeal, TROMSØ

Ms Inger Kjersti DØRSTAD, Judge, Oslo City Court, OSLO

POLAND/POLOGNE :

Ms Irena PIOTROWSKA, Judge, President of Circuit Court in Katowice, Member of the National Council of Judiciary, KATOWICE

PORTUGAL :

M. Orlando AFONSO, Juge Conseiller à la Cour d'Appel d'Evora, ALMADA (Vice-Chair of the CCJE/Vice-Présidente du CCJE)

ROMANIA/ROUMANIE :

Ms Aida–Rodica POPA, Judge of the High Court of Cassation and Justice, BUCHAREST

RUSSIAN FEDERATION / FEDERATION DE RUSSIE :

Mr Nikolay ROMANENKOV; Justice, Supreme Court of the Russian Federation, MOSCOW

SERBIA / SERBIE :

Ms Spomenka ZARIĆ, Judge of the Supreme Court, BELGRADE

SLOVAKIA/SLOVAQUIE :

(Apologised/ Excusé)

SPAIN/ESPAGNE :

Mr José Francisco COBO SÀENZ, Magistrat, President of the 2nd Seccion at the Audiencia Provincial (Navarra), PAMPLONA

SWEDEN/ SUEDE :

Ms Charlotte BROKELIND, Chief Judge, Eksjo District Court, EKSJO

Mr Carl Gustav FERNLUND, Justice of the Supreme Administrative Court, STOCKHOLM

SWITZERLAND / SUISSE :

M. Ulrich MEYER, Juge Fédéral, Tribunal Fédéral, LUCERNE

“THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA”/“L’EX-REPUBLIQUE YUGOSLAVE DE MACEDOINE” :

Mrs Aneta ARNAUDOVSKA, Judge, Director of the Academy for Training of Judges and Prosecutors, SKOPJE

TURKEY/TURQUIE:

Dr Mehmet Murat YARDIMCI, Judge, DG for International Law and Foreign Relations, Ministry of Justice, ANKARA

UKRAINE :

Mr Viktor GORODOVENKO, Head of the Court of Appeal Zaporizhska region, ZAPORIZHYA (Apologised/ Excusé)

UNITED KINGDOM/ ROYAUME-UNI

Lord MANCE, Law Lord, House of Lords, LONDON

EXPERTS

Ms Maria Giuliana CIVININI, PISTOIA (Expert, European Planning Team, Kosovo)(Apologised/ Excusée)

OBSERVER STATES/ ETATS OBSERVATEURS

JAPAN/JAPON_:

Mr Tokuji IZUMI, Justice of the Supreme Court of Japan
Mr Satoshi UEDA, Judge of Chiba District Court
Mr Akira TAKANO, Consul (Attorney)

MEXICO/MEXIQUE :

Mme Elvia Rosa DIAZ DE LEON D'HERS, Magistrat, Conseillère de la Judicature du Mexique, SAN ANGEL

M. Joaquin GONZALEZ-CASANOVA, Directeur Général des Relations Nationales et Internationales du Conseil de la Judicature Fédéral, Judicature du Mexique, Delegación Alvaro Obregón

OBSERVERS / OBSERVATEURS**EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF JUDGES (EAJ) / ASSOCIATION EUROPEENNE DE JUGES (AEJ)**

Mr Virgilijus VALANČIUS, President of the Supreme Administrative Court of Lithuania, President of the European Association of Judges, VILNIUS

GROUPEMENT EUROPEEN DES MAGISTRATS POUR LA MEDIATION (GEMME)

Mr Aleš ZALAR, District Court Judge, District Court of Ljubljana, LJUBLJANA

FEDERATION EUROPEENNE DES JUGES ADMINISTRATIFS / ASSOCIATION OF EUROPEAN ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES

M. Pierre VINCENT, Presiding Judge, Nancy Administrative court of Appeal, NANCY

EUROPEAN NETWORK OF COUNCILS FOR THE JUDICIARY (ENCJ) / RESEAU EUROPEEN DES CONSEILS DE LA JUSTICE (RECJ)

Sir John THOMAS, President of the ENCJ, Royal court of Justice, LONDON

Ms Monique van der GOES, Deputy Director of the ENCJ office, BRUSSELS

OTHER / AUTRES**EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS / COUR EUROPEENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME**
(Apologised/ Excusé)**EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON CRIME PROBLEMS / COMITÉ EUROPÉEN POUR LES PROBLÈMES CRIMINELS**

M. Nikola MATOVSKI, Professeur, Faculté de Droit de l'Université « S-TS Cyrille et Methode » - SKOPJE

EUROPEAN COMMITTEE ON LEGAL COOPERATION (CDCJ) / COMITE EUROPEEN DE COOPERATION JURIDIQUE (CDCJ)

Mr Edwin KILBY, Head of European Policy, European and International Division, Ministry of Justice, LONDON

EUROPEAN JUDICIAL TRAINING NETWORK (EJTN) / RESEAU EUROPEEN DE FORMATION JUDICIAIRE (REFJ)

Judge Victor HALL, Secretary General, European Judicial Training Network, BRUSSELS

(Apologised/ Excusé)

Dr Sophie TURENE, Clifford Chance Lecturer in Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge, CAMBRIDGE

**COUNCIL OF EUROPE'S SECRETARIAT /
SECRETARIAT DU CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE**

(CCJE E-mail : ccje@coe.int)

Fax : + 33 (0)3 88 41 37 43

Directorate General of Human Rights and Legal Affairs / Justice Division
Direction Générale des droits de l'Homme et des affaires juridiques / Division de la Justice

M. Stéphane LEYENBERGER, Deputy Head of the Justice Division / Chef adjoint de la Division de la justice
Mme Muriel DECOT, Secretary to the CCJE / Secrétaire du CCJE
Mr Jean-Pierre GEILLER , Documentalist / Documentaliste
Mme Sandrine MAROLLEAU, Webmaster
Mme Emily WALKER, Assistant

INTERPRETERS / INTERPRETES

QUAINE Philippe
MARCHINI Isabelle
GUITTONNEAU Nicolas