



The aim of the CEPEJ is to contribute to improving the quality of justice and the efficiency of its functioning in the 47 Member States of the Council of Europe.

## Edito

### Report "European judicial systems - Efficiency and quality of justice"

#### European judicial systems Efficiency and quality of justice

CEPEJ STUDIES No. 23



Edition 2016 (2014 data)

On 6 October 2016, the CEPEJ published the 2016 edition of its report "European judicial systems - Efficiency and quality of justice". This report, which gives a detailed picture of the functioning of European judicial systems, and which constitutes a reference document for public policymakers, is presented in a new, more concise way.

For the first time, the publication of the CEPEJ report comes with a thematic report which addresses, this year, the use of Information technology in European courts. In 2018, on the occasion of the publication of the next edition of the report, the chosen theme will be on court users.

The publication of this report includes an innovating tool containing all data collected by the CEPEJ for policymakers, justice professionals, academicians and for the whole public, of . This dynamic database, CEPEJ-STAT, enables the selection of data for some countries, for specific years, and the generation of maps, figures and tables. It is already successfully used, since its launch.

Following the identification of the report's main trends in a presentation note, the CEPEJ studied the impact of its report in each of its member state on the basis of press releases found in the Pres Review and the information provided by CEPEJ members.

Nearly 30 000 internet connexions have been registered on the CEPEJ website in October, when the report was published.

Practical workshops to promote the use of CEPEJ-STAT have been organised in every relevant Council of Europe entity. Workshops can be organised upon request to the CEPEJ Secretariat.

Articles in the Newsletter:

- Nela Kuburović, Minister of Justice of Serbia
- Patrick Hetzel, French parliamentarian
- Impact of the publication of the evaluation report in the Council of Europe member States
- Ongoing activities

Contact: [cepej@coe.int](mailto:cepej@coe.int)

## Thematic file: Which impact for the CEPEJ evaluation report ?

### The CEPEJ report seen by the Minister of Justice of Serbia



**Presentation of the Report of the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ): "European Judicial Systems - Efficiency and Quality of Justice" by the Serbian Minister of justice, Nela Kuburović: "Serbia does not fall into countries with the "most critical" situation regarding court efficiency statistics**

In August 2016, Ms Nela Kuburović became Minister of Justice of Serbia. Until then, she had also been a member of the CEPEJ.

The Serbian Ministry of Justice, in co-operation with the Council of Europe office in Belgrade, organised an event to present the 2016 report and the work of the CEPEJ, on Wednesday 23 November 2016 in Belgrade, with the participation of representatives of the judicial power, competent judicial institutions, NGOs, international partners and donors. On this occasion, Ms Nela Kuburović declared that "Serbia does not fall into countries with the "most critical" situation regarding statistics on judicial efficiency, as many States are also struggling with the same problems we have, which are the duration of civil litigious cases and low clearance rate".

The Serbian Minister of justice also explained that the CEPEJ works towards the improvement of the efficiency of judicial systems in the Council of Europe member States, aiming to provide an efficient enforcement of civil rights and to increase the level of citizens' trust in the judicial system, which is also one of the priorities of the Government of the Republic of Serbia. Ms Nela Kuburović, declared to this effect: "The aim is to ultimately reduce the number of cases before the European Court of Human Rights and which have been caused by judicial institutions of the Council of Europe member states through various forms of violations of the right to a fair trial".

Ms Nela Kuburović also indicated that "in the past two years, the co-operation with this working body of the Council of Europe has significantly improved, and special attention is paid to the recommendations and guidelines which establish relevant European standards. Furthermore, progress has been made in the manner of reporting within the evaluation which is conducted by the CEPEJ every two years; the information given is more precise, but the data suggests that efforts are necessary in many areas, and that the method of keeping the court statistics must undergo changes."

Ms Nela Kuburović also underlined that, with the application of the new Law on Enforcement and Security, the Serbian Ministry of Justice is expecting significant improvements in the statistics relating to enforcement cases. Nonetheless, the Ministry must continue to make significant efforts in other areas, such as improved efficiency of civil litigious cases. One of the Report's conclusions is that, precisely, the promotion and the use of alternative dispute resolution in civil litigious and criminal cases are necessary, for the purpose of reducing the number of incoming cases.

Mr. Tim Cartwright, Head of the Council of Europe Office in Belgrade, stated that the Council of Europe supports Serbia's efforts of initiating reforms to improve the efficiency of the judiciary. He underlined that the data and conclusions of the CEPEJ Report are an indicator of success and progress in the process of European integration, and that the Council of Europe stands at the disposal of the Republic of Serbia as its member State.

The report indicates that in Serbia in 2014, 359 days were needed to resolve first instance civil litigious cases, whereas in "the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" 132 days were needed, 298 in Montenegro, 380 in Croatia, 532 in Italy and 603 in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

An overview of the number of resolved civil cases at the first instance level in 2014 shows that in Serbia, an average of 3.18 cases for 100 inhabitants were initiated in 2014, unlike, for example, in Austria and Germany, where the number is much lower (1.11 and 1.76).

In 2014, the Republic of Serbia had 2.700 judges, i.e. 38 judges per 100.000 inhabitants, which is similar to the judicial systems of the countries of Central and especially Eastern Europe, which operate with a ratio of judges to population significantly greater than in Western European countries.

Compared to the previous evaluation cycles, and in accordance with the establishment of a new network of courts, Serbia noted the increasing trend of the number of first instance courts, with 2.2 per 100,000 inhabitants first instance courts being above the European average (2.0).

When it comes to the number of lawyers, Serbia follows an increasing trend, which is recorded in most of the European countries - Serbia has 118 lawyers per 100,000 inhabitants and it is in this respect similar to Montenegro, the Czech Republic and Denmark, while, for example, this number is significantly lower in Austria and Slovenia (94 and 79), and is significantly higher in Italy and Greece (368 and 388).

---

## **CEPEJ's work is useful to parliamentarians**



As the Special rapporteur of the National Assembly Committee on justice, I was delighted and most interested to hold discussions with the CEPEJ Secretariat concerning the findings of the evaluation cycle on the functioning of judicial systems.

These findings concern the day-to-day operation of the judicial systems in 45 European countries, which enables us to compare the situation and difficulties of the French judicial system with those in other countries. I was particularly interested in the comparison with our neighbours in Germany, Italy and the Netherlands.

In a period of major budgetary restrictions, in France and elsewhere, it is particularly important to properly understand the key issues concerning a policy and the difficulties encountered, and to put them into perspective so as to be able to support the case for and advocate increasing levels of funding, or at least keeping them unchanged. The tables, charts and analyses presented by the CEPEJ are very enlightening in this respect.

I am not surprised to see that our country remains very far behind comparable countries in terms of the financial effort which it makes for its justice system. We know that, for decades, the resources available to the French justice system have been too limited to enable it properly to perform its vital task for society. For instance, the Netherlands spends twice as much on its judicial system as France does. That gives pause for thought. Budgetary funding allocated to the operation of the judicial system has been increasing slightly for several years, but it is mainly due to technical increases in the pay of existing judicial staff, rather than the provision of additional human or logistical resources.

I note, however, that along with Luxembourg, France is the only country where access to courts of first instance remains free of charge. In all the other countries, fees have to be paid in order to bring legal actions or use other court services (in terms of registration, for instance). The level of these fees or duties varies depending on the country, but I note that there is a clear trend in Europe towards increasingly having a

share of the cost of the operation of courts borne by the users rather than the by tax-payers alone. That is a political choice which public decision-makers have to take and assume responsibility for.

To remain with access to justice, I note that the findings presented by the CEPEJ are also very useful for guiding political choices regarding legal aid for the financially weakest individuals. Should we limit the number of cases eligible and pay the lawyers concerned well, or broaden the range of cases eligible and limit the funds available for each case? Some countries have chosen to combine the two, but at great cost.

These are just a few examples which show how useful the CEPEJ's work is to elected representatives, who have to scrutinise, guide and validate justice policies.

**Patrick Hetzel**  
**Parliamentarian, Member of the Finance Committee**  
**National Assembly, France**

## Impact of the publication of the evaluation report in the Council of Europe member States

**Albania:** Some of the CEPEJ recommendations have been taken into account in the framework of the reform of justice underway in Albania (especially concerning the reform of the judicial map - the number of district courts should in consequence be reduced from 22 to 12. The CEPEJ evaluation report has been translated and diffused to the main stakeholders of the albanese judicial system in the framework of the cooperation project that CEPEJ is actually undergoing in the country in the field of efficiency and quality of justice.

**Azerbaijan:** the report was disseminated among judges. The thematic report rose great interest in Azerbaijan. From 1 January 2017, the Economic Courts implemented the recording system.

**Bosnia and Herzegovina:** the report was discussed among the members of the High Council of the Judiciary.

**Bulgaria:** the Supreme Judicial Council was especially interested by the report but the translation was not yet finalised. The Bulgarian version of the report should be delivered soon.

**Cyprus:** the report was presented to the President of the Republic who is also a lawyer. It was also presented to the law committee of the Parliament. The Vice-President of this committee published the overview of the report in the newspaper. It was also given to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is hoped that the government will increase the budget of the judiciary.

**Czech Republic:** the report was presented to the judicial network of judges. It has been highlighted the great interest for the evaluation report of the Supreme Court and the Chamber of notaries.

**France:** the report has been widely disseminated, in particular among politicians. The CEPEJ Secretariat was heard on the basis of the evaluation report by the Special Rapporteur of the National Assembly in view of the preparation for the 2017 budget of the judicial system. Similarly, the Chair of the CEPEJ-GT-EVAL was heard by the Chair of the Senate Law Committee and its Commission on Justice Reforms.

**Georgia:** after the publication of the report, in November 2016, the Superior Council organised a meeting to which all institutions involved in the preparation of the evaluation report were invited. Concrete measures were presented to improve the functioning and to coordinate the activities in the preparation of the next report. The results of the report have also been presented at the annual conference of judges in December 2016. The CEPEJ dynamic database (CEPEJ-STAT) has been presented at this conference. The Secretariat has been invited to present this tool to Georgian judges. The CEPEJ results help having a picture of the situation inside and outside the country. They have been used for drafting the action plan of the Strategy Reform Plan adopted by many bodies (Ministry of Justice, High Judicial Council, Ministry of Interior, Parliament, the Office of the Public Defender, the Legal Aid Centre, the Bar Association...). It should be implemented over the period 2016-2020.

**Germany:** there were few responses from the media regarding the report. This is mainly due to the fact that the report has not been translated.

**Greece:** the most productive way to disseminate the report is to organise meetings with a limited number of participants such as judges (especially the court presidents) and lawyers. It was noted that the media commonly use pictures with bad indicators. Therefore, it is important to be careful in the information transmitted (especially if a study regarding the relations media-judicial systems is planned to be prepared). It was suggested creating guidelines on the way to present data in the press. The public trust is very sensitive to this information, especially in a period of economic crisis.

**Hungary:** the report was widely disseminated to the decision-making bodies, to the institutions having provided the data and to the press. There were few responses from the press.

**Iceland:** the report was of great interest, especially for the Judicial Council which uses the report. The Ministry of Interior should take more notice of the report.

**Ireland:** there was an open public discussion between the Judiciary and the Ministry of Justice concerning the cost for establishing the Judicial Council. The discussion was underpinned by the material made available by the CEPEJ. The Irish member had the opportunity to present the report to senior court managers.

**Italy:** the media coverage was moderate, despite several articles in main newspapers. An important event was organised with the President of the High Judicial Council and the President of the Supreme Court. The Italian member was asked to participate actively to make benchmarking. Restricted panels are considered to be useful to highlight specific elements.

**Latvia:** the media coverage of the report focused on the most important issues (e.g.: number of courts, judges' salaries, number of judges, training, timeframes, etc.). The Latvian situation is compared to situations in other countries and not only neighbouring countries. A seminar related to timeframes was held. The report was also made available in the Supreme Court website.

**Lithuania:** information regarding the report was provided to the Ministry of Justice and all authorities concerned. The new Judicial Council was elected in November. Some issues were discussed with the President of the State and the President of the Judicial Council. The information about the content of the report was prepared for the media which focused on the length of proceedings especially regarding criminal cases. The recent election at the Parliament did not allow the latter to pay special attention to the report.

**Luxembourg:** information was published on the website of the judicial administration. The report is mainly read by the judiciary. The report is used to note the achievements but not to discuss the issues that could be raised. It would be a huge progress to use the report as a way of improvement.

**Malta:** the report was disseminated to stakeholders (judges, ministers, lawyers...). It is planned to organise a meeting about database. The report and the CEPEJ dynamic database will be presented together. Due to the political situation (the presidential elections), there were no articles published in Malta - after the elections, media will perhaps be more interested in publishing articles about the report.

**Monaco:** the report raises the interest of judicial authorities and legal professions. Since July 2016, a text has been issued and the heads of courts and the justice administration gathered on 12th December. It is planned to include at this meeting the CEPEJ reports, 2014 Edition (2012 data) and 2016 Edition (2014 data). The media coverage was very important, especially for the Directorate of Judicial Services, which represents a driving force behind proposals for the budget allocated to justice. Important topics are the workload of prosecutors and the computerisation of justice. There is an on-going discussion with the Ministry of Finance to isolate the budget of courts and public prosecution services. The media coverage is also important for:

- trade unions of judges (especially regarding possible budget increases) and
- the High Council of the Judiciary (the report is a way to make suggestions for thought and action).

**Montenegro:** the Ministry of Justice is taken a great interest in the report. It has been published on their website and it informed the institutions concerned. The translation issue has also to be taken into account. It is expensive and time consuming but it has been ensured that the best efforts would be taken to achieve the translation. The dynamic database, CEPEJ-STAT, is used for important strategic decisions and it represents an important tool to compare Montenegro with other countries.

**Netherlands:** the Judicial Council published the report on their website. The Justice Scoreboard of the European Commission draws more attention than the CEPEJ report.

**Portugal:** the report was published on the Ministry of Justice website and also on the Facebook page. There was a press release from the Ministry of Justice and a positive feedback concerning the IT report, which is one of the priorities of the government.

**Romania:** the report was published on the Ministry of Justice website in order to make it visible to all justice stakeholders. As regards the translation, the necessary resources are in process of identification. To date, there has been no particular response to the report but the most important is that data were taken into account immediately after the publication: this is considered as essential for proposals as regards amendments on judicial issues. At the present time, laws are proposed regarding the status of judges and the report is an important tool to guide the judicial authorities.

**Russian Federation:** the report was presented to the Court statistics Units. Data was used for answering the questions of the press and the Parliament. The main report was of no great interest for the media. However the thematic report on IT in courts has been of particular interest for the judicial system.

**Serbia:** the Ministry of Justice, in co-operation with the Council of Europe, organised an event for the presentation of the report and the dynamic database CEPEJ-STAT on 23 November 2016 (on the same day of the adoption of the Law on domestic violence and the Criminal Code). There were over 50 participants (representatives of judiciary, NGOs...). Everyone was extremely enthusiastic. The dynamic database, CEPEJ-STAT has been recognised as being an excellent tool and very useful. The conclusions of the report on judicial efficiency have been taken into account in order to decrease backlogs.

**Slovak Republic:** the Ministry of Justice and the Judicial Council are working on a new way to assess judges. The Justice Scoreboard of the European Commission is of greatest interest for media compared to the CEPEJ report.

**Spain:** the thematic most covered by the press was the number of judges. Spain has a lower number of judges compared to other countries (judicial counsellors are more numerous than judges).

**Switzerland:** there were little covering of the report by the media. However, this autumn, a session was organised with all secretaries-general of all Cantonal Appeal Courts and a session with all presidents of the Cantonal Supreme Courts. During these sessions the statistics of the Swiss judicial system were presented.

**"the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia":** the former President of the Macedonian Academy of Science and Arts was contacted to organise a conference related to efficiency in the judiciary. A wide

participation was observed (the president of the Supreme Court, notaries, members of the Academy of Science and Arts who are dealing with legal issues, etc.). It was requested to the Academy of Science and Arts to publish all the topics related to the report.

**Turkey:** the checking of the translation is ongoing. The report will then be sent to the Turkish libraries, the Superior Court, the High Council of Judges, the public prosecutor services. The report was submitted to the Ministry of Justice and has been presented on the website of the Ministry of Justice. Information notes have been given to the Press Agency.

**Ukraine:** the report was translated and it has received great responses. It was transmitted for websites such as the one of the Institution of Statistics.

**United-Kingdom:** the report was not of great interest for the media.

▶ [Link to the press review](#)

## Ongoing activities: what's new?

### Evaluation of judicial systems

#### 2016-2018 evaluation cycle

The scheme for the evaluation of European judicial systems for the 2016-2018 cycle was adopted at the 28th plenary meeting of the CEPEJ in December 2016. It will be opened to be completed by national correspondents by 1st June 2017. It will be presented in a new way with a new informatic tool to facilitate the collecting and processing of data.

#### Peer evaluation

A peer evaluation mission on judicial statistics took place in the Czech Republic in February 2017. Two other missions are foreseen this year, in Cyprus (30 and 31 May) and in Georgia.

▶ [More information...](#)

### Timeframes of proceedings

At its 28th plenary meeting in Strasbourg on 6 and 7 December 2016, the CEPEJ adopted the document entitled: "Towards judicial timeframes - implementation guide", based on the work of the SATURN working group on judicial timeframes. For the first time, the CEPEJ provides an encrypted information concerning the timeframes by case category.

▶ [Towards European Timeframes for Judicial Proceedings - Implementation Guide](#)

▶ [More information...](#)

### Quality of Justice

At its 28th plenary meeting, the CEPEJ adopted a Guide entitled: "Measuring the quality of justice", which lists numerous indicators to measure the quality of processes and judicial decisions in judicial services. These indicators are founded on the Checklist for promoting the quality of justice and the courts as well as on other documents developed by the CEPEJ. This guide underlines the importance of the feedback from court users on services provided by courts to measure the quality of justice. This document has been prepared by the CEPEJ-GT-QUAL on the basis of a preparatory work by Fabio Bartolomeo (CEPEJ member, Italy)

▶ [Guide "Measuring the quality of justice"](#)

The CEPEJ also adopted, at its plenary meeting, the "Guidelines on how to drive change towards Cyberjustice" - Stock-taking of tools deployed and summary of good practices, prepared by the GT-QUAL on the basis of a preliminary work of Harold Epineuse, scientific expert (France). Through these Guidelines, the CEPEJ wishes not only to contribute to documenting this field by compiling details of the most recent experience gained in the context of European judicial systems, but also to take a critical look at IT development as applied to the justice system in recent years and at existing challenges for both professionals working in the field of justice and policymakers.

▶ [Guidelines on how to drive change towards Cyberjustice - Stock-taking of tools deployed and summary of good practices](#)

Finally, the CEPEJ adopted the document prepared by the CEPEJ-GT-QUAL, on the basis of a preliminary work by Francesco De Satis, scientific expert (Italy), entitled:

▶ [Good practice guide on Structural measures to improve the functioning of civil and administrative justice in addition to the effective domestic remedies required by Article 13 of the ECHR](#)

### Training programme for the organisation of court user satisfaction surveys

The CEPEJ pursues its training programme for the organisation of satisfaction surveys amongst court users. The interested courts may benefit from the support of the CEPEJ experts in this field. They are invited to address their request to the Secretariat of the CEPEJ: [stephane.Leyenberger@coe.int](mailto:stephane.Leyenberger@coe.int).

### Courts training programme for the application of CEPEJ tools

The CEPEJ has created a training programme for the courts regarding the use of the SATURN tools on court delays. It is provided by CEPEJ members and experts. Each court interested in this programme is invited to contact [stephane.Leyenberger@coe.int](mailto:stephane.Leyenberger@coe.int).

► [More information](#)

## Mediation

The reactivation of the CEPEJ Working group on mediation (CEPEJ-GT-MED) was announced at the last plenary meeting of the CEPEJ in December 2016. The meetings of the GT-MED will take place on 23-24 May and 16-17 November 2017 to pursue the work in this field.

► [More information](#)

## CEPEJ Innovation Centre



In the framework of the establishment at the end of 2016, of its platform of exchange of good practices, the CEPEJ highlights the justice plan of excellence and the strategic agenda 2015-2020 which has been implemented by the Superior Court of Justice of Murcia (Spain). The national correspondent for Spain, Mr Juan Fernando Armengot, in collaboration with the President of the Court Mr. Miguel Pascual del Riquelme, presented this plan at the 28th plenary meeting of the CEPEJ on 7 December 2016. It focuses on 6 aspects:

- Towards an Open Administration of Justice
- A user-orientated justice
- Innovation, modernisation and organisation excellency
- Awareness of judicial certainty and security
- Promotion and integration of leadership and management tools

► [Promotion of the description of the project](#)

► [More information...](#)

## Call for applications for the Council of Europe Prize "Crystal Scales of Justice" for innovative practices contributing to the efficiency and quality of justice



The Council of Europe is organising the 9th edition of the Crystal Scales of Justice Prize. The aim of the prize is to identify and promote innovative practices regarding the conduct of proceedings, court organisation and the functioning of court systems in general. To be eligible for consideration, the practices nominated must have been implemented recently and they should be easily usable by other States or jurisdictions. Their efficiency must be measurable. The 2017 competition is open to courts, Bar Associations, non-governmental organisations and any other bodies dealing with judicial affairs in a member State of the Council of Europe or an observer State to the CEPEJ\*. Applications must meet the eligibility criteria as specified in the Rules of the Prize, and be submitted to the Council of Europe ([cepej@coe.int](mailto:cepej@coe.int)), preferably electronically, by **15 June 2017**. The Prize awarding ceremony will take place in Edinburgh (Scotland) on 27 October 2017 in the framework of the European Day of Justice.

Contact: [Cepej@coe.int](mailto:Cepej@coe.int)

► [More information about the Crystal Scales of Justice Prize](#)

## 2017 edition of the European day of justice

The European day of justice is celebrated on 25 October each year. It addresses European citizens, to students and justice professionals. Its objective is to bring justice closer to citizens, to inform them on their rights and to promote the work of the Council of Europe and the European Commission in the field of justice, with, for example, simulation of procedures and information sessions.

In 2016, the main event of the European day of justice has been celebrated in Belgrade (Serbia). 19 member States organised a specific event on this occasion.

The main event in the framework of the celebration of the European day of justice will take place in Edinburgh, on 27 October 2017.

- ▶ [Report on the events organised in Europe to celebrate the 2016 European Day of Justice](#)
- ▶ [More information](#)

## CEPEJ co-operation programmes

CEPEJ is involved in the following co-operation programmes:

- ▶ "Horizontal facility for Western Balkans and Turkey" ([Albania](#), [Kosovo](#)\*)
- ▶ "Eastern Partnership Programmatic Co-operation Framework (PCF)" ([Azerbaijan](#), [Republic of Moldova](#))
- ▶ "Towards a strengthened democratic governance in the Southern Mediterranean" ([Jordan](#), [Tunisia](#))
- ▶ "Programme to support the justice sector reform - improving the functioning of justice in Morocco using the tools of the CEPEJ" ([Morocco](#))
- ▶ "Developing mediation practices in civil disputes in [Turkey](#)"

[\* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence.]

### Programme "Strengthening the efficiency and quality of the Slovak judicial system through the application of the tools and methodology of the CEPEJ"



The Slovak Republic has made a voluntary contribution of € 700,000 to strengthen the efficiency and quality of the Slovak judicial system through the application of the tools and methodology of the CEPEJ. The agreement was signed on 31 March 2017 by Ms Marcela Hanusová, Chargé d'affaires a.i., Permanent Representation of the Slovak Republic, and Mrs Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General.

- ▶ [More information about the programme](#)

### CEPEJ and Court Administration of Latvia launch a co-operation project in view of a comprehensive evaluation of the judicial system



On 21 February 2017 Mr. Edvins Balševics, Director of the Court Administration of Latvia, and Mrs Gabriella Battaini-Dragoni, Deputy Secretary General of the Council of Europe, signed an agreement on funding the Project "Evaluation of the Latvian judicial system". Under this agreement, the CEPEJ and the Court Administration of Latvia will cooperate in view of strengthening the independence, efficiency and quality of the Latvian judiciary. In particular, CEPEJ will conduct an assessment of the overall performance of the national judicial system, applying its tools and methodology. The action will be implemented in the framework of the "Justice for Growth" Project, with the support of the European Social Fund.

According to the "EU Justice Agenda 2020 – Strengthening Trust, Mobility and Growth within the Union", justice policies should support economic recovery, growth and tackling unemployment. Latvian authorities pursue structural reforms needed to ensure that the justice system is capable of delivering swift, reliable and trustworthy justice, which would notably reduce the length of judicial proceedings, thereby supporting the effectiveness of other policies. The announced project should facilitate the implementation of the priorities assumed by the Ministry of Justice of Latvia for justice sector reforms.

- ▶ [More information about the programme](#)

## Publications

- ▶ [2016 edition of the report "European judicial systems - efficiency and quality of justice" \(CEPEJ Studies No. 23\)](#)
- ▶ [Thematic report: use of information technology in European courts \(CEPEJ Study No. 24\)](#)
- ▶ [Good practice guide on Structural measures to improve the functioning of civil and administrative justice in addition to the effective domestic remedies required by Article 13 of the ECHR](#)
- ▶ [Guide "Measuring the quality of justice"](#)
- ▶ [Implementation guide "Towards European timeframes for judicial proceedings"](#)
- ▶ [Guidelines on how to drive change towards Cyberjustice](#)



## Readers corner

You wish to react to an article published in this issue or to suggest us topics to be approached, please send us your

## Upcoming events - January to July 2017

- ▶ **3 and 5 May 2017**

suggestions by e-mail to the following address:  
[cepej@coe.int](mailto:cepej@coe.int).

Meeting of the Working group on  
evaluation of European judicial systems  
(GT-EVAL)  
Strasbourg, France

▶ **4 May 2017**

Meeting of national correspondents  
Strasbourg, France

▶ **23 and 24 May 2017**

Meeting of the working group on  
Mediation (GT-MED)  
Strasbourg, France

▶ **29 and 30 June 2017**

CEPEJ Plenary meeting  
Strasbourg, France

▶ [More information](#)