

Strasbourg, 25 June 2021

CEPEJ-GT-EVAL (2021)5rev

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION FOR THE EFFICIENCY OF JUSTICE
(CEPEJ)**

**Project of Cooperation with European Commission – Support for a better evaluation of the result of the
judicial reform efforts in the Eastern Partnership “Justice Dashboard EaP”**

EXPLANATORY NOTE

I. Introduction

Background

The CEPEJ is a unique body, made up of experienced experts from the 47 Council of Europe member states. It assesses the efficiency of judicial systems and proposes practical tools and measures for states to work towards an increasingly efficient service of justice for the public.

Since 2004, every two years, the CEPEJ is undertaking a process of evaluating the judicial systems of the Council of Europe member states. An Evaluation Scheme has been designed and used by the CEPEJ to identify indicators in line with the principles of the Council of Europe in the field of efficiency and fairness of justice.

Furthermore, CEPEJ conducts annual study for “EU Justice Scoreboard” (concerning European Union member states) which contains a large part of CEPEJ data (extract from CEPEJ Evaluation Scheme), in the framework of an existing service contract between DG-JUST and the Council of Europe.

Besides, since 2019, the CEPEJ has been involved in a cooperation project with the European Commission (EC) in the frame of the Western Balkan Strategy for measuring the impact of justice reforms. Accordingly, the Western Balkan Dashboard is aimed at providing quantitative and qualitative data on the functioning of the judicial systems of the beneficiaries (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Serbia, Kosovo^{1*}) which will allow for a better measurement of the results of the justice reform efforts supported by the EC in the Western Balkans.

Justice Dashboard EaP – general information

During 2020, the EC has approached CEPEJ and proposed an action aimed at supporting the Eastern partner countries in their efforts to achieve, systematic and data-based monitoring and evaluation on the quality, efficiency, independence and accountability of their justice systems, including the prosecution services. Constituting a key tool in the context of the upcoming EU-EaP post-2020 policy objectives, this action is based on an annual collection and processing of data concerning the functioning of the judicial systems based on indicators focussing on the essential parameters of effective justice systems of the beneficiary countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova and Ukraine.

The methodology itself was agreed between the CEPEJ Working group on evaluation (CEPEJ-GT-EVAL), EC and the beneficiaries, and has been developed on the basis of the previous CEPEJ work, primarily Evaluation Scheme, EU Justice Scoreboard and Western Balkan Dashboard. Concretely, the exercise will be carried out according to the CEPEJ methodology and in close coordination with the EC. The action also introduces some new indicators and widens the scope of existing schemes to include areas of particular interest for the EC and the beneficiary countries. For that reason, the action expands some of the existing CEPEJ questions and introduces new ones regarding independence of justice, integrity and anti-corruption, training, akin to the Western Balkan Dashboard.

Part of the questionnaire and explanatory note were prepared in cooperation with the GRECO Secretariat.

In parallel, the action proposes to support each beneficiary country with technical expertise and capacity building activities in order to improve the effective and systematic collection, processing and analysis of data on the functioning of the judicial systems and judicial statistics according to the CEPEJ methodology.

Data collection and methodology

The CEPEJ will collect annually data on the functioning of the justice system in each beneficiary country. Some of the data to be collected are identical to those used in the general CEPEJ evaluation process, while others are specific to this action only.

* 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.

The methodology for the collection and verification of data is defined by the CEPEJ Secretariat, under the supervision of the CEPEJ-GT-EVAL. Data collection will be based on reporting by each beneficiary country, which will be invited to appoint a CEPEJ correspondent entrusted with the collection and coordination of the replies to the CEPEJ questionnaire, through the internet system: CEPEJ-COLLECT. Extensive work will be carried out by the action team responsible for the data collection within the CEPEJ Secretariat to verify the quality of the data submitted by the correspondents. This quality check process requires a certain time in order to guarantee the reliability of the quantitative and qualitative data to be finally presented to EU. During the whole process, the correspondent will be the unique interlocutor for the CEPEJ Secretariat. No data will be modified by the CEPEJ without specific information from the correspondents.

The CEPEJ shall provide the results of the data collection in time to ensure the timely preparation of the EU Annual reports, subject to the provision of the relevant data in due time by the beneficiary countries and proper involvement of the CEPEJ correspondents in the quality check process.

II. Comments concerning the questions

This explanatory note accompanies the questions in this action's questionnaire and aims to assist the CEPEJ correspondents entrusted with replying to the questions in clarifying the purpose of each question, its idea and definition. In case of more complex questions this document tries to clarify the ambiguities with practical examples of how questions should be interpreted and which replies should be given.

You can also find some indications, especially on the quality control process in the document "Overview of data quality control process" (CEPEJ-GT-EVAL(2019)2rev). All the relevant information are available on the following webpage <https://www.coe.int/en/web/cepej/cepej-national-correspondents>.

Should you have any question regarding this Scheme and the way to answer it, please send an e-mail to Oxana GUTU (Oxana.GUTU@coe.int) or Tony VILELA (Tony.VILELA@coe.int).

a. General remarks

NA and NAP answers:

When answering questions, it may not always be possible to give a number or to choose between different modalities of answers (Yes or No). In these cases you can use NA or NAP respectively.

NA (information/data is not available) means that the concept/category referred to in the question exists in your system, but that you do not know the answer/data (e.g. administrative law cases exist in your system, but you cannot quantify their number).

NAP (not applicable) means that the question is not relevant in your judicial system (for example, because a question refers to a category of judicial staff or the type of dispute which does not exist in your system).

The answers NA or NAP are very different from each other, please observe these rules, any mistake will lead to wrong interpretations. The consistency rules (vertical and horizontal) do not apply in the same way in the presence of one or more NA or NAP responses.

Consistency (horizontal and vertical): in a table having different subcategories and a total, the latter must equal the sum of the different sub-categories.

Subcategories:

If the answers of one or more sub-categories are **NA** (not available), the total cannot be equal to the sum of the other sub-categories for which the answers are quantitative data.

- if only one category is NA, the total must necessarily be NA;
- if several subcategories are NA, the total can be either NA or a quantitative data (which will necessarily be greater than the sum of the available sub-categories);
- on the other hand, if one or more subcategories are **NAP** (not applicable), they do not have an impact on the total which can be equal to the sum of the sub-categories since this/these NAP responses indicate that this/these sub-categories do not exist in the legal system.

Examples:**Example no. 1 - one subcategory is NA:**

	Approved budget (in €)	
TOTAL - Annual public budget allocated to the functioning of all courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7)	NA	
1. Annual public budget allocated to (gross) salaries	1000	
2. Annual public budget allocated to computerisation	NA	
3. Annual public budget allocated to justice expenses (expertise, interpretation, etc.)	1000	
4. Annual public budget allocated to court buildings (maintenance, operating costs)	2000	
5. Annual public budget allocated to investments in new (court) buildings	5000	
6. Annual public budget allocated to training	2000	
7. Other (please specify)	1000	

This example shows that if one sub-category is NA (in this case “2. Annual public budget allocated to computerisation”) than the “Total” also must be NA.

Example no. 2 - several subcategories are NA:

	Approved budget (in €)	
TOTAL - Annual public budget allocated to the functioning of all courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7)	10000	
1. Annual public budget allocated to (gross) salaries	1000	
2. Annual public budget allocated to computerisation	NA	
3. Annual public budget allocated to justice expenses (expertise, interpretation, etc.)	NA	
4. Annual public budget allocated to court buildings (maintenance, operating costs)	2000	
5. Annual public budget allocated to investments in new (court) buildings	NA	
6. Annual public budget allocated to training	1000	
7. Other (please specify)	1000	

This example shows that if more than one sub-category is NA than the “Total” can be NA or a number (10 000 as in the example) higher than the sum of the other sub-categories (5 000 in this case), if these three sub-categories are known but cannot be provided separately.

Example no. 3 - one (or several) subcategory(ies) is/are NAP:

	Approved budget (in €)	
TOTAL - Annual public budget allocated to the functioning of all courts (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7)	8000	
1. Annual public budget allocated to (gross) salaries	1000	

2. Annual public budget allocated to computerisation	1000	
3. Annual public budget allocated to justice expenses (expertise, interpretation, etc.),	1000	
4. Annual public budget allocated to court buildings (maintenance, operating costs)	2000	
5. Annual public budget allocated to investments in new (court) buildings	NAP	
6. Annual public budget allocated to training	2000	
7. Other (please specify)	1000	

This example shows that reply NAP does not have influence on the "Total" since that sub-category does not exist in the legal system and consequently it is treated as 0 (8000 = sum of the existing sub-categories).

Comments: CEPEJ allocates a comment for every question. We differentiate two types of comments: General comments (in specific tab of CEPEJ-COLLECT) and specific comments under each question.

In the "specific comments" area, the CEPEJ correspondent should provide detailed information on the specificities of the judicial system for **the on-going data collection** as well as explain substantial variations of data from the data provided to CEPEJ in some of the previous evaluations.

The **specific comments under each question** are different from the **general comments** which **apply to all evaluations** and are located in a separate tab. Such comments refer to specificities of the judicial system relevant to all evaluation cycles and will be helpful when analysing the replies and processing data. It is not required to fill in this area systematically but only when specifics in the system exist and the interpretation of data should be aware of it. These comments should be as precise and as concise as possible.

When an answer and/or a comment to a specific question remains unchanged from one evaluation process to the other, it is possible for national correspondents to "cut and paste" from the previous evaluation round. For the General comment this is done automatically and the user should intervene only in case change is needed. In the event of an unchanged answer/comment from one cycle to the next, a simple reference to the answers of the previous cycle is not possible.

Gross figures and full-time equivalent of posts: the posts in gross figures concern the total number of persons working, independently of their working hours. The posts in full-time equivalent, on the other hand, are aimed at quantifying the posts taking the full time as a reference. The indication of the full-time equivalent implies that the number of part time working persons has to be converted: for instance, one half-time worker should count for 0.5 of a full-time equivalent, two people working half the standard number of hours count for one "full-time equivalent".

Check and variations from previous evaluations: please always check the data inserted. Check the figures inserted (for instance the number of zeros!).

Please also compare the data indicated for the year of reference with the ones provided for the previous CEPEJ evaluation rounds and explain significant variations from one evaluation to another. This is not automatically possible to see within the CEPEJ-COLLECT system for the first cycle of data collection but only starting with the second cycle. For numerical data, the system will automatically warn you in case of a significant variation and data can only be saved with these variations if a comment is inserted in a specific box that will appear under the concerned data. Indeed, these variations may be explained by, for example, structural reform, legislative change, different methodology or a change in the interpretation of the question by the CEPEJ correspondent. Please note that this change should be well explained and not only mentioned. For example, if there is a new methodology introduced, the differences with the previous one should be elaborated.

Euros: all financial amounts have to be given in Euros except where value in local currency is specifically required. This is essential to avoid any misinterpretations or problems of comparability. For countries outside the euro zone, the exchange rate, on 1st January of the reference year +1, has to be indicated in question 3.

Rules and exceptions: Please give answers, if possible, according to the general situation in your system and not according exceptions. You may indicate exceptions to the rules in the comment area below the question.

Sources: Please indicate the sources of your data where requested. The “source” concerns the institution which has provided the information to answer the question (e.g. the National Institute of the Statistics or the Ministry of Justice). This will help check the reliability of the data.

Year of reference: the year of reference for this Scheme is 2020.

Please note that the questions that are copied from CEPEJ Evaluation Scheme are added in blue between brackets to ease the link between the numbering of these two questionnaires.

b. Comments question by question

General Data

These data will enable to determine ratios allowing comparative analysis.

Question 1 (Question 1 of the CEPEJ questionnaire)

The number of inhabitants should be of 1 January of the reference year +1.

Question 2 (Question 3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Please indicate the annual Gross domestic product (GDP) at current prices per capita. Gross domestic product (GDP) at current prices is GDP at prices of the current reporting period (i.e. not readjusted for the effects of price inflation) also known as nominal GDP.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is an indicator of economic activity which is the most commonly used and is usually measured on an annual or quarterly basis to determine the economic growth of a country from one period to another. GDP is a measure of total consumption, investment, government spending and the value of exports minus imports.

Question 3 (Question 5 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The exchange rate at 1 January of the reference year + 1 should be provided for this question. The exchange rate should be expressed as number of units of national currency required to obtain 1 Euro for all countries outside the Euro zone.

The mid exchange rate published by the Central/National Bank for 1 January of the reference year + 1 is the expected value. In case of big fluctuation of exchange rate between cycles an average annual exchange rate for the reference year could be provided instead.

Indicator 1. Budget

Indicator 1.1 Budget allocated to courts and prosecution offices, per capita and in Euro / Budget allocated to the whole justice system

Question 4 (Question 6 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The annual, approved and implemented, public budget allocated to the functioning of all courts has been defined by the CEPEJ (see categories below) and may differ from the member states' definitions. **For comparability reasons, please observe the CEPEJ categories.**

The budget (approved) should be reported, if possible, without other sources (e.g. co-financed by EU or other external donor). The latter should be mentioned in comments. The funds from other sources (amount or estimation of the budget) should be provided in Q10 or Q11.

Note: If you cannot separate the budget of the public prosecution services and / or the budget of legal aid from the budget allocated to the functioning of all courts, please indicate “NA” and answer to question 5 below.

This budget includes:

Categories 1 to 7:

1. (Gross) salaries are those of all judicial and non-judicial staff working within courts, excluding, if appropriate, the public prosecution system (and the staff working for the prosecution services). This amount should include the total salary costs for the employer: if, in addition to the gross salary proper, the employer also pays insurances and/or pensions, these contributions should be included.

2. Computerisation includes all the expenses for equipment, investments, installation, use and maintenance of computer systems (including the expenses for outsourced technical staff).

2.1 Investments in computerisation should include the amount designated only for the equipment, investments, and installation. More precisely, this category should include only purchase of new or upgrade of the existing hardware and software, as well as development costs.

2.2 Maintenance of the IT equipment of courts should include only maintenance costs, such as updates of licences, repairment of software “bugs” etc.

3. Justice expenses borne by the state (or by the justice system) refer to the amounts that the courts should pay out within the framework of judicial proceedings, such as expenses paid for expert opinions or court interpreters. Any expenses to be eventually paid by the parties (e.g. individual costs of experts and interpreters to be reimbursed to the court budget or, court fees and taxes paid to cover justice expenses; see questions 8 and 9 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) should be excluded. The amount to be paid for legal aid and/or coverage or exemption of court fees should also not be indicated here (see questions from 12 to 13-2).

4. Court buildings' budget includes all the costs that are related to the maintenance and operation of court buildings (costs for rental, electricity, security, cleaning, maintenance etc.). It does not include investments in new buildings.

5. Investments in new (court) buildings includes all the costs that are connected with **investments in new court** buildings (either building of new structure or purchase of existing buildings).

6. The annual public budget allocated to **training** includes all training directly covered by the courts for the training of judges and non-judicial staff, excluding, if appropriate, the public prosecution system (and the staff working for the prosecution services). It does not include the specific budget of a separate public training institution for judges and / or prosecutors (see question 142 (question 131-0 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

7. Other includes all figures that you cannot subsume under categories listed above.

This budget must not include in particular (they are reported at different questions):

- the budget of the prosecution system (see question 6);
- the budget for legal aid (see questions 12 and 13);
- the budget for the prison and probation systems;
- the budget for the operation of the Ministry of Justice (and/or any other institution (of executive or legislative branch of power) which deals with the administration of justice);
- the budget for the operation of other institutions (other than courts) attached to the Ministry of Justice;
- the budget of the judicial protection of youth (social workers, etc.);
- the budget of the Constitutional courts;
- the budget of the High Judicial Council. State Prosecutorial Council (or similar body (of the judicial branch of power));
- the annual income of court fees or taxes received by the state (see questions 8 and 9),

The **approved** budget is the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament (or another competent public authority). If the approved budget had been changed (rebalance or amendment) during the year, the latest change should be reported.

The **implemented** budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year.

Where appropriate, the annual budget allocated to the functioning of all courts must include both the budget at national level and at the level of regional or federal entities.

Question 5 (Question 7 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

If you have answered to question 4, please fill in with “NA” for this question.

If you answer to this question, please note that the **approved** budget is the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament (or another competent public authority). The **implemented** budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year.

Question 6 (Question 13 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The *Public Prosecutor* should be understood according to the following definition contained in Recommendation Rec(2000)19 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the role of public prosecution in the criminal justice system: "(...) authorities who, on behalf of society and in the public interest, ensure the application of the law where the breach of the law carries a criminal sanction, taking into account both the rights of the individual and the necessary effectiveness of the criminal justice system".

If you cannot separate the budget of the public prosecution services and / or the budget allocated to the functioning of all courts, please indicate "NA" and answer to question 5.

The **approved** budget is the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament (or another competent public authority).

The **implemented** budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year.

The budget (approved) should be reported, if possible, without other sources (e.g. co-financed by EU or another external donor). The latter should be mentioned in comments. The funds from other sources (amount or estimation of the budget) should be provided in Q10 or Q11.

The annual public budget allocated to **training** of the public prosecution services includes all costs allocated to training of public prosecutors and the staff working for the prosecution services. It does not include the specific budget of a separate public training institution for judges and / or prosecutors (see question 142 (question 131-0 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

Questions 7, 8 and 9 (Questions 15-1, 15-2 and 15-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

These questions take into account the budget allocated to the whole justice system. It includes the budget of the judicial system (Q4+Q12+Q6) and the other categories as listed in Q9 accordingly.

The **approved** budget is the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament (or another competent public authority).

The **implemented** budget corresponds to the observed expenditures during the reference year.

The budget (approved) should be reported, if possible, without other sources (e.g. co-financed by EU or another external donor). The funds from other sources (amount or estimation of the budget) should be provided in Q10 or Q11.

The annual public budget allocated to the whole justice system should include, in particular the budget of the judicial system (in accordance with the CEPEJ definition i.e. Q8):

- the budget for courts
- the budget for legal aid;
- the budget for the public prosecution services;

And possibly other elements (Q9):

- the budget for prison system
- the budget for probation services
- the budget for High Judicial Council
- the budget for High Prosecutorial Council
- the budget for the Constitutional Court
- the budget for the judicial management body
- the budget for Advocacy State (i.e. the budget referring to a lawyer representing the state's interests)
- the budget for enforcement services
- the budget for notariat
- the budget for forensic services
- the budget for the judicial protection of juveniles
- the budget for the functioning of the Ministry of Justice

- the budget for refugees and asylum seekers services
- the budget for immigration service
- the budget for some police services
- other

Note: for these questions, the answers "No" and "NAP" are equivalent.

The budget for the “judicial protection of juveniles” includes the budget referring to the youth protection, mainly the budget allocated to social workers and not the budget for juvenile courts (this should be included at Q4).

The budget of “some police services” includes the budget of the judicial police, prisoners’ transfer, security in courts, etc.

And for category “other” please specify elements as for example budget allocated to training, if there is no training institution (as mentioned in question 142 (question 131-0 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) and if this training is not financed by the courts or prosecution services (questions 4.6 and 6.1 (questions 6.6 and 13.1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)).

Question 10

Substantial funding for justice system’s budget might come from external donors, such as international organizations (EU, COE, UN, OSCE etc.), other states (foreign state’s agencies for international development and cooperation, inter-governmental programs, embassies, etc.), NGOs, etc. Considering the significance of such funding, data on the amounts contributed to different elements of different budgets should be reported.

If possible, please provide breakdown of abovementioned funds into the following categories: courts, prosecutors’ offices, legal aid, and at the end, the whole justice system. When answering this question, please pay attention to ensure consistency with data provided under earlier questions relating to budgets (Q4, Q6, Q7, Q12 and Q13). If funding of different categories comes from the same external source (e.g. one project finances activities of both courts and prosecutors’ offices), please try to separate portions spent for each category. If you cannot make a precise calculation, please answer NA and provide a close estimate in Q11.

The indicated amount should include all external donations received in the reference year. For the purposes of this question, the reference should be made to the **implemented budget**. In case you cannot provide implemented budget, the value of approved budget can be used instead. In that case, please make a note and specify details in the comment box. Considering that this amount will be composed of contributions made by different donors through different programs and projects, it is important to include funds obtained from all external donors irrespective of modalities of those contributions (direct donation to judiciary budget, funding of specific activities within judiciary, implementing projects aimed at improving functioning of judiciary, etc). Please give relevant information in the comment box.

If possible, only amounts spent within the reference year should be reported. In case the funding is obtained within a multi-year project financed by external donors, try to separate funds spent within a reference year from the overall project’s budget. If the amount spent in the reference year cannot be extracted from the overall budget, please provide the amount per year that represents average spending and is being calculated based on the following formula:

Amount spent in the reference year = (total project budget/total number of months envisaged for the project implementation) X number of months of project implementation during the reference year

For example: if total project budget is 4,5 million EUR and envisaged timeframe for implementation is 24 months, the project has started on 1 May of the reference year, thus the amount obtained within reference year will be:
 $(4,500,000.00/24) \times 8 = 1,500,000$

Same formula applies if the project lasted less than a year.

In the comment area, you can explain specific purposes for which donations were given, such as trainings of judges and prosecutors, implementation of new IT solutions in judiciary, etc.

Question 11

If you cannot provide the exact amount of external contributions to the budgets in question 10, please provide the best estimate of the ratio between external donations and respective budgets. This ratio should be presented as percentage calculated in relation to the total implemented budget of the category in question. When making an estimate, please use the same logics and methodology described under question 10.

Indicator 1.2 Budget of the judicial system

See questions 4, 5 and 6 (questions 6, 7 and 13 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Questions 12, 13, 13-1 and 13-2 (Questions 12, 12-1, 12-2 and 12-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Legal aid is defined as the aid provided by the state to persons who do not have sufficient financial means to defend or represent themselves in court or to prevent litigation or to offer access to legal advice or information.

Following two categories should be distinguished:

Cases brought to court - legal aid allowing litigants to finance fully or partially their court fees when appearing in court (legal representation and all court fees: to initiate court proceedings and other court fees);

Cases not brought to court - to prevent litigation or to offer access to legal advice or information (access to law knowing one's rights and asserting them, but not necessarily through court review), such as legal advice, ADR and some other legal services, or to enforce a judicial decision (for expenses that are not a part of enforcement proceedings in courts).

Total amount should include only the expenses to be covered for those benefiting from legal aid (or their lawyers). Administrative costs resulting from such procedures (e.g. salaries of free legal aid services staff) should be excluded.

The **approved** budget is the budget that has been formally approved by the Parliament (or another competent public authority).

The **implemented** budget corresponds to the actual expenditures during the reference year.

Question 13-1 (Question 12-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This question refers only to one part of legal aid and that is the coverage or the exemption of court fees (see below) as an aid provided by the state to persons who do not have sufficient financial means to defend or represent themselves in court. For the purposes of this question, coverage or exemption of court fees should be considered whenever it is provided by the state regardless of whether it is in the framework of the legal aid system or another system of derogation (e.g. derogation provided for by the Court fees act). Please explain in the comments if this is not part of the legal aid system in your country.

This question refers to the total of all court fees and not only those needed to initiate court proceedings.

The answer NAP should be selected only by the states/entities that do not require court fees at all.

The question refers to two different possibilities regarding court fees:

- "Coverage of court fees" exists when beneficiary of legal aid or other system of derogation receives full amount of legal aid in advance and pays the court fees from that amount, or when beneficiary pays the court fees and later is reimbursed for that cost through legal aid or other system of derogation;
- "Exemption from court fees" refers to a situation when beneficiary of legal aid or other system of derogation is freed from obligation to pay court fees.

To make distinction between two options clearer, in the first option beneficiary is required to pay the court fees and he/she does pay them, but the expense is at the beginning or at the end born by the legal aid budget (or other public budget), while in second, he/she is not required to pay the court fees at all.

It is possible that both of these options exist parallelly in one system (coverage for one type of cases and exemption for others), and then both options should be answered "Yes".

Question 13-2 (Question 12-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

In most systems that provide coverage of court fees, these fees are calculated since the amount of fees has to be transferred at some point from a public budget to the beneficiary. On the other hand, in the systems that grant exemptions from court fees these amounts might not be calculated nor presented in financial documents (budgets, reports etc). However, some systems still calculate or estimate monetary value of the exemptions granted. The estimation for example might be based on the number of beneficiaries multiplied by the average amount of court fees for certain types of cases.

If the value of covered/exempted fees are calculated or estimated, it should be specified whether this amount is included in the budget of legal aid provided in Q12 (approved budget) and Q13 (implemented budget) or not. The purpose of this information is to better compare different systems.

Indicator 2. Profile of the judiciary

Indicator 2.1 Average gross salary of judges and prosecutors at the beginning of their career

Question 14 ([Question 4 of the CEPEJ questionnaire](#))

Please indicate the average *gross* annual salary and not the *net* salary in your country for all sectors of the economy (public and private). The gross salary is calculated before any social expenses and taxes have been deducted. This data must be indicated in Euros.

Question 15 ([Question 132 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Two different indicators are analysed: the salary at the beginning of the career (at a first instance court for a judge/public prosecutor; starting salary at his/her salary scale) and the salary at the end of the career (at the Supreme Court or the Highest Appellate Court). Please indicate the average salary of a judge/prosecutor at the highest level and not the salary of the Court President/the Attorney General).

These indicators represent the salary for full-time work. If a bonus given to judges significantly increases their income, please specify it and, if possible, indicate the annual amount of such bonus or the proportion that the bonus takes in the judge's income. This bonus does not include the bonus mentioned under question 18.

The *gross* salary is calculated before any welfare costs and taxes have been paid (see question 4).

The *net* salary is calculated *after* the deduction of welfare costs (such as pension schemes) and taxes (for those countries where they are deducted beforehand and automatically from the sources of income; when this is not the case, please indicate that a judge/public prosecutor has to pay further income taxes on this "net" salary, so that it can be taken into account in the comparison).

If it is not possible to indicate a determined amount, please indicate the minimum and maximum annual gross and net salary.

Questions 16 and 17 ([Questions 133 and 134 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please indicate any additional benefits judges and public prosecutors may enjoy in your system. For example, judges and public prosecutors might receive free or subsidised housing, especially if assigned to courts outside of their place of residence.

Question 18 ([Question 139 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please indicate if there is a possibility for judges' additional remuneration to be in relation to the number of decisions, quality of their work or any other productivity criteria.

Indicator 2.2 Number of justice professionals - Judges/ Prosecutors/Non-judge staff/Non-public prosecutor staff/Lawyers

Questions 19 to 27 ([questions 46 to 52-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

These questions aim at counting all persons entrusted with the task of delivering or participating in a judicial decision. Please make sure that public prosecutors and their staff are excluded from these figures (if it is not possible, please indicate this clearly). Questions 28 to 32 deal with these professionals.

Please indicate the number of posts that are actually filled (at 31 December of the reference year) and not the theoretical budgetary posts.

Please provide the answer in full-time equivalent which indicates the number of persons working the standard number of hours (whereas the gross figure of posts includes the total number of persons working independently of their working hours). The indication of the full-time equivalent implies that the number of part time working persons has to

be converted: for instance, one half-time worker should count for 0.5 of a full-time equivalent, two people that work half the standard number of hours count for one "full-time equivalent".

For the purposes of this Scheme, a *judge* must be understood according to the case law of the European Court of Human Rights. In particular, the judge decides, according to the law and following an organised procedure, on any issue within his/her jurisdiction. He/she is independent from the executive power.

Therefore, **judges deciding in administrative or financial matters (for instance) must be counted** if they are included in the above mentioned definition.

Professional judges (see Q19 to Q21 (Q46 – 48 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)) are those who have been recruited, trained and who are paid as such.

Non-professional judges (see Q22 and Q23 (Q49 – 49-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)) are those who sit in courts and whose decisions are binding but who do not belong to the professional judges, arbitrators or sit in a jury. This category includes namely lay judges and the (French) "*juges consulaires*".

Echevinage/mixed bench (see Q22 and Q23 (Q49 – 49-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)) refers to a system of judicial organisation in which cases are heard and decided by a panel, composed of both, professional judge/s (who preside the panel), and persons who do not belong to the rank of professional judges (non-professional members of echevinage). They are usually chosen amongst a group of pre-selected persons, eligible to participate in panels, for one case or permanently for a period of time (more cases).

Jury (see Q24 (Q50 CEPEJ Questionnaire)) – not to be confused with echevinage (Q23 (Q49-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)), this category concerns for instance the citizens who have been drawn/selected to take part in a jury entrusted with the task of judging serious criminal offences (guilty or not guilty) or other cases. They are selected randomly and usually for one case only.

Question 19 ([Question 46 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

For the purposes of these questions, *professional judges* are those who have been recruited, trained and who are paid as such. The information should be given for posts that are actually filled (not the theoretical number included in the budget) and in full-time equivalent.

Please give answer in full-time equivalent (see general remarks).

The data concerns all general jurisdictions and specialised courts.

In order to better understand gender issues in the judiciary, please specify the number of women and men who practice in the different court levels.

When judges sit at different levels of jurisdiction, they must be assigned according to their main activity. On this basis, first instance judges are those who decide in a case for the first time; second instance judges can be defined as those who control the first decision that has been made.

If it is not possible for you to distinguish the main activity of a judge, please provide the data in full time equivalent (FTE) for each instance to which the judge is attending.

When there are differences between the judges on the same level of jurisdiction (e.g. different judges for courts of different competences at the first instance), the situation should be explained in the comment section.

Judges, seconded or temporary assigned to other functions (e.g. to Ministry of Justice) (if applicable), should not be included in the reported figure.

Question 19-1 (Question 47 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The **court president** must be understood as a judge (or non-judge) who is in charge of the organisation and the management of a court (legal entity). Regarding the countries such as Spain and Turkey where one judge is considered as one legal entity, this definition could be interpreted as a person which receives the title of "President" for the entire court (and not the president of a chamber or a section of a chamber) and who is, for example, responsible for coordinating the work of all the judges of his/her court.

Please note that court presidents (question 19-1) are also accounted under question 19 if they practise as judges.

Questions 20 and 21 (questions 48 and 48-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

These questions concern *occasional professional judges* who do not perform their duty on a permanent basis but who are paid for their function as a judge.

At first, the *gross data* could be indicated. Secondly, in order to compare the situation between member states, the same indication could be given, if possible, in *full-time equivalent*.

Question 21 (Q48-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) allows measuring to what extent part-time judges participate in the judicial system.

Questions 22 and 23 (questions 49 and 49-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

For the purposes of these questions, **non-professional judges** are those who sit in courts (as defined in question 19 (Q46 of the CEPEJ questionnaire) and whose decisions are binding but who do not belong to the categories mentioned in questions 19 and 20 (46 and 48 of the CEPEJ questionnaire) above. This category includes namely lay judges and the (French) "*juges consulaires*". Neither the arbitrators, nor the persons who have been sitting in a jury (see question 24 (Q50 of the CEPEJ questionnaire) are subject to this question.

The answer "Yes" applies to the situation where a non-professional judge is independent, or panel of judges is composed of non-professional judges.

The "echevinage/mixed bench" is a system of judicial organisation in which cases are heard and decided by a panel, composed of both, professional judge/s (who preside the panel), and persons who do not belong to the professional judges. They can be either chosen randomly or amongst a group of pre-selected persons, eligible to participate in panels.

Question 24 (question 50 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This category concerns for instance the citizens who have been drawn/selected to take part in a jury entrusted with the task of judging serious criminal offences or other cases. It may be a jury composed for one case or several cases.

Question 25 (question 50-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

If you select "other than criminal cases", please specify in the comment to which types of cases does it refer.

Question 26 (question 52 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

All non-judge staff, working in all courts, must be counted here in full-time equivalent for posts actually filled. In order to better understand gender issues in the judiciary, please specify the total number as well as each category by gender. Please make sure that the figures presented exclude staff working for the public prosecution services (See question 32 (Q60 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)) (otherwise mention the situation in the comment).

Please give answer in full-time equivalent (see general remarks).

The different categories are:

1. The "**Rechtspfleger**" is defined as an independent judicial body according to the tasks that were delegated to him/her by law. Such tasks can be connected to: family and guardianship law, law of succession, law on land register, commercial registers, decisions about granting a nationality, criminal law cases, enforcement of sentences, reduced sentencing by way of community service, prosecution in district courts, decisions concerning legal aid, etc. The Rechtspfleger has a quasi-judicial function.

2. "**Non-judge (judicial) staff whose task is to assist the judges such as registrars**" directly assist a judge with judicial support (assistance during hearings, (judicial) preparation of a case, judicial assistance in the drafting of the decision of the judge, legal counselling - for example court registrars). If data has been given under the previous category (Rechtspfleger), please do not add this figure again under the present category.

3. "**Staff in charge of different administrative tasks and of the management of the courts**" are not directly involved in the judicial assistance of a judge, but are responsible for administrative tasks (such as the registration of cases in a computer system, the supervision of the payment of court fees, administrative preparation of case files, archiving) and/or the organisation of some of the court services (for example a head of the court secretary, head of the computer department of the court, financial director of a court, human resources manager, etc.).

4. **“Technical staff”** includes staff in charge of execution tasks or any technical and other maintenance related duties such as cleaning staff, security staff, staff working at the courts’ computer departments or electricians.

5. **“Other non-judge staff”** includes all non-judge staff that are not included under the categories 1-4.

This question should be filled respecting the horizontal and vertical consistency as described in "General remarks" of the explanatory note.

Question 27 (Question 52-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

All non-judge staff specified in question 26 should be distinguished by different instances in this question. The totals of course should be identical. Instances should be considered in the same manner as for judges defined in question 19. In case it is not possible to distinguish the staff on some instance, it should be specified in comments.

Please give answer in full-time equivalent (see general remarks).

Question 28 (Question 55 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The *Public Prosecutor* should be understood according to the following definition contained in Recommendation Rec(2000)19 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the role of public prosecution in the criminal justice system: "(...) authorities who, on behalf of society and in the public interest, ensure the application of the law where the breach of the law carries a criminal sanction, taking into account both the rights of the individual and the necessary effectiveness of the criminal justice system".

The information should be given in full-time equivalent for posts that are actually filled (not the theoretic number which appears in the budget) (see note on questions 19).

In order to better understand gender issues in the judiciary, please specify the number of female and male staff working at different levels of jurisdiction as well as the number of female and male staff who are heads of public prosecution offices.

All prosecutors must be accounted, including those having specialised functions (e.g. public prosecutor specialised on organised crime, terrorism, economic crime, etc.).

In the case where prosecutors serve at several levels of jurisdiction, they should be assigned according to their main activity. In this respect, first instance prosecutors are those who process a case for the first time. Second instance prosecutors are those performing prosecution functions in cases for which a first decision has been made.

If it is not possible for you to distinguish the main activity of a prosecutor, please provide the data in full time equivalent (FTE) for each instance to which the prosecutor is attending.

Question 28-1 (Question 56 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

For the purposes of this question, a **head of public prosecution office** should be understood as a prosecutor (or non-prosecutor) who is in charge of the organisation and management of a prosecution office (legal entity).

Please note that the heads of prosecution offices (Q28-1) are also counted under Q28 if they practise as prosecutors.

Questions 29, 30 and 31 (Questions 57, 57-1 and 59 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

In some countries, there are *persons who are specifically entrusted with duties similar to those exercised by public prosecutors*, for instance police officers that are able to bring a case before court or to negotiate sentences. This excludes lawyers that bring charges to a criminal hearing and victims who can go directly to the judge without having the public prosecution services intervene.

Please specify if in your country exist persons having similar duties to public prosecutors. If the answer is positive, please provide more information in the comment of Q29.

Please give answer in full-time equivalent (see general remarks).

Please also specify whether these persons are included in the data concerning the number of public prosecutors (question 28 (Q55 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)).

Question 32 (Question 60 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

For the purposes of this question, please number the non-prosecutor staff working for the prosecution system, even when this staff appears in the budget of the court. This figure should not include the number of staff working for judges. The information should be given in full time equivalent for posts which are actually filled (not the theoretic number included in the budget).

Please give answer in full-time equivalent. (see general remarks).

Question 33 (Question 146 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

For the purposes of this question, *lawyers* refer to the definition of the Recommendation Rec(2000)21 of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on the freedom of exercise of the profession of lawyer, as follows: a person qualified and authorised according to national law to plead and act on behalf of his or her clients, to engage in the practice of law, to appear before the courts or advise and represent his or her clients in legal matters.

Question 34 (Question 147 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Legal advisors (for instance, some solicitors) are legal professionals who give legal advice and prepare legal documents but have no competence to represent users in courts.

Indicator 3. Efficiency and productivity

Indicator 3.1 Case flow (Clearance Rate, Disposition Time, Pending cases)

Questions 35 to 41 (Questions 91 to 94, Questions 97 and 98 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Information on the **caseload of first and second instance courts** should be provided.

A court case is a request (issue or problem), submitted to court, to be resolved by the court within its competence (i.e. jurisdiction). A court case is usually registered separately in the court case register according to the state rules. Court cases typically end with a decision on rights and obligations of parties (e.g. in civil matters) or with a decision on guilt of the defendants (e.g. in criminal matters). Other acts in court jurisdiction as provided by state rules (e.g. registering in land and business registry) should also be counted as court cases. **On the other hand**, administrative tasks in courts such as issuing criminal records certificates, document certification etc. should not be considered as incoming/resolved court cases for the purpose of these questions.

In principle, when one actual and legal situation is regarded in the national system as more than one court case because stages (phases) of proceedings are registered as separate court cases, this should be reported as one case only.

Note: Other procedures related to court cases are within jurisdiction of courts in some systems, while in others they are not (e.g. criminal investigation can be a procedure at the office of the public prosecutor or in court, civil enforcement can be executed by enforcement agents or by courts). Such procedures can be reported as separate cases when they: 1) are in jurisdiction of courts; 2) can be distinguished from the main trial phase by different actual or legal questions to be resolved; and 3) they represent more than just an administrative task to complement the main trial phase. For example, if another procedure in court is required for civil enforcement, after the “main” civil case has already been adjudicated, and the court deals with different questions (e.g. should the enforcement be allowed or not), these two procedures can be reported as two separate cases. If you have situation like this in your system, please give details in the comments.

Incoming cases in the reference year are all cases submitted to court (first instance, second instance or Supreme Court) for the first time. Cases which have already been submitted to a court at the same instance level (after an appeal for example) should be counted again.

Pending cases are cases which have not been completed at the end of the reference year. Please provide both the number of pending cases on 1 January of the reference year and the pending cases on 31 December of the reference year.

Resolved cases include all the procedures which have come to an end at the instance level (first instance, appeal or Supreme Court as applicable) during the year of reference, either through a judgment or through any other decision which ended the procedure (provisional decisions or procedural decisions not ending the case (e.g. on parties, perfection of the claims, allowing or disallowing the evidence, expenses etc.) should not be counted here).

Pending cases older than 2 years are pending cases (on 31st December of the reference year) that had first arrived at the court more than 2 years ago (i.e. before 1st January of Ref. year -1). This answer regards only the current instance (e.g. for pending cases at second instance from arrival to second instance only).

Questions 35 and 39 (Questions 91 and 97 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Litigious cases are cases for which the judge decides on disputed case whereas **non-litigious (non-contentious) cases** are other issues in competence of courts (typically, there is no direct dispute between parties). The latter can be for example registration cases (e.g. land registry), where a decision can be taken either by a judge or by another person (e.g. Rechtspfleger).

Categories included in "other than criminal law cases"

1. Litigious civil (and commercial) cases are for instance litigious divorce cases or disputes regarding contracts. In some countries *commercial cases* are addressed by special commercial courts, whilst in other countries these cases are handled by ordinary (civil) courts. Bankruptcy proceedings must be understood as litigious proceedings. Despite the organisational differences between countries in this respect, all the information concerning civil and commercial cases should be included in the same category. If appropriate, litigious civil (and commercial) cases do not include administrative law cases (see category 3). Any other type of litigious cases (e.g. judicial appeal against deeds processed by an enforcement agent) is included in this category.

2.1 General non-litigious civil (and commercial) cases concern court cases that are decided in a specific procedure that does not require two or more opposing parties to prove their rights and claims (there is no direct dispute between parties). For example, this includes uncontested payment orders, request for a change of name, cases related to enforcement (when non categorised as litigious – see above), divorce cases with mutual consent (for some legal systems), etc. One type of cases can be categorised as non-litigious even when the court is required to conduct a substantive examination of evidence, as long as there is no examination of claims and evidence from two or more opposing parties within the same procedure. **If courts deal with such cases, please indicate the different case types included.** Non-contentious register cases (2.2) and/or other non-litigious cases (2.3) are excluded from this category.

2.2 (including 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3) In certain member states, *registration tasks (business registers and land registers)* are dealt with by special units or entities of the courts. These are to be considered as non-litigious civil cases. Activities related to business registers could be the registration of new businesses or companies in the business register of the court or the modification of the legal status of a company. Changes in the ownership of immovable goods (like land or houses) may be a part of court activities which are related to the land register.

3. Administrative law cases (litigious or non-litigious) concern disputes between citizens and (local, regional or national) authorities, for instance: asylum refusals or refusals of construction permit applications. Administrative cases are considered only if processed in court and not when it is only an issue under any administrative body. Administrative law cases are in some countries addressed by special administrative courts or tribunals, whilst in other countries they are handled by the ordinary civil courts. **If countries have special administrative courts/tribunals or separate administrative law procedures or are anyway able to distinguish between administrative law cases and civil law cases, these figures should be indicated separately under “administrative law cases”.**

4. The category “**other**” can be related to other types of cases (not corresponding to the categories above) They can include for example legal aid cases, simplified procedures that can continue as civil etc. Administrative tasks in courts such as issuing criminal records certificates; document certification etc. should not be reported.

Please check that your figures are vertically consistent (see general remarks).

With regard to questions 35, 38, 39 and 40, (Questions 91, 94, 97 and 98 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) a special formula for horizontal consistency applies:

(Pending cases on 1 January + Incoming cases) - Resolved cases = Pending cases on 31 December

Questions 38 and 40 (Questions 94 and 98 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Criminal law cases: Are considered here as **criminal cases**, all cases for which a sanction may be imposed by a judge, even if this sanction is foreseen, in some national systems, in an administrative code (e.g. fines or community service). These can include, for example, some anti-social behaviour, nuisance or some traffic offenses.

Warning: if these cases are included in the responses to questions 38 and 40 (Q94 et Q98 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire), then they should not be counted a second time as "administrative cases" in the responses to questions 35 and 39 (Q91 and Q97 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

The offenses sanctioned directly by the police or by an administrative authority, and not by a judge, should not be counted (e.g. penalty for parking in a closed area not contested before a judge, or failure to comply with an administrative formality not contested before a judge).

To differentiate between *misdemeanour / minor offenses* and *severe offenses* and ensure the consistency of the responses between different systems, the CEPEJ invites you to classify as *misdemeanour / minor* all offenses for which it is not possible to pronounce a sentence of privation of liberty. Conversely, should be classified as *severe offenses* all offenses punishable by a deprivation of liberty (arrest and detention, imprisonment). If you cannot make such a distinction, please indicate the categories of cases reported in the category "severe offenses" and cases reported in the category "minor offenses".

Other criminal cases: are an exception to the general definition of criminal cases, as this category of cases usually includes procedures in which sanction may not be imposed (such as criminal investigation, enforcement of criminal sanctions etc.). It should be noted that depending on a national legislation, these procedures might be within jurisdiction of courts in some systems, while in others they are conducted by other bodies (e.g. criminal investigation can be a procedure conducted by public prosecutor offices or courts). When such procedures are in jurisdiction of courts, they can be reported as "Other criminal cases", regardless of the fact that the main case is already reported as a severe or misdemeanor case.

This category could also include other procedures related to criminal cases, such as some cases of enforcement of criminal sanctions (e.g. fines, the change of monetary sanction to imprisonment). Please give details in the comments.

Note: The administrative tasks related to the "main" trial phase should not be reported as separate case in "other cases" or in any other category (as they are only a phase of the main criminal proceeding).

Please check that your figures are *horizontally* and *vertically* consistent (the total of the criminal cases includes the cases of categories 1, 2 and 3) (see general remarks). If appropriate, please don't forget to comment on the specific situation in your country (including answers NA and the calculation of the total of criminal law cases).

Question 41

The **eight case categories**, which are (mostly) common in Europe, can be defined as follows:

1. **Civil and commercial litigious cases:** see the explanatory note in respect of Q35 and Q39.
2. **Litigious divorce case:** i.e. the dissolution of a marriage contract between two persons, following a judgment of a competent court. The data should not include: divorce ruled by an agreement between the parties concerning the separation of the spouses and all its consequences (procedure of mutual consent, even if they are processed by the competent court) or ruled through an administrative procedure. If your country has a totally non-judicial procedure as regards divorce or if you cannot isolate data concerning adversarial divorces, please specify it and give the subsequent explanations. Furthermore, as regards divorce, if there are in your country compulsory mediation procedures or fixed timeframes for reflection or if the conciliation phase is excluded from the judicial proceeding, please specify it and give the subsequent explanations.
3. **Employment dismissal case:** cases concerning the termination of an employment (contract) at the initiative of the employer (working in the private sector). It does not include dismissals of public officials, following a disciplinary procedure for instance.
4. **Insolvency:** Legal status of a person or an organisation that cannot repay the debts owed to creditors. Data should encompass bankruptcy declaration by a court, as well as all procedures connected with bankruptcy (recovery of credits, liquidation of assets, payment of creditors, etc.).
5. **Robbery** concerns stealing from a person with force or threat of force. If possible these figures should *include* muggings (bag-snatching, armed theft, etc.) and *exclude* pick pocketing, extortion and blackmail (according to the definition of the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice). The data should not include

attempts. The case should be counted here when the robbery is either the only offence concerned or the main offence concerned in the case.

6. **Intentional homicide** is defined as the intentional killing of a person. Where possible the figures should include assaults leading to death, euthanasia, infanticide and exclude suicide assistance (according to the definition of the European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice). The data should not include attempts. The case should be counted here when the intentional homicide is either the only offence concerned or the main offence concerned in the case.
7. **Bribery cases** - these cases should include criminal offences committed intentionally that sanction the promising, offering or giving by any person, directly or indirectly, of any undue advantage to any of the persons performing their official duties (such as public officials, members of parliament, judges etc.), for him or her to act or refrain from any acting in the exercise of his or her functions, as well as the request or receipt by any of persons performing their official duties, directly or indirectly, of any undue advantage or the acceptance of an offer or a promise of such an advantage, to act or refrain from acting in the exercise of his or her functions. The undue advantage might be for oneself or for anyone else. Both cases of active and passive bribery should be included here. The case should be counted here when bribery is either the only offence concerned, or the main offence concerned in the case.
8. **Trading in influence** – these cases should include criminal offences committed intentionally that sanction the promising, giving or offering, directly or indirectly, of any undue advantage to anyone who asserts or confirms that he or she is able to exert an improper influence over the decision-making of any person in performing their official duties (such as public officials, members of parliament, judges etc.), as well as the request, receipt or the acceptance of the offer or the promise of such an advantage, in consideration of that influence, whether or not the influence is exerted or whether or not the supposed influence leads to the intended result. The undue advantage might be for oneself or for anyone else. Both cases of active and passive trading in influence should be included. The case should be counted here when trading in influence is either the only offence concerned, or the main offence concerned in the case.

The average length of cases corresponds to the average length of resolved cases at this instance within the reference year.

If the *average length of proceedings* is not calculated from the lodging of court proceedings, please specify the starting point for the calculation. The average length of proceedings has to be presented in days. If you only have information on the length of proceedings in months (or years), please recalculate the length of proceedings in days.

Indicator 3.1.1 Case flow management – public prosecution

Question 41-2 (Question 106 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

In civil matters, the public prosecutor can, in some member states, be entrusted for instance with the responsibility of safeguarding the interest of children or persons under guardianship. In administrative matters, he/she can, for instance, represent the interests of children against the state or one of its bodies.

For example the public prosecutor can give his/her opinion regarding a proposal to buy a business that has been declared bankrupt, as well as the guaranties given to the buyer and even oversee the procedure to ensure that the law is respected, to avoid any conflict of interest and to prevent any abuse of power.

This issue is addressed by the Consultative Council of European Prosecutors (CCPE) in its Opinion N° 3 (2008) on the "Role of prosecution services outside the Criminal Law Field" (www.coe.int/ccpe).

Question 41-3 (Question 107 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The number of cases in this question refers only to the first instance criminal cases processed by public prosecutors. The data should be presented per case files which means that an event or series of events that give rise to the criminal prosecution should be counted as one case irrespective of the number of alleged offenders or offences (one case file can involve one or several perpetrators and/or can imply one or more criminal offences). However, if data cannot be presented in that manner because cases are counted differently in your system (for example per perpetrators, per criminal offences or per some other criteria), please provide the answer in accordance with your methodology but specify in the comment the criteria used for counting cases.

1. "Pending cases on 1 Jan. ref. year" are cases which have not been completed at the end of the previous year (reference year-1).
2. "Incoming/Received cases" should include cases submitted to public prosecutors by the police and other bodies as well as victims (if applicable) within the reference year.
3. "Processed cases" include all cases that were closed or brought to court between 1 January and 31 of December. They should sum up the following 4 categories (3.1+3.2+3.3+3.4).
 - 3.1. Discontinued criminal cases are cases received and processed by the public prosecutor, which have not been brought before the court and for which no sanction or any other measure has been taken. They should sum up the following 4 categories (3.1.1+3.1.2+3.1.3+3.1.4).
 - (3.1.1) Number of cases discontinued because the case could not be processed since no alleged offender was identified (it should be noted that some systems might require a lapse of time for this type of discontinuation);
 - (3.1.2) due to the lack or absence of an established offence or due to a specific legal situation (e.g. amnesty, statute of limitation, prescription etc.); or
 - (3.1.3) for reasons of opportunity, where the legal system allows it;
 - 3.1.4. discontinued for other reasons.
 - 3.2. Cases "Concluded by a penalty or a measure imposed or negotiated by the public prosecutor" refer to proceedings which have not been brought before a judge (for example all transactions not approved by a judge).
 - 3.3. "Cases closed by the public prosecutor for other reasons" - different systems offer various procedures and reasons for closing cases in public prosecution. All the cases that cannot be categorized under any other offered option could be counted under this category.
 - 3.4. "Cases brought to court" are all those situations in which the public prosecution is presenting a case to a court. The procedures (including guilty pleas, see Q41-4 (Question 107-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)) in which a judge takes the final decision (including if the decision is simply an approval of a previous agreement concluded between the prosecutor and the accused) must also be included in this category.
4. The cases which are still open in the public prosecution at the end of the reference year should be counted in the "Pending cases on 31 Dec. ref. year".

Question 41-4 (Question 107-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Regarding guilty plea procedures, there are two options that should be differentiated based on the moment in which a case has been concluded by this procedure. The option "Before the main trial" should be selected always when a guilty plea agreement has been concluded before the official start of the main trial. This option should be selected even if the agreement must be subsequently validated by a judge and/or court as long as this procedure did not involve opening of the main trial. Contrary to that, whenever a guilty plea agreement has been concluded after the official start of the main trial, it should be counted under "During the court case".

Question 41-5 (Question 109 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

If traffic cases represent a large volume of cases, please specify whether the data indicated in the frame of Q41-3 (Question 107 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) includes or not such cases. Relevant analyses based on a comparison of states or entities can be done only by considering clusters of states or entities which have or have not included traffic offences.

Indicator 3.2 Monitoring and evaluation of court, judges and prosecutors activities

Questions 42 and 43 (Questions 66 and 67 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

It is important to identify the countries who have implemented at a national level a quality systems in courts and to see if specialised staff working in the courts are also specifically responsible for the quality policy within courts (whether or not it is solely responsible).

When a system/policy exists, but it is not set up on national level, or there are several different systems/policies (e.g. at different courts) the answer should be "No" and the situation should be explained in the comment.

General quality standards/policies (e.g. quality of public services, archiving of documents etc.) should be considered only when applying directly to the work of courts.

For the purpose of these questions, a system based exclusively on monitoring the efficiency of work of courts (e.g. monitoring the number of cases, duration of cases etc.) should not be considered as a quality management system.

See also the reference material on the CEPEJ website concerning court quality such as for example the Checklist for promoting the quality of justice and the courts (CEPEJ(2008)2) or the document Measuring the quality of justice (CEPEJ(2016)12).

Question 42 ([Question 66 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

If yes, please add for example who is responsible for setting the standards and what are the details (content, scope) of the standards (e.g. standards for reasoning of decisions).

Question 43 ([Question 67 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

In context of this question "personnel" should be understood as either judges or court staff, responsible for implementing and/or monitoring the national level quality standards.

In the comment, please explain briefly their tasks and responsibilities.

Questions 44 to 47 ([Questions 77 to 78-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The question here is whether there are any performance and quality indicators set/agreed upon for the courts/public prosecution services to be measured.

For questions 45 and 47 (Questions 78 and 78-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire), several answers are possible. If "other", please specify in comment.

For explanation on **Number of incoming, resolved and pending cases** please see Explanatory note to questions 35 to 41 (Questions 91 to 94, questions 97 and 98 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

Length of proceedings (timeframes) means either monitoring the duration of proceeding from start (e.g. average duration of resolved cases or average age of pending cases), or according to set timeframes (e.g. number or percentage of cases older than X months).

Backlogs – are pending cases which have not been resolved within an established timeframe. For example, if the timeframe has been set at 24 months for all the civil proceedings, the backlog is the number of pending cases that are older than 24 months.

Productivity of judges and court staff refers to monitoring the extent of work done (e.g. number of resolved cases per judge or per department).

Satisfaction of court staff and satisfaction of users refers to evaluation of level of satisfaction among those groups. This can be measured for example by surveys.

Costs of the judicial procedures refers to monitoring the overall budget (or some aspects of the budget) regarding judicial procedures (e.g. costs of justice expenses per case).

Number of appeals refers to number of all cases, where the appeal against final decision had been lodged within the reference year.

Appeal ratio can be calculated for example by dividing the number of all resolved cases, with the number of all cases, where appeal was filed, or by dividing the number of all resolved cases, where the appeal was filed, with the number of cases where appeal was successful or unsuccessful (in some systems the information on successful appeal can be unreliable due to the different reasons for which the decision can be changed at the higher instance or remanded/reversed/quashed to the first instance).

Clearance rate (CR) - ratio obtained by dividing the number of resolved cases by the number of incoming cases in a given period, expressed as a percentage:

$$\text{Clearance Rate (\%)} = \frac{\text{Resolved cases in a period}}{\text{Incoming cases in a period}} \times 100$$

A Clearance Rate equal to 100 % indicates the ability of the court or of a judicial system to resolve as many cases as the number of incoming cases within the given time period. A Clearance Rate above 100 % indicates the ability of the system to resolve more cases than those received. Finally, a Clearance Rate below 100 % appears when the number of incoming cases is higher than the number of resolved cases. In this case the number of pending cases will increase.

Essentially, the Clearance Rate shows how the court or judicial system is coping with the in-flow of cases.

Disposition time - ratio between pending cases and resolved cases (in days). It shows the theoretical duration for a court to solve all the pending cases.

$$\text{Calculated Disposition Time} = \frac{\text{Number of pending cases at the end of a period}}{\text{Number of resolved cases in a period}} \times 365$$

Question 47 ([Question 78-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Percentage of convictions and acquittals – can be calculated from the number of the cases, ending with the conviction and number of cases, ending with the acquittal of the defendant. The other categories are defined above.

Questions 48 to 55 ([Questions 73 to 73-6 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The evaluation refers to monitoring and review of defined performance indicators (see Q45 and Q47 (Q78 and Q78-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)) at the level of individual courts/public prosecution services.

Questions 56 and 57 ([Questions 79 and 79-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The purpose here is to indicate the persons responsible for evaluation of the performance. Several answers are possible for this question. If "other", please specify in the comment.

If more than one answer is given, please explain the procedure of evaluation.

Questions 58 to 73 ([Questions 70 to 82-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The aim of questions 58 to 73 (Q70 to Q82-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) is to be able to reflect the situation in your judicial system regarding the implementation of performance measurement tools and evaluation of all court and public prosecution services. Therefore, if such tools are implemented, for example, in one or more (pilot) courts, please answer "No". You can explain the situation and the projects that are carried out in the comment.

Questions 58 and 60 ([Questions 70 and 71 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

For explanation on indicators, see explanatory note to Q45 and Q47 (Questions 78 and 78-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

Question 60 ([Question 71 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The scope of this question is to see whether the number of pending cases and number of backlogs is monitored.

Pending cases are cases which remain to be resolved by the court concerned at a given point in time (e.g. 1st January). Backlogs are pending cases which have not been resolved within an established timeframe.

To monitor the number of backlogs, monitoring the age of pending cases is required. Please give details concerning your system to measure the number of pending cases and backlogs.

Question 61 ([Question 72 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The scope of this question is to see whether additional information on timeline of the proceedings is monitored. This information is important to promote active management of work of courts/public prosecution services, as well as to prevent unnecessary delays in proceedings.

Waiting time means time during which nothing happens in a procedure (for instance because the judge is waiting for an expert's report). It is not the general length of the procedure.

Questions 62, 63, 66, 67 and 68 ([Questions 80, 80-1, 81, 81-1 and 81-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The questions 62, 63, 66, 67 and 68 (Q80 to Q81-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) aim to establish if the final statistics and annual reports of activities concerning each court are available to the public via the internet and at which frequency. This gives an idea of the degree of transparency of each court.

Questions 62 to 65 (Questions 80 to 80-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

If this centralised institution is the same for both courts and prosecution, the answer should be YES at both questions 62 and 64 (Q80 and Q80-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

These questions do not regard the monitoring of data on performance of courts for purposes of court management.

Questions 72 and 73 (Questions 82 and 82-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The aim of these questions is to know whether dialogue regarding procedures for communication (of documents) between the courts and prosecution (Q72 (question 82 of the CEPEJ questionnaire)) or with lawyers (Q73 (question 82-1 of the CEPEJ questionnaire)) is possible (e.g. organisation, number and planning of hearings, on-call service for urgent cases) in general, and not in individual cases.

The questions concern the preliminary phase of setting up (mise en état) the file (e.g. communication and arrangements regarding the dealing with urgent cases, concentration of hearings, notification of attendance at hearings and administrative questions).

The comment should include information on this process or structure (e.g. does it concern formal and/or informal ways, is this communication nation-wide, local or ad hoc).

Questions 74, 75, 75-1, 78 and 79 (Questions 83, 83-1, 83-2, 83-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

These questions address only the quantitative targets to measure the individual work of each judge/prosecutor, participating in the work of the whole court/public prosecution services, e.g. a defined number of cases to be resolved per month or per year. The answer should be YES also in cases, where a more general assessment of the judge/prosecutor is possible, which includes elements such as qualitative indicators and/or other factors (e.g. conduct of the judge/prosecutor, other activities, specialisation and knowledge). If different targets are defined for judges/prosecutor (i.e. the assessment does not include performance targets), the answer here should be NO and the situation should be explained in questions 76/80 (Q114/Q120 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire).

Questions 76, 76-1, 79-1 and 80 (Questions 114 and 120 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Contrary to question 74 (Question 83 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire), individual assessments of the professional activities of judges and public prosecutors may involve qualitative aspects. They might have an influence on judges' and public prosecutors' careers and may have an impact on disciplinary issues. The answer to this question is interesting to make a relevant analysis of the answers to questions 236/245 and 238/247.

Such an evaluation does not seem to be in accordance with systems where judges or public prosecutors are elected.

Indicator 3.3 Electronic case management system and court activity statistics

Question 82-0

An IT strategy is an effective plan of intentions how to develop IT for the judiciary in future. It usually includes also an action plan, or it is accompanied by one. Planned actions can include development or implementation of only evolutionary changes of CMS, digitalization of new branches (e.g. digitalization of administrative procedures), or development and implementation of new software/tools.

Questions 82-1

The question refers to the time from the moment when the last significant changes the CMS were installed and operational. It does not refer to standard evolutions connected to the proper functioning of the CMS but only major changes with adding functionalities or upgrading of the system.

Questions 82-2

This question should confirm what might already be part of the IT strategy (in case strategy is closely followed) but provide clear statement if there will be changes expected in the CMS or other important system within judiciary in next year.

Questions 82 and 83 (Questions 63-1 and 63-1-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Case management system: this question relates to business-management software or a suite of integrated applications, Enterprise resource planning (ERP) system, the workflow used by courts to register and manage their cases. Case management system (CMS) is essential and this question deals with its deployment rate as well different connectivity and accessibility features of the system.

The deployment rate % could be interpreted as:

- 100% the system is deployed in all courts
- 50-99% the system is deployed in most of the courts (in all except some specialized courts for example)
- 10-49% the system is deployed in some courts (only appeal for example)
- 1-9% just starting to be deployed or in testing phase
- 0% (NAP) does not exist at all for this matter
- NA (information is not available)

Some precisions on the terms used:

Status of case online - this column requires to specify if the part of the CMS shows the status of the case online for the parties (e.g. dates of hearings) or the content of the case (documents of parties, decisions) etc.

Accessible to parties means that parties in case can access online and see the status of their case, scheduled hearings, documents etc.

Publication of decision refers to accessibility online of the decision directly from CMS.

Both (in case the both first options exist).

Not accessible at all - when the parties can not follow the status of their cases online at all, however it does not preclude the possibility for judges and court staff to access and work on the case in a CMS.

Centralised or interoperable database – on the assumption of cases storage in a database consolidated at national level (or if interoperable databases exist) for all courts, the answer to give will have to be “Yes”. If there is not a centralisation of data (for example, if the data are stored on a court server without any possibility of consolidation), the answer will then be “No”.

Early warning signals – it is a question of whether the software has a possibility of implementing warning signals in order to have a dynamic and proactive management of cases. For example, it can refer to warnings of times elapsed (estimated or current) in order to prevent inventories or the exceeding of predefined threshold (detection for example of cases for which the age exceeds certain relevant period (two years for example)), or automated reports, containing data on critical cases (e.g. warnings on oldest cases or cases without activity/ idle cases). You may indicate in comment if this is based entirely or partly on the guidelines of the CEPEJ SATURN Centre.

Status of integration/connection of a statistical tool with CMS: CMS is the main source of statistical data for analysis of the work of the courts. This column refers to the integration of the statistical module within CMS and its level of development.

Business intelligence refers to means, tools and methods allowing collecting, consolidating, modelling and presenting the data of an organisation. It aims at offering to the manager of this organisation an overview of the activity processed to help him/her take his/her decisions.

In that respect the categories foreseen include:

- **Fully integrated including BI** – fully integrated as a statistical module of CMS with sophisticated modelling and reporting including Business Intelligence (BI) module;
- **Integrated** - included as a module of the CMS with pre-defined reporting and ad hoc reporting possibilities but no BI;
- **Not integrated but connected** - separate statistical module but connected with CMS or statistical reporting importing data from CMS;
- **Not connected at all.**

Questions 84 and 85 (Questions 62-4 and 62-4-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The question requires a reply in case there is a centralised national database of court decisions so called case-law database and the reply should be “Yes” in case it exists in any electronic form for certain cases only or at some instances etc. The second part of the question deals with the details of this database.

Separate column is included for each instance for the deployment availability of the database of court decisions. This is to understand if this database includes all decisions rendered at all instances or only some decisions that are selected as relevant to be published in the case-law database.

Link to ECHR case law: if the decisions registered in the case-law database have hyperlinks which reference to the ECHR judgements in HUDOC database.

If the database of decided cases (case-law, etc.) is available in open data: According to the “CEPEJ European Ethical Charter on the use of artificial intelligence in judicial systems and their environment *“The term open data refers to making structured databases available for public download. These data can be inexpensively re-used subject to the terms of a specific licence, which can, in particular, stipulate or prohibit certain purposes of re-use. Open data should not be confused with unitary public information available on websites, where the entire database cannot be downloaded (for example, a database of court decisions). Open data do not replace the mandatory publication of specific administrative or judicial decisions or measures already laid down by certain laws or regulations. Lastly, there is sometimes confusion between data (strictly speaking open data) and their processing methods (machine learning, data science) for different purposes (search engines, assistance in drafting documents, analysis of trends of decisions, predicting court decisions, etc.)”* (<https://rm.coe.int/ethical-charter-en-for-publication-4-december-2018/16808f699c>).

You could also mention in comment of this question:

- if the publication of these decisions is preceded (or not) by an anonymization of the name of the parties, of witnesses and/or professionals (judges, prosecutors, lawyers, etc.);
- if the data published are processed by public or private operators (initiative);
- if the data published are processed with expert systems or artificial intelligence (for predictive justice for example);
- if “yes for some judgments”, what are the criteria for publication, if possible.

Indicator 4 (Access to justice – legal aid)

Indicator 4.1 (Number of cases for which legal aid has been granted)

Question 86 (question 20 of the CEPEJ questionnaire)

This question which concerns the number of cases should be linked to questions 12 and 13 (questions 12 and 12-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) regarding the budget allocated to legal aid. For **court cases**, this question requires counting the number of court cases in which legal aid has been granted and not the number of decisions to grant legal aid - it does not matter whether legal aid has been granted once or more in the frame of one case. For **cases outside court**, all decisions on granting legal aid in specific situation (e.g. legal advice, costs of ADR etc.) should be considered as one case. If this is not possible, the answer should be NA, and the number of individual decisions should be put in comment. When the same decision can concern several (court and outside court) cases, the answer for total should be NA.

Indicator 4.2 (Amount of legal aid)

Questions 87 and 88 (Questions 23-0 and 23 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

It is possible that legal aid is limited according to the economic situation of the applicant. The threshold below which the granting of the legal aid is possible may be different for partial or full legal aid.

If the threshold is the same for full and partial legal aid, and the decision depends on other criteria, the same figures should be entered under “full legal aid” and “partial legal aid” and the situation should be explained in the comments.

Please note that indicated figures should represent values per one person.

Please elaborate in the comment if any other eligibility criteria are taken into account for granting legal aid and provide any other clarification that could explain the data communicated. For example, it could be specified if the answer refers to a value per one person or conversely, to a couple / family level, and if the same or different criteria apply in cases where legal aid is requested for family law cases.

Indicator 4.3 (Timeframes for granting legal aid)

Question 88-1 (Question 20-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This question concerns timeframes for approving legal aid requests. It should be noted that duration of time should be measured in days from the initial request to the final approval. The answer should address two different aspects:

- **“Maximum duration prescribed in law/regulation”** – the duration should reflect timeframes envisaged in the relevant laws and regulations. If there are timeframes prescribed for each different stage of the procedure for granting legal aid, the answer should represent the sum of timeframes needed for different stages. If the rules set the minimum and maximum duration, only maximum envisaged values should be taken into account. In addition, the comment should specify in which legal instruments these timeframes are envisaged and explain if there are different timeframes set for different types of cases.
- **“Actual average duration”** – the answer in this part should reflect the actual state of play and not the legal requirements, meaning that the average time should be calculated based on the actual duration of time passed between initial requests and final approvals for all procedures for granting legal aid completed in the reference year.

Indicator 5 Appointment/recruitment/mandate of judges/prosecutors

Questions 89 to 130

This section should provide information on procedures and criteria for the first recruitment of judges and prosecutors.

There are few specific aspects that should be taken into consideration when answering questions within this section.

For the purposes of this section, Judicial academy should be understood as an institution responsible for training, but also has a role in appointment and recruitment procedure of future judges/prosecutors.

Furthermore, this section follows appointment/recruitment procedure from the beginning to the end, and it divides this process into three subsequent stages: Entry procedure, Selection procedure and Formal decision. At the end, it also examines details of the mandate of those who successfully complete the procedure (subsection Mandate). Therefore, the whole section is divided into four logical parts:

- A. Entry Procedure** - examines criteria, competent authorities and procedure for entering the process to become a judge or prosecutor. It collects detailed information on how candidates enter judicial academy or some other type of pre-selection for the recruitment procedure.
- B. Selection** - the second stage of the overall procedure. It focuses on criteria and competent authorities for the selection of judges/prosecutors from the list of candidates that successfully completed the entry procedure.
- C. Formal decision on appointment** - the last step in the process of appointment and recruitment. It examines competent authorities for formal appointment of judges/prosecutors.
- D. Mandate** - specific part of this section that deals with details of the probation period (if it exists in the system) and length of the appointment.

It is also very important to note that within the entry and selection procedure, this section differentiates two possible paths for becoming a judge or prosecutor depending on whether candidates for these positions had to graduate from Judicial Academy or not.

The first path follows the recruitment procedure through the Judicial Academy (“Via Judicial Academy”).

The second path scrutinizes the recruitment procedure of all other candidates that have not graduated from Judicial Academy (“Without Judicial Academy”). Primarily, this option is intended for “experienced professionals”, and therefore, it should include all legal professionals who qualify for the position of a judge/prosecutor on the basis of their years of experience and/or other criteria, not on the basis of graduating from Judicial Academy.

If Judicial Academy does not exist in the system, CEPEJ correspondent should provide answers for just one path – “Without Judicial Academy”; and select NAP for the other path.

If Judicial Academy exists in the system and only a graduate from Judicial Academy can become appointed judge/prosecutor, CEPEJ correspondent should select NAP for the path – “Without Judicial Academy”.

If the system provides a possibility to become a judge/prosecutor both for graduates and non-graduates of Judicial Academy, CEPEJ correspondent should provide answers under both options paying particular attention to the differences between these two paths.

If there are some specifics of your system that were not included in the questions and/or could not be visible from the answers to the questions, please explain them in the comment areas under respective questions.

Indicator 5.1 Recruitment

Question 89 (Question 110 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Competitive exam is a potential condition for entering into the judiciary which consists of a predefined, open competition. It could be a way of recruiting judges, either as an exclusive way, in combination or in parallel with other procedures which enable the recruiting of legal professionals with long term experience. This competition is different from the bar exam, which might be a prerequisite to apply for the competitive exam.

Experience and seniority may either be interpreted broadly (ex. jurists, lawyers, notaries, legal consultants, clerks and other occupations in the field of law) or narrowly (ex. positions in courts or public prosecution offices). The years of practice or holding a certain position might be relevant.

If different, parallel systems for recruitment exist, please briefly describe each as well as whether any system is prevailing.

A. Criteria for entry into the process to become a judge

Question 90

“Entry criteria” are general requirements that candidates need to fulfil to be shortlisted to participate in the exam to enter the Judicial Academy, or to be pre-selected for a procedure of recruitment to become a judge without Judicial Academy. The table in this question provides requirements that are most commonly met in different judicial systems. If there are some additional criteria in your system, you can select other and then specify them in the comment area. The meaning of the “Clean criminal record” might vary in different systems, and therefore, please provide more details in the comment area.

Question 91

“Authority competent during the entry selection procedure” is an institution in charge for evaluating and deciding which candidates fulfil entry criteria. This institution makes a list of eligible applicants to be selected in the subsequent selection procedure. Please note that term “executive” includes all institutions and bodies that belong to executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the entry procedure please select “other body” and provide explanation in the comment area.

Question 92

“Public call for candidates” means that there was an open call for the application published in media, websites, official gazette etc. available to general public and directed to all potential candidates.

Question 93

This question deals with transparency in the pre-selection process by examining whether the entry criteria are publicly available or not.

“Publicly available” entry criteria means that criteria for entering the competition were known before candidates applied and were published in a way that ensures easy access to the general public (for example, prescribed by the law or published in a vacancy notice).

If answer to this question is positive, please specify whether criteria are announced as part of the public call or announced separately. The option “Yes, announced separately” should be selected when entry criteria are not part of the public call but are published as a separate document. Situations in which criteria are published as part of some other publicly available legal document, such as law or by-law (e.g. Law on Judges, Rulebook on criteria for evaluation of candidates, etc.) should also be reported under this option.

The option “other” should be selected if none of the offered option is fully applicable to your system.

Question 94

This question deals with transparency in the pre-selection process by examining whether the list of pre-selected candidate is public or not. Please indicate if the list of pre-selected candidates is announced on the internet, available only to the applicants which participated in the process, or not available at all.

Question 95 and 96

This question examines if non-preselected candidates enjoy the right to an appeal. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on appeal in the following question. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. If you select court, please specify what kind of court in the comment (eg administrative court, court of general jurisdiction, Supreme court, constitutional court, etc). The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge, please select “other body” and provide explanation in the comment area.

B. Selection procedure for judges (after exam/interviews, etc.)

Question 97

The selection of judges is a process of deciding which individuals from the pool of pre-selected candidates are best suited for becoming judges and filling in the vacant positions. This question aims to explore which criteria are used to make such a decision by the competent authorities.

Results/score from Judicial Academy training – is a grade from Judicial Academy studies. It can be average grade from the studies, grade given on a final exam or similar grade that refers to the candidates’ performance from the studies. Additional testing for non-Academy graduates is a particular exam/test given to professionals who have not graduated from Judicial Academy and intended to examine their level of legal knowledge, skills, etc.

Duration of previous work experience – if competent authorities evaluate previous work experience in terms of its duration, please select this option. This might be the case when priority is, for example, given to the candidates who have more years of work experience.

Relevance of previous work experience – if competent authorities evaluate relevance of work experience, please select this option. This might be the case when authorities consider not only duration of work experience, but also analyse type of work which candidates performed in their previous positions (the nature of the work, the field of law which he practiced, etc.).

Age – select in case if life age is prescribed as a criterion for selection.

Interview evaluation – some systems set interviews with candidates as a mandatory or facultative requirement for the selection. If evaluation from these interviews is considered within selection procedure, please select this option.

Performance appraisal from previous employer(s) – this criterion refers to the situation when competent authorities obtain appraisals from previous employers, analyse them and take them into consideration when making decision on the selection. Performance appraisal includes different forms of grading, narrative reporting on employees’ performance and skills, as well as references on the candidates’ personal characteristics (for example, mentor’s evaluation of a candidate who has worked as a judge’s/public prosecutor’s assistant or trainee).

Automatic selection of each successful candidate from Judicial Academy or every pre-selected experienced candidate – please select this option if your system provides that all Judicial Academy graduates and/or pre-selected candidates automatically are selected to become judges. This option would mean that process was not divided into two separate stages of pre-selection and selection, but only one integrated process exists at the end of which all candidates are considered selected.

Other - If other criteria exist, please select this option and list them in the comment area. You should also provide more details on how these other criteria are used in the selection process.

Question 98

The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body/institution is in charge for the selection procedure in your system please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area. Please note that term "executive" includes all institutions and bodies that belong to the executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members, etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent.

C. Formal decision on appointment (including by Parliament)

Question 99

There are different systems of final appointment of judges. Some systems leave the final appointment within competencies of the judiciary, while others might involve bodies from legislative or executive branches of power. Please select provided options to best reflect your system.

The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the final appointment procedure, please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area.

Please note that term "executive" includes all institutions and bodies that belong to the executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the side comment which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent.

Question 100

In the process of making the final decision on appointment, the competent authority may have different competences. It is possible that this authority provides only a formal confirmation of the candidates proposed by the authority which makes selection (option 1). The second option ("Has a right to appoint some and reject some among the selected (proposed) candidates") should be selected in all situations in which this authority is competent to reject a candidate, irrespective of whether this body, at the same time, might select some other candidate from the list to fill the vacant post (for example there are two proposed candidates for one post) or leave the post unfilled (because only one candidate was proposed for that post). If this institution is also authorized to appoint other candidates that were not proposed by the authority which conducts selection process, please select the third option. If your system provides some other competences that are relevant for the final appointment, please explain them in the side comment area.

Question 101

This question provides information whether non-preselected candidates enjoy the right to appeal. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on appeal in the following question.

Question 102

Please select body/bodies competent to decide on appeal. The option "court" in this question refers to any court in which appeal should be decided, including court concerned, higher court, Supreme court or court competent for administrative cases. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the final appointment procedure in your system please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area.

Question 103

If your system prescribes evaluation of the integrity of new candidates, please describe both process and criteria used in order to explain how the competent authorities conduct such evaluation. The term "integrity" should be considered in line with CCJE Opinion No. 21 (2018) Preventing corruption among judges as well as GRECO Fourth Round reports on your country (available on www.coe.int/greco).

D. Mandate of judges

Questions 104 and 105 (Questions 121 and 122 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

A mandate for an undetermined period means that judges are appointed for 'life' (until their official age of retirement) and cannot be removed from office (unless severe disciplinary proceedings/sanctions against a judge are ordered, knowing that the most severe sanction is a dismissal). It is possible for judges to be appointed for life after a "probation period". If there is a probation period, after which judges are appointed for life, please answer "yes".

Question 106

Describe which authority is responsible to decide if the probation period (mentioned in the previous question) is successful or not. If you select executive power, please specify in the side comment which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if your system puts some other body in charge for the entry procedure please select "other body" and provide explanation in the side comment.

Question 107

In case there is possibility for the candidates to appeal (complain) when the probation is considered unsuccessful please answer "Yes".

Question 108 ([Question 125 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please select "NAP" if your answer to Question 104 (Question 121 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) is "yes".

Question 109 ([Question 125-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please select "NAP" if your answer to Question 104 (Question 121 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) is "yes".

If renewable, please explain how many times, under what conditions, etc.

Question 111 ([Question 116 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Competitive exam is a potential condition for becoming a public prosecutor which consists of a predefined, open competition. It could be a way of recruiting public prosecutors, either as an exclusive way, in combination or in parallel with other procedures which enable the recruiting of legal professionals with long term experience. This competition is different from the bar exam, which might be a prerequisite to apply for the competitive exam.

Experience and seniority may either be interpreted broadly (ex. jurists, lawyers, notaries, legal consultants, clerks and other occupations in the field of law) or narrowly (ex. positions in courts or public prosecution offices). The years of practice or holding a certain position might be relevant.

If different, parallel systems for recruitment exist, please briefly describe each as well as whether any system is prevailing.

A. Criteria for entry into the process to become a prosecutor

Question 112

"Entry criteria" are general requirements that candidates need to fulfil to be shortlisted to participate in the exam to enter the Judicial Academy, or to be pre-selected for a procedure of recruitment to become a public prosecutor without Judicial Academy. The table in this question provides requirements that are most commonly met in different judicial systems. If there are some additional criteria in your system, you can select other and then specify them in the comment area. The meaning of the "Clean criminal record" might vary in different systems, and therefore, please provide more details in the comment area.

Question 113

"Authority competent during entry selection procedure" is an institution in charge of evaluating and deciding which candidates fulfil entry criteria. This institution makes a list of eligible applicants to be selected in the subsequent selection procedure. Please note that term "executive" includes all institutions and bodies that belong to executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members, etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge in your system for the entry procedure please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area.

Question 114

“Public call for candidates” means that there was an open call for the application published for example in media, websites, official gazette etc. available to general public and directed to all potential candidates.

Question 115

This question deals with transparency in the pre-selection process and identifying whether the entry criteria are publicly available or not.

“Publicly available” entry criteria means that criteria for entering the competition were known before candidates applied and were published in a way that ensures easy access to the general public (for example, prescribed by the law or published in a vacancy notice).

If answer to this question is positive, please specify whether criteria are announced as part of the public call or announced separately. The option “Yes, announced separately” should be selected when entry criteria are not part of the public call but are published as a separate document. Situations in which criteria are published as part of some other publicly available legal document, such as law or by-law (e.g. Law on Public prosecutors, Rulebook on criteria for evaluation of candidates etc.) should also fall under this option.

The option “other” should be selected if none of the offered option is fully applicable to your system.

Question 116

This question deals with transparency in the pre-selection process by examining whether the list of pre-selected candidate is public or not. Please indicate if the list of pre-selected candidates is announced on the internet, available only to the applicants which participated in the process, or not available at all.

Question 117 and 118

This question examines if non-preselected candidates enjoy the right to an appeal. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on appeal in the following question. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge, please select “other body” and provide explanation in the comment area.

B. Selection procedure for prosecutors (after exam/interviews, etc.)

Question 119

The selection of public prosecutors is a process of deciding which individuals from the pool of pre-selected candidates are best suited for becoming public prosecutors and filling in the vacant positions. This question aims to explore which criteria are used to make such a decision by the competent authorities.

Results/score from Judicial Academy training – is a grade from Judicial Academy studies. It can be average grade from the studies, grade given on a final exam or similar grade that refers to the candidates’ performance from the studies. Additional testing for non-Academy graduates is a particular exam/test given to professionals who have not graduated from Judicial Academy and intended to examine their level of legal knowledge, skills, etc.

Duration of previous work experience – if competent authorities evaluate previous work experience in terms of its duration, please select this option. This might be the case when priority is, for example, given to the candidates who have more years of work experience.

Relevance of previous work experience – if competent authorities evaluate relevance of work experience, please select this option. This might be the case when authorities consider not only duration of work experience, but also analyse type of work which candidates performed in their previous positions (the nature of the work, the field of law which he practiced, etc.).

Age – select in case if life age is prescribed as a criterion for selection.

Interview evaluation – some systems set interviews with candidates as a mandatory or facultative requirement for the selection. If evaluation from these interviews is considered within selection procedure, please select this option.

Performance appraisal from previous employer(s) – this criterion refers to the situation when competent authorities obtain appraisals from previous employers, analyse them and take them into consideration when making decision on the selection. Performance appraisal includes different forms of grading, narrative reporting on employees' performance and skills, as well as references on the candidates' personal characteristics (for example, mentor's evaluation of a candidate who has worked as a judge's/public prosecutor's assistant or trainee).

Automatic selection of each successful candidate from Judicial Academy or every pre-selected experienced candidate – please select this option if your system provides that all Judicial Academy graduates and/or pre-selected candidates automatically are selected to become public prosecutors. This option would mean that process was not divided into two separate stages of pre-selection and selection, but only one integrated process exists at the end of which all candidates are considered selected.

Other - If other criteria exist, please select this option and list them in the comment area. You should also provide more details on how these other criteria are used in the selection process.

Question 120

The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the selection procedure in your system please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area. Please note that term "executive" includes all institutions and bodies that belong to the executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members, etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent.

C. Formal decision on appointment (including by Parliament)

Question 121

There are different systems of final appointment of public prosecutors. Some systems leave the final appointment within competencies of the judiciary, while others might involve bodies from legislative or executive branches of power. Please select provided options to best reflect your system.

The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the final appointment procedure, please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area.

Please note that term "executive" includes all institutions and bodies that belong to the executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the side comment which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent.

Question 121-1

In the process of making the final decision on appointment, the competent authority may have different competences. It is possible that this authority provides only a formal confirmation of the candidates proposed by the authority which makes selection (option 1). The second option ("Has a right to appoint some and reject some among the selected (proposed) candidates") should be selected in all situations in which this authority is competent to reject a candidate, irrespective of whether this body, at the same time, might select some other candidate from the list to fill the vacant post (for example there are two proposed candidates for one post) or leave the post unfilled (because only one candidate was proposed for that post). If this institution is also authorized to appoint other candidates that were not proposed by the authority which conducts selection process, please select the third option. If your system provides some other competences that are relevant for the final appointment, please explain them in the side comment area.

Question 122

This question provides information whether non-preselected candidates enjoy the right to appeal. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on appeal in the following question.

Question 123

Please select body/bodies competent to decide on appeal. The option "Court/prosecution office" in this question refers to any court/prosecution office in which appeal should be decided, including prosecution office concerned, higher prosecution office or the highest instance prosecution office, courts of general jurisdiction (including Supreme court) or court competent for administrative cases. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the final appointment procedure in your system please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area.

Question 124

If your system prescribes the evaluation of integrity of new candidates, please describe both process and criteria used in order to explain how the competent authorities conduct such evaluation. The term "integrity" should be considered in line with CCJE Opinion No. 21 (2018) Preventing corruption among public prosecutors as well as GRECO documents.

D. Mandate of prosecutors

Questions 125 and 126 ([Questions 123 and 124 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

A *mandate for an undetermined period* means that public prosecutors are appointed for 'life' (until their official age of retirement) and cannot be removed from office (unless severe disciplinary proceedings/sanctions against a public prosecutor are ordered, knowing that the most severe sanction is a dismissal). It is possible for public prosecutors to be appointed for life after a "probation period". If there is a probation period, after which public prosecutors are appointed for life, please answer "yes".

Question 127

Please select which authority is responsible to decide if the probation period (mentioned in the previous question) is successful or not. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if your system puts some other body in charge for the entry procedure please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area

Question 128

In case there is a possibility for the candidates to appeal (complain) when the probation is considered unsuccessful, please answer "Yes".

Question 129 ([Question 126 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please select "NAP" if your answer to Question 125 (Question 123 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) is "yes".

Question 130 ([Question 126-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please select "NAP" if your answer to Question 125 (Question 123 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) is "yes".

If renewable, please explain how many times, under what conditions, etc.

Indicator 6 Promotion

For judges

Question 132

In this question please select the institution that decides which judges will be promoted. Please note that term "executive" includes all the institutions and bodies that belong to executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members etc. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if your system puts some other body in charge for the entry procedure please select "other body" and provide explanation in the comment area

Questions 133 and 134 ([Questions 113 and 113-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Regarding the promotion criteria for judges, it is necessary to refer to Opinion No. 17 (2014) of the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE)² on the evaluation of judges' work, the quality of justice and respect for the judicial independence.

² <https://rm.coe.int/16807481ea>

Questions 135 and 136

Those questions examine if a decision on promotion can be appealed. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on appeal in the following question. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the entry procedure in your system please select “other body” and provide explanation in the comment area.

For prosecutors

Question 137

In this question please select the institution that decides which prosecutors will be promoted. Please note that term “executive” includes all the institutions and bodies that belong to executive power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members etc. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if your system puts some other body in charge for the procedure of promotion please select “other body” and provide explanation in the comment area.

Questions 140 and 141

Those questions examine if a decision on promotion can be appealed. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on appeal in the following question. If you select executive power, please specify in the comment area which particular body/institution of the executive power is competent. The list of institutions is not exhaustive, so if some other body is in charge for the entry procedure in your system please select “other body” and provide explanation in the comment area.

Indicator 7 Training

Indicator 7.1 Training

Question 142 ([Question 131-0 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

This question only concerns member states that have public bodies specifically entrusted with the training of judges and/or public prosecutors (schools, academies). The professions can be trained together (in a single institution) or separately. Training can be only initial, only continuous or both initial and continuous. Several institutions can therefore co-exist or one may offer all types of training.

The budgets to be indicated should only correspond to the single budget of those bodies, and not to the total public budget for the training of judges and prosecutors (in particular, if part of the training is provided by a University or private institutes or financed by the court/public prosecution services, for example). If the budget of the public training institution includes both public state budget and substantial donor support (ex. for member states in the process of EU integration), please indicate a total budget with the donor support and specify in the comment.

Questions 143 and 144 ([Questions 127 and 129 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

These questions aim to better understand the types of training offered to judges and public prosecutors. For example, initial training might be compulsory, or it may be optional. On the other hand, it is possible that training in certain categories is not at all organised within the judiciary of a country, in which case please choose the option “no training proposed”.

“Compulsory” training shall be understood as training set as a precondition/condition to perform certain judicial tasks. If a dual system exists (i.e. training is compulsory for certain categories of judges and not for others), please select the option which most accurately describes the system and give an explanation and/or exceptions within the general comments section.

In-service training for specialised judicial functions refers to training organised for judges for commercial or administrative matters, intellectual property law training for work in specialised departments for intellectual property matters, or training for public prosecutors for working on cases of organised crime etc.

“In-service training on ethics” should address standards and norms that prescribe how judges/prosecutors should behave in order to maintain independence and impartiality, as well as to avoid impropriety.

“In-service training on child-friendly justice” relates to all trainings aimed at raising judges’ and public prosecutors’ competences and knowledge to handle cases involving minors, including training on children’s rights and children’s

access to justice, as well as on how to convey child-friendly information to and communicate with children participating in proceedings, adapted to the age and maturity of the child.

Question 147 ([Question 131-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

This question aims to gather information on the quantity of trainings provided by all public institution(s) responsible for trainings within the reference year, counting both the number of training courses available (in-person and online) and the number of days of in-person training courses delivered.

The available courses should reflect different training programs that are offered by the institution(s).

“In person” training must be understood as with physical presence of both trainers and participants in the same room.

“Online” training courses must include all trainings that take place over the internet, irrespective of the format of the e-learning (it includes trainings via specifically designed platforms, downloadable lectures, courses where a trainer gives lecture via video-conference in real time etc).

Training courses which are designed to be in-person but which were delivered online (for example, via videoconference because of the pandemic) should be counted under the third column (*Online training courses available (e-learning)*). Trainings which are designed to be in-person but which were delivered sometimes in-person and sometimes online (for example due to the changing measures for fighting pandemic during the reference year) should be counted both under the first column (*Number of in-person training courses available*) and the third one (*Online training courses available (e-learning)*). If possible, please provide in the comment the number of those available trainings which are counted under both columns.

More generally, please provide as much information as possible in the comments to explain how the trainings were impacted by the pandemic (such as the number of trainings cancelled, if and how training courses designed originally to be in person were modified to be delivered online, etc.).

In the second column (Number of delivered in-person training courses in days) only training days in person, as defined above, should be counted. Regarding the number of online training courses in days, if you have these data available, please provide them in the comment.

A training day shall be understood as one working day. Please include also half-day trainings as half-days in your calculation. Therefore, if a training lasts for two half-days, please calculate as one.

If an in-person training course is organised more than once within the reference year on a particular subject, each course repetition should be counted. For example, situation where one training course which lasts 3 days was delivered 10 times during the reference year, should be reported as one training course in the first column and 30 days in the second.

If a training is organised for more than one category of participants (for example a joint training for judges and prosecutors), it should be counted under each concerned category of participants (as one training for judges and one training for prosecutors), but will still be counted as one training in the total. Consequently, in this question the total does not necessarily have to equal the sum of the sub-categories of participants (vertical consistency will not be required).

If other professionals in the field of justice are included in the training courses for judges and/or prosecutors, details of such trainings should be specified in the comments. In particular, please provide the topics and frequency of such trainings.

Q147-1. ([Question 131-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please apply the same interpretation as in Q147 (Q131-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) and count in the first column (Number of participants in in-person training courses) only participants to trainings organised with physical presence whereas you should count in the second column (Number of participants in online training courses (e-learning)) participants whom followed the trainings online.

In case the same person participated in several courses, please count each time he/she participated as one.

Question 148 and 149

In-service training includes various forms of trainings provided during the judges'/prosecutors' mandate. The term sanction should be understood in the broadest sense possible, such as a fine, loss in echelon, delay in the ability to apply for promotion, etc.

Compulsory training should be understood as a training that judges/prosecutors are mandatory required to attend by a law/regulation (for example mandatory training for adjudicating cases that involve minors in some countries).

Question 150

This question refers only to the compulsory trainings that were dedicated exclusively to the ethics, prevention of corruption and conflict of interest, even if a training addressed only one of these three areas. If the same training(s) included both judges and prosecutors as participants, please tick both boxes and provide explanation in the comment area.

Question 151

When expressing training sessions in days, please note that one-day should be counted as a regular working day. If one training is organised in two sessions in two days but in total it lasts less than a regular working day it should be considered as "Up to 1 day".

Question 152

The option "Only once" means once during their whole mandate.

"More than once on ad hoc basis" – this option should be selected if there is a rule requiring judges/prosecutors to attend more than once whenever the training is organized or whenever they are invited, and the training are organized on ad hoc basis.

"More than once on regular basis" - this option should be selected if there is a rule requiring judges/prosecutors to attend more than once and trainings are organized on a regular basis, meaning there is a plan/schedule of trainings given in advance or there is rule that these trainings have to be organized regularly in a specified period of time (for example 10 trainings a year).

Question 153 ([Question 59-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

In this question, please select the reply "Yes" if general trainings (initial or continuous) for prosecutors are available to address crimes relating to domestic violence on one side, and sexual violence on the other. Furthermore, if such trainings exist in your system and, they are specifically designed for minor victims, please select "Yes, specifically for minor victims". If both general trainings and specific ones for minors exist, please select both affirmative answers ("Yes" and "Yes, specifically for minor victims"). These answers will help evaluate how different judicial systems take these issues into account.

Indicator 7.2 Training in EU Law

Questions 154 and 155

For these two questions, please apply the relevant explanations from Q147 when replying the following columns: Number of in-person training courses available, Number of delivered in-person training courses in days, Number of online training courses (e-learning) available.

Furthermore, please apply the relevant explanations from Q147-1 when replying the following columns: Number of judges participating and Number of prosecutors participating.

Indicator 8 Accountability and processes affecting public trust

Indicator 8.1 Confidence and satisfaction of citizens with their justice system

Question 156 ([Question 37 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Non-execution of court decisions can refer for example to:

- a situation where the execution is delayed for very long and it is no longer of significance for the party or the substantial damages were taken due to delay,
- cases when execution is denied (for any reason) by the competent authority.

Questions 157, 158 and 159 ([Questions 40, 41 and 41-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

These questions refer to the existence of a procedure enabling every user of the justice system to complain about a fact that he/she thinks is contrary to the good functioning of the judicial system such as for example the excessive length of proceedings or the lack of impartiality of a judge or prosecutor or even the corruption of a judge, a public prosecutor or the court staff and public prosecution offices. If there are such situations known in your country (underlined in particular in the reports published by the Group of States against Corruption – GRECO), please specify.

Questions 158 and 159 (Questions 41 and 41-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) allow you to mention some aspects of this procedure: authority responsible for dealing with the complaint, the existence or not of a time limit for dealing with the complaint and finally the compensations amounts granted (in euros).

The comment can include information on the efficiency of this complaint (e.g. percentage of successful complaints) and other information e.g. other possible outcomes of the complaints, the procedure for compensation etc.

Please verify the consistency of your answer with that of question 156.

Question 160 ([Question 85 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

This question aims to provide information on procedures which allow guaranteeing for the court users that the principle of judges' impartiality is respected, in accordance with Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. If there is a procedure in place for challenging a judge when a party considers that the judge is not impartial, please provide the description of that procedure in the comment area. The comment should also include the references to the law(s)/regulation(s) which regulate the procedure, as well as explanation of which institutions are in charge of the procedure and what are their respective competences.

Question 161 ([Question 85-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please indicate the ratio between the total number of initiated recusal procedures and total number of recusals pronounced within the year of reference.

Question 162-0 ([Question 115 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

This question should provide information on the status of public prosecution, which may vary fundamentally from one member state to another.

Please select one of the offered answers which reflects the status of public prosecution services in your system:

“Has an independent status as a separate entity among state institutions” – public prosecution could not be considered a part of any of the three branches of power but represents a separate entity with full independence.

“Is part of the executive power but enjoys functional independence” – public prosecution is within the executive power but has some guarantees that ensure certain level of functional independence; please describe in the comment the extent and guarantees of this independence.

“Is part of the executive power (without functional independence)” – public prosecution is within the executive power without any guarantees of its functional independence.

“Is part of the judicial power but enjoys functional independence” - public prosecution is within the judicial power but has some guarantees that ensure a certain level of functional independence; please describe in the comment the extent and guarantees of this independence.

“Is part of the judicial power (without functional independence)” - public prosecution is a part of the judicial power without any guarantees of its functional independence.

“Is a mixed model” – all the systems that combine elements of at least two models mentioned above should select this option and explain its characteristics in the comment.

“Has other status” – if public prosecution has a status that cannot be described by any of the offered answers, please select this option and explain the system in the comment box.

In addition, if public prosecution enjoys certain level of independence, please provide more details in the comment and specify in particular objective guarantees of this independence. Furthermore, please explain if these guarantees are provided for by the Constitution, laws, or some other regulation.

For definitions, principles and terminology please refer to the CCPE Opinion No.9 (2014) on European norms and principles concerning prosecutors.³

Question 162 (Question 115-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This question aims to explore how public prosecutors are independent from influences in prosecuting individual cases. The question asks specifically if there is legislation or regulation to prevent these specific instructions.

Public prosecutors can be subject to instructions of general nature, to specific instructions on given cases or are not subject to any instructions.

If the government or other institution can issue general regulations but must not give directions in specific cases please specify “Yes” and explain in more detail the status.

Question 162-1 (Question 115-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Irrespective of the general norm that prevents specific instructions, some systems provide exceptions in the laws and regulations that envisage the possibility of their issuance. If this is the case, the answer “Yes” should be selected and the exceptions should be listed and explained in the comment.

Question 162-2.0 (Question 115-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Under this question, it should be indicated which authorities can issue specific instructions and multiple replies are possible. “Executive power” includes all individuals, institutions and bodies that belong to this branch of power, such as government, public administration, ministries, president of the state, other bodies and committees composed of executive power members etc.

Question 162-2 (Question 115-4 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Some systems specifically require that instructions when they exist, take the written form exclusively. Other systems allow oral instructions with or without written confirmation. Depending on the required form in the laws/regulations, the adequate reply should be selected. If no specific form is required, please select “Other” and explain in the comment.

Question 162-3 (Question 115-5 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

In order to understand better the nature and characteristics of the specific instructions, please select one or more different replies. “Issued seeking prior advice from the competent public prosecutor” should be selected if the instructions can be issued by an authority only after obtaining a written advice on the matter from a competent public prosecutor. “Mandatory” means that a prosecutor is not allowed to depart from the instruction or might be held responsible if he/she does. “Reasoned” refers to a situation where the authority has to explain its written instructions, especially when they deviate from the competent public prosecutor’s advices and to transmit them through the hierarchical channels. “Recorded in the case file” is an option that should be selected when the advice and the instructions become part of the file so that the other parties may take cognisance of it and make comments.

Question 162-4 (Question 115-6 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The frequency of the specific instructions might provide relevant information on their use in practice which might indicate the level of prosecutors’ independence in their work. “Exceptional” means that specific instructions generally do not exist in the system but are allowed and can be issued in rare situations. “Occasional” means that specific instructions exist in the system and are issued from time to time. “Frequent” means that specific instructions exist in the system and are issued often. “Systematic” means that specific instructions exist in the system and are issued regularly as part of the everyday work in processing cases.

Question 162-5 (Question 115-7 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

If prosecutors are allowed to oppose a specific instruction and report it to an independent body, please provide more details in the comment by specifying what is the body in charge for such reports and what are its competences. Furthermore, it should be described what are the conditions that have to be fulfilled for a prosecutor to oppose/report specific instruction.

Question 163 (Question 31 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

³ <https://rm.coe.int/168074738b>

This question aims to learn how states protect the groups of people who are particularly vulnerable in judicial proceedings.

It does not concern the police investigation phase of the procedure nor compensation mechanisms for the victims of criminal offences.

Definitions of different categories of offences (sexual violence/rape, terrorism, domestic violence etc.), should be in accordance with national legislation of each state.

Ethnic minorities must be addressed in line with the Council of Europe's framework convention for the protection of national minorities (CETS N° 157). It does not concern foreigners involved in a judicial procedure. Special measures for these groups can be, for instance: language assistance during court proceedings or special measures to protect the right to a fair trial and to avoid discrimination.

Persons with disabilities must be addressed in line with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol ([A/RES/61/106](#)) which was adopted on 13 December 2006.

Information mechanisms might include, for instance:

- a public, free of charge and personalised information mechanism, operated by the police or the justice system, which enables the victims of criminal offences to get information on the follow-up to the complaints they have launched;
- the obligation to inform beforehand the victim of sexual violence/rape, in case of the release of the offender;
- the obligation of the judge to inform the victims of all his/her rights.

Special arrangements in court hearings might include, for instance,

- the possibility for a minor to have his/her first declaration recorded so that he/she does not have to repeat it in further steps of the proceedings;
- live audio or videoconferencing of the hearing of a vulnerable person so he/she is not obliged to appear before the accused;
- in camera hearing, excluding the public, of a victim of sexual violence/rape;
- the obligation (or the right to request) that statements of a vulnerable person (e.g. minor) are made in the presence of a probation counsellor;
- the testimony of minors under 16 cannot be received under oath.

The *other specific modalities* can consist in, for instance,

- the possibility of an *in camera* proceeding, excluding the public;
- the language assistance during a court proceeding for ethnic minorities or disabled persons;
- the obligation to hear the opinion of an association protecting the interest of a minor accused of a crime;
- the right for a woman who is a victim of family violence to enjoy the use of the common house;
- the physical protection during the time of the judicial proceeding;
- the right of an association protecting and defending the interest of a group of vulnerable person to exercise the civil rights granted to the plaintiff;
- the prohibition on publishing personal details and photographs of minor defendants and witnesses.

Indicator 8.2 Promotion of integrity and prevention of corruption

Terms in this section should be in line with CCJE Opinion No.21 (2018) Preventing corruption among judges and GRECO Fourth Round Evaluation Reports

The Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) works following evaluation rounds, each dealing with different aspects of the prevention and the fight against corruption. GRECO's Fourth Evaluation Round is dedicated to prevention of corruption among members of parliament, judges and prosecutors and is therefore relevant for this CEPEJ questionnaire in parts that concern judges and prosecutors. Each GRECO member state received a tailor-made set of recommendations in GRECO's Evaluation Report. All the beneficiaries of this project received these recommendations too, except Kosovo which is not a member of GRECO. The level of implementation by the country with each individual recommendation (fully, partly or not implemented) is then assessed in a series of compliance reports, adopted by GRECO at regular intervals until the country has reached an acceptable global level of implementation. The compliance procedure is then closed for that evaluation round. Compliance procedures are currently on-going for all beneficiary countries and GRECO's evaluation and compliance reports should be taken into account when answering relevant questions of this questionnaire. All adopted and public reports are available at

[www.coe.int/greco](https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/structure/member-and-observers). The list of GRECO country representatives which may be contacted for more detailed information is available at <https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/structure/member-and-observers>.

Question 164

Guarantees of the independence of judges might be found in different laws/regulations. Their position in the hierarchy of legal norms vary from system to system. Please indicate where these provisions are prescribed in your legal system. You may select one or more options.

Constitution is the highest law in a state.

Special law refers to the laws that govern status of judges, such as special law on judges or sometimes law on judicial councils.

Bylaws should be understood as different rules and regulations that are positioned below the laws in hierarchy of norms.

Question 166

Guarantees of the independence of prosecutors might be found in different laws/regulations. Their position in the hierarchy of legal norms vary from system to system. Please indicate where these provisions are prescribed in your legal system. You may select one or more options.

Constitution is the highest law in a state.

Special law refers to the laws that govern status of judges, such as special law on judges or sometimes law on judicial councils.

Bylaws should be understood as different rules and regulations that are positioned below the laws in hierarchy of norms.

Question 168, 169 and 170

Breaches of integrity should be understood in a broader sense and capture all infringements of criminal and disciplinary rules. The questions refer to the infringements committed both in professional capacity and private life of judges/prosecutors. All sanctions prescribed in the system should be provided irrespective of where they have been envisaged.

Question 171

This question focuses only on criminal cases related to the breaches of integrity (such as receiving a bribe or abuse of position). The disciplinary cases concerning breaches of integrity should be addressed in questions 236/237 and 246/247.

Number of sanctions pronounced should include all convictions – courts' decisions by which a defendant was found guilty.

For the purpose of this question, the following definitions should be used:

INITIATED CASE is a case received by an authority competent for conducting proceedings and pronouncing a sanction (e.g. High Judicial Council, disciplinary committee for judges or similar body). Only first instance cases submitted for the first time should be counted. A case is considered initiated at the moment of submitting a case to the first instance competent authority (a preliminary or investigative procedure where another authority receives notices, gathers evidence and/or decides to submit the case to the competent authority or not, should not be counted).

COMPLETED CASE should include all the procedures which have come to an end, either through a judgment, disciplinary decision or through any other decision which ended the procedure. Only final decisions (legal remedies have not been used or have been exhausted) should be considered.

Question 172

Code of ethics should be understood as a set of rules based on moral principles and accepted values that regulate conduct for judges/prosecutors in both professional capacity and private life.

Question 172-0

Measures to prevent corruption are all the measures and tools that are put in place to prevent corruption risk in the judiciary. Measures of prevention can include drawing a risk map, strengthening the internal control function, implementing mandatory staff rotation, establishing safe complaints mechanisms (e.g. whistleblowing), adopting codes of conducts, defining specific policies and rules regarding gifts.

Questions 176 to 181 ([Questions 138 to 138-5 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

These questions related to institutions / bodies giving opinions on ethical questions of the conduct of judges / public prosecutors aim to explore in more detail the institutional capacities of member states to deal with issues of ethics within the judiciary.

Such a body might be, for example, a separate institution, High Judicial Council or a commission within this institution, or it may take some other form. Such a body may be addressed regarding contentious ethical issues, and it might render opinions of various strengths.

The opinions of these bodies may be considered publicly available if they are published on a website, circulated among judges and public prosecutors, published in the “official gazette” or journal, etc.

Question 182

Please describe all available mechanisms to report attempts on influence/corruption on judges and prosecutors, opened to judges and prosecutors themselves and/or to lawyers, parties, court users, court employees, general public and so on.

Question 183

In this question, the term transparency refers to the method used for distribution of court cases that is set in advance and known to parties, attorneys and general public.

Question 184

Automatic allocation - there is a predefined list of judges and cases are distributed one by one following the order on the list.

Random allocation - cases are distributed randomly by computer algorithm.

Specific allocation for priority cases – please select this option if there are rules particularly envisaged for allocation of priority cases (e.g. cases involving detention, cases involving minors etc.) as an exception to the general method of allocation.

Possibility to exclude a judge from the allocation – there are different situations that could exclude a judge from the allocation of cases (such as large workload, absence from work, recusal etc.); if such specific possibility is prescribed in your system, please select this option and provide details.

All interventions in the system irreversibly logged/registered – to ensure respect for the rules and transparency in distribution of cases, some judiciaries require that any alterations in the established system for allocation of cases are registered (in case management system or different registries). Please select this option if your system envisages such possibility.

Question 186

Please select “Yes” if reasoned decision of any form is required to reassign case in your system.

Question 189

This question aims at examining the level of implementation of the recommendations given by GRECO to the country concerned in its Evaluation report within the framework of the 4th cycle of evaluation concerning the prevention of corruption. Although this GRECO evaluation relates to members of parliament, judges and prosecutors, for the purposes of this questionnaire, the answer should be limited only to the points concerning judges and prosecutors.

It is important to note that this question should be answered by the CEPEJ/GRECO staff, not the CEPEJ correspondents.

Indicator 8.3 Declaration of assets

Terms in this section should be in line with CCJE Opinion No.21 (2018) Preventing corruption among judges and GRECO Fourth Round Evaluation Reports

The Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) works following evaluation rounds, each dealing with different aspects of the prevention and the fight against corruption. GRECO's Fourth Evaluation Round is dedicated to prevention of corruption among members of parliament, judges and prosecutors and is therefore relevant for this CEPEJ questionnaire in parts that concern judges and prosecutors. Each GRECO member state received a tailor-made set of recommendations in GRECO's Evaluation Report. All the beneficiaries of this project received these recommendations too, except Kosovo which is not a member of GRECO. The level of implementation by the country with each individual recommendation (fully, partly or not implemented) is then assessed in a series of compliance reports, adopted by GRECO at regular intervals until the country has reached an acceptable global level of implementation. The compliance procedure is then closed for that evaluation round. Compliance procedures are currently on-going for all beneficiary countries and GRECO's evaluation and compliance reports should be taken into account when answering relevant questions of this questionnaire. All adopted and public reports are available at www.coe.int/greco. The list of GRECO country representatives which may be contacted for more detailed information is available at <https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/structure/member-and-observers>.

For judges

Question 190

Declaration of assets as a mandatory duty for all judges/prosecutors is a common practice in some judiciaries, and it is envisaged as an anti-corruptive mechanism.

The offered list of laws and regulations under this question refers to some of the common possibilities encountered in different judiciary systems. The list is not exhaustive, so if your system prescribes obligation to declare assets in some other laws or regulations, please select "other" and specify in the comment area.

Question 192

Many systems provide a predefined form for declaration of assets that should be filled in by judges and submitted to a competent authority. If this is the case, please attach the form.

Question 193

assets– the judges/prosecutors report on their properties (including real estates, vehicles, boats etc.).

financial interests - such as savings, equity, stocks, stock options, bonds, notes, intellectual property rights and the like.

sources of income – this includes salaries but also income generated from properties, such as renting out real estate, income from investments or income generated from intellectual property rights etc.

liabilities – this includes loans, debts etc.

gifts – presents above certain value received by judges/prosecutors.

others – please specify in the side comment area if there are other items that should be declared. This may include accessory activities (e.g. consultancy) in the public or private sector, remunerated or not, offers and agreements for any such future activities, or any other interest of relationship that may or does create a conflict of interest.

Question 194

The duty to declare assets might apply at the beginning and at the end of the term of office. Some systems also envisage an obligation for a judge/prosecutor to declare any significant changes in their reported assets, such as declaration of purchasing a new real estate. If your system requires annual declarations, please specify under "other".

Question 195

Many systems require judges/prosecutors to declare the assets of their family members and precisely define the circle of the family members that fall under the scope of this norm.

Question 196

This question aims to examine if the same rules for declaration of assets apply to judges' family members in terms of items to be declared, moment of declaration etc.

Question 201

"Other criminal sanction" includes all sanctions pronounced, including those in misdemeanour proceedings.

For Prosecutors

Questions 202 and 215

For the purpose of those questions, the following definitions should be used:

INITIATED CASE is a case received by an authority competent for conducting proceedings and pronouncing a sanction (e.g. High Judicial Council, disciplinary committee for judges or similar body). Only first instance cases submitted for the first time should be counted. A case is considered initiated at the moment of submitting a case to the first instance competent authority (a preliminary or investigative procedure where another authority receives notices, gathers evidence and/or decides to submit the case to the competent authority or not, should not be counted).

COMPLETED CASE should include all the procedures which have come to an end, either through a judgment, disciplinary decision or through any other decision which ended the procedure. Only final decisions (legal remedies have not been used or have been exhausted) should be considered.

Question 203

Declaration of assets as a mandatory duty for all judges/prosecutors is a common practice in some judiciaries, and it is envisaged as an anti-corruptive mechanism.

The offered list of laws and regulations under this question refers to some of the common possibilities encountered in different judiciary systems. The list is not exhaustive, so if your system prescribes obligation to declare assets in some other laws or regulations, please select "other" and specify in the comment area.

Question 205

Many systems provide a predefined form for declaration of assets that should be filled in by prosecutors and submitted to a competent authority. If this is the case, please attach the form.

Question 206

assets– the judges/prosecutors report on their properties (including real estates, vehicles, boats etc.).

financial interests - such as savings, equity, stocks, stock options, bonds, notes, intellectual property rights and the like.

sources of income – this includes salaries but also income generated from properties, such as renting out real estate, income from investments or income generated from intellectual property rights etc.

liabilities – this includes loans, debts etc.

gifts – presents above certain value received by judges/prosecutors.

others – please specify in the side comment area if there are other items that should be declared. This may include accessory activities (e.g. consultancy) in the public or private sector, remunerated or not, offers and agreements for any such future activities, or any other interest of relationship that may or does create a conflict of interest.

Question 207

The duty to declare assets might apply at the beginning and at the end of the term of office. Some systems also envisage an obligation for a judge/prosecutor to declare any significant changes in their reported assets, such as declaration of purchasing a new real estate. If your system requires annual declarations, please specify under "other".

Question 208

Many systems require judges/prosecutors to declare the assets of their family members and precisely define the circle of the family members that fall under the scope of this norm.

Question 209

This question aims to examine if the same rules for declaration of assets apply to public prosecutors' family members in terms of items to be declared, moment of declaration etc.

Question 214

"Other criminal sanction" includes all sanctions pronounced, including those in misdemeanour proceedings.

Indicator 8.4 Conflict of interests

Terms in this section should be in line with CCJE Opinion No.21 (2018) Preventing corruption among judges and GRECO Fourth Round Evaluation Reports

The Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) works following evaluation rounds, each dealing with different aspects of the prevention and the fight against corruption. GRECO's Fourth Evaluation Round is dedicated to prevention of corruption among members of parliament, judges and prosecutors and is therefore relevant for this CEPEJ questionnaire in parts that concern judges and prosecutors. Each GRECO member state received a tailor-made set of recommendations in GRECO's Evaluation Report. All the beneficiaries of this project received these recommendations too, except Kosovo which is not a member of GRECO. The level of implementation by the country with each individual recommendation (fully, partly or not implemented) is then assessed in a series of compliance reports, adopted by GRECO at regular intervals until the country has reached an acceptable global level of implementation. The compliance procedure is then closed for that evaluation round. Compliance procedures are currently on-going for all beneficiary countries and GRECO's evaluation and compliance reports should be taken into account when answering relevant questions of this questionnaire. All adopted and public reports are available at www.coe.int/greco. The list of GRECO country representatives which may be contacted for more detailed information is available at <https://www.coe.int/en/web/greco/structure/member-and-observers>.

For judges

Question 216

When answering this question, please try to provide the full picture in the area of conflicts of interests by capturing all the relevant norms from different law(s)/regulation(s) that concern conflict of interests. The conflict of interest should be understood as any situation in which the official has an interest that affects or may affect the impartial exercise of his public powers or official duties.

Question 217

Any acceptance of a gift by a judge in relation to the performance of his/her judicial duties is likely to give rise to a perception of undue influence. This is why most member states have rules, for example, on the acceptance of gifts and other benefits by judges (and other public officials) within the exercise of their profession. Low (objective) value thresholds, on the one hand, and the definition of what is acceptable hospitality, on the other, can give the judges clear and understandable guidance, especially when combined with recommendations on how to proceed when an improper gift has been given. CCJE Opinion No.21 (2018) Preventing corruption among judges. Conflicts of interest may also occur due to other reasons, such as the exercise of accessory activities, links with a party to a case etc.

Question 218 (Question 135 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Teaching includes for instance practising as a University professor, participating in conferences, participating in educational activities in schools, etc.

Research and publication include, for instance, publishing articles in newspapers, scientific and legal journals, on-line blogs, etc. Participating in working groups for drafting of legal norms should also be understood within this category.

Cultural function includes, for instance, performing in concerts and theatre plays, selling his/her own paintings, etc.

Question 219

The specific nature of the judicial function and the need to maintain the dignity of the office and protect judges from all kinds of pressures mean that judges should behave in such way as to avoid conflicts of interest or abuses of power. This requires judges to refrain from any professional activity that might divert them from their judicial responsibilities or cause them to exercise those responsibilities in a partial manner. In some states, incompatibilities with the function of judge are clearly defined by the judges' statute and members of the judiciary are forbidden from carrying out any professional or paid activity. Exceptions are made for educational, research, scientific, literary or artistic activities (CCJE Opinion No.3 (2002) on the principles and rules governing judges' professional conduct, in particular ethics, incompatible behaviour and impartiality).

Furthermore, some systems require judges to ask for an authorisation to perform these accessory activities. If judges have such obligation in your system, please select yes. If the duty to ask for an authorisation exists only in relation to some accessory activities, and not for all of them, please select yes and specify details in the comment area.

Question 221

Judges might not be required to obtain prior authorisation to exercise an accessory activity, but they might be obliged to inform the hierarchy of the court, the High Judicial Council or another authority about these activities. In this way, the competent authorities will be enabled to keep track of possible risks to the conflicts of interest.

Question 222 and Question 223

Given the variety of possible conflicts of interests, procedures for sanctioning breaches, as well as prescribed sanctions may be found in several laws. For examples, procedure/sanctions for failing to recuse oneself may be found in the criminal or civil procedure codes, procedure/sanction for failure to declare a conflict of interest in the law on the prevention of conflicts of interest, procedure/sanction for unauthorised exercise of an accessory activity in the code of ethics or the law on judges etc.

law on the prevention of conflict of interests – a special law that regulates only conflicts of interests and envisages procedure/sanctions for violations of those rules

criminal procedure code – the procedure/sanctions is regulated by the criminal procedure code

civil procedure code – the procedure/sanctions is regulated by the civil procedure code

code of ethics – some violations of the rules that regulate conflicts of interests might be sanctioned under code of ethics that also provide a special procedure for those cases

law on judges – the laws which regulate status of judges sometimes also envisage procedure/sanctions for judges in cases of conflicts of interests

law on the High Judicial Council – the law which regulates status and competences of the High Judicial Council might also provide procedure/sanctions for judges in cases of conflicts of interests

other, please specify – if some other legal document prescribes rules of procedure/sanctions for judges in cases of conflict of interests please select this option.

Question 224

This question refers only to number of disciplinary, misdemeanour and criminal cases initiated/completed/sanctions pronounced against judges in a reference year. The number of procedures for recusal of an acting judge within civil or criminal proceedings should not be included under this question.

For the purpose of this question, the following definitions should be used:

INITIATED CASE is a case received by an authority competent for conducting proceedings and pronouncing a sanction (e.g. High Judicial Council, disciplinary committee for judges or similar body). Only first instance cases submitted for the first time should be counted. A case is considered initiated at the moment of submitting a case to the first instance competent authority (a preliminary or investigative procedure where another authority receives notices, gathers evidence and/or decides to submit the case to the competent authority or not, should not be counted).

COMPLETED CASE should include all the procedures which have come to an end, either through a judgment, disciplinary decision or through any other decision which ended the procedure. Only final decisions (legal remedies have not been used or have been exhausted) should be considered.

For prosecutors

Questions 225 - 233

All explanatory notes referring to the conflict of interest in the section for judges apply *mutatis mutandis* in this section.

Question 225

When answering this question, please try to provide the full picture in the area of conflicts of interests by capturing all the relevant norms from different law(s)/regulation(s) that concern conflict of interests. The conflict of interest should be understood as any situation in which the official has an interest that affects or may affect the impartial exercise of his public powers or official duties.

Question 227 (Question 137 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Teaching includes for instance practising as a University professor, participating in conferences, participating in educational activities in schools, etc.

Research and publication include, for instance, publishing articles in newspapers, scientific and legal journals, on-line blogs, etc. Participating in working groups for drafting of legal norms should also be understood within this category.

Cultural function includes, for instance, performing in concerts and theatre plays, selling his/her own paintings, etc.

Question 228

Some systems require public prosecutors to ask for an authorisation to perform these accessory activities. If public prosecutors have such obligation in your system, please select yes. If the duty to ask for an authorisation exists only in relation to some accessory activities, and not for all of them, please select yes and specify details in the comment area.

Question 231

Public prosecutors might not be required to obtain prior authorisation to exercise an accessory activity, but they might be obliged to inform the hierarchy in the public prosecution, the High Judicial/Prosecutorial Council or another authority about these activities. In this way, the competent authorities will be enabled to keep track of possible risks to the conflicts of interest.

Question 231 and 232

Given the variety of possible conflicts of interests, procedures for sanctioning breaches, as well as prescribed sanctions, may be found in several laws. For examples, procedure/sanctions for failing to recuse oneself may be found in the criminal or civil procedure codes, procedure/sanction for failure to declare a conflict of interest in the law on the prevention of conflicts of interest, procedure/sanction for unauthorised exercise of an accessory activity in the code of ethics or the law on public prosecutors/public prosecution etc.

law on the prevention of conflict of interests – a special law that regulates only conflicts of interests and envisages procedure/sanctions for violations of those rules

criminal procedure code – the procedure/sanctions is regulated by the criminal procedure code

civil procedure code – the procedure/sanctions is regulated by the criminal procedure code

code of ethics – some violations of the rules that regulate conflicts of interests might be sanctioned under code of ethics that also provide a special procedure for those cases

law on public prosecutors/public prosecution – the laws which regulate status of prosecutors sometimes also envisage procedure/sanctions for prosecutors in cases of conflicts of interests

law on the High Judicial/Prosecutorial Council – the law which regulates status and competences of the High Judicial Council might also provide procedure/sanctions for prosecutors in cases of conflicts of interests

other, please specify – if some other legal document prescribes rules of procedure/sanctions for prosecutors in cases of conflict of interests please select this option.

Question 234 (Question 140 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The body “authorised to initiate disciplinary proceedings” is the one that formally starts disciplinary proceedings by submitting an act to the authority in charge to decide on a disciplinary case. The act starting a proceeding could be a disciplinary lawsuit, disciplinary indictment or similar act. In some systems this can be a separate, autonomous body such as disciplinary prosecutor (not to be confused with public prosecutors in criminal proceedings), disciplinary office, disciplinary inspector and similar.

An “ombudsman” (also known as “ombudsperson”, “ombud”, or “public advocate”) is an official who is charged with representing the interests of the public by investigating and addressing complaints of maladministration or a violation of rights. The ombudsman is usually appointed by the government or by parliament, but with a significant degree of independence. In some countries an “inspector general”, “citizen advocate” or other official may have duties similar to those of a national ombudsman and may also be appointed by the parliament.

Questions 235 (Question 142 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

“Disciplinary power” in this question should be understood as a power to sanction judges for violating disciplinary rules.

In case “Disciplinary court or body” is within the “High Judicial Council”, and therefore it is not clear which reply should be given, please select “High Judicial Council” if the disciplinary court or body is composed exclusively from all or some members of the Council. If the disciplinary court or body is composed from members of the “High Judicial Council” and other members, please select “Disciplinary court or body”.

Question 236

When disciplinary proceeding is initiated, a judge may be authorized to present an argumentation to defend him/herself. A judge may have a possibility to present his/her argument in oral hearing and/or in written submission. Depending on the rules of disciplinary procedure, one or both of these options should be selected.

If the rules of disciplinary procedure do not provide the possibility for a judge to present an argument, please select “none”

Questions 237, 238 and 239 (Question 239 corresponds to Question 145 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

These questions, which appear as tables, specify the number of disciplinary proceedings against judges that are initiated (question 237), number of disciplinary cases completed (question 238) and number of the sanctions actually pronounced against judges (question 239). If a significant difference between those figures exists in your country and if you are aware of the reasons, please specify.

Initiated case is a case received by an authority competent for conducting proceedings and pronouncing a sanction (e.g. High Judicial Council, disciplinary court, disciplinary committee for judges or similar body). Only first instance cases submitted for the first time should be counted. A case is considered initiated at the moment of submitting a case to the first instance competent authority (a preliminary or investigative procedure where another authority receives notices, gathers evidence and/or decides to submit the case to the competent authority or not), should not be counted.

Breach of professional ethics (including breach of integrity), professional inadequacy (e.g. systematic slowness in delivering decisions), *criminal offence* (offence committed in the private or professional framework) refer to cases in which disciplinary proceedings are conducted either before, during or after criminal proceedings for the same facts. Please complete the list where appropriate. The same applies to the type of possible sanctions (e.g. *reprimand, suspension, fine, withdrawal of a case, transfer of the file to another court or department, temporary reduction of salary, position downgrade, resignation, dismissal etc.*). Please note that disciplinary proceedings related to the breaches of integrity (such as breaches of the rules on conflict of interest, accessory activities, partiality, nepotism, tampering with the case allocation system etc.) should be included in the first category *Breach of professional ethics*.

If the disciplinary proceedings are undertaken because of several mistakes, please count the proceedings only once and for the main mistake.

Specific comments could in particular be developed, where appropriate, as regards the procedures initiated and the sanctions pronounced in the case of corruption of judges and public prosecutors, namely by taking into account the reports by the Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) and possibly by *Transparency International*.

Question 237-1

“Professional inadequacy” is envisaged as one of the reasons for initiating disciplinary proceedings in some systems. Which behaviours fall into this category depends on the actual definition of this term in a judicial system and developed practice of its disciplinary bodies. For that reason, the scope of this notion varies in different judiciaries, therefore CEPEJ correspondents are asked to provide more information on this particular category of offences.

Questions 240 and Question 241

Question 240 tries to examine if judges enjoy the right to appeal disciplinary decision. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on the appeal in the following question.

Question 242 ([Question 121-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

This question aims to better understand the status of judges in different member states by identifying the reasons for transferring a judge without their consent as well as the procedural guarantees in place.

Description of the disciplinary procedure against prosecutors:

Question 243 ([Question 141 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The body “authorised to initiate disciplinary proceedings” is the one that formally starts disciplinary proceedings by submitting an act to the authority in charge to decide on a disciplinary case. The act starting a proceeding could be a disciplinary lawsuit, disciplinary indictment or similar act. In some systems this can be a separate, autonomous body such as disciplinary prosecutor (not to be confused with public prosecutors in criminal proceedings), disciplinary office, disciplinary inspector and similar.

An “ombudsman” (also known as “ombudsperson”, “ombud”, or “public advocate”) is an official who is charged with representing the interests of the public by investigating and addressing complaints of maladministration or a violation of rights. The ombudsman is usually appointed by the government or by parliament, but with a significant degree of independence. In some countries an “inspector general”, “citizen advocate” or other official may have duties similar to those of a national ombudsman and may also be appointed by the parliament.

Questions 244 ([Question 143 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

“Disciplinary power” in this question should be understood as a power to sanction prosecutors for violating disciplinary rules.

In case “Disciplinary court or body” is within the “Public prosecutorial Council”/ “High Judicial Council”, and therefore it is not clear which reply should be given, please select “Public prosecutorial Council”/ “High Judicial Council” if the disciplinary court or body is composed exclusively from all or some members of the Council. If the disciplinary court or body is composed from members of the “Public prosecutorial Council”/ “High Judicial Council” and other members, please select “Disciplinary court or body”.

Question 245

When disciplinary proceedings are initiated, a prosecutor may be authorized to present an argumentation to defend him/herself. A prosecutor may have a possibility to present his/her argument in oral hearing and/or in written submission. Depending on the rules of disciplinary procedure, one or both of these options should be selected.

If the rules of disciplinary procedure do not provide the possibility for a prosecutor to present an argument, please select “none”

Questions 246, 247 and 248 ([Question 248 corresponds to Question 145 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

These questions, which appear as tables, specify the number of disciplinary proceedings against public prosecutors that are initiated (question 246), number of disciplinary cases completed (question 247) and number of the sanctions actually pronounced against public prosecutors (question 248). If a significant difference between those figures exists in your country and if you are aware of the reasons, please specify.

Initiated case is a case received by an authority competent for conducting proceedings and pronouncing a sanction (e.g. High Judicial Council, disciplinary court, disciplinary committee for judges or similar body). Only first instance cases submitted for the first time should be counted. A case is considered initiated at the moment of submitting a case to the first instance competent authority (a preliminary or investigative procedure where another authority

receives notices, gathers evidence and/or decides to submit the case to the competent authority or not), should not be counted.

Breach of professional ethics (including breach of integrity), professional inadequacy (e.g. systematic slowness in conducting procedural actions), *criminal offence* (offence committed in the private or professional framework) refer cases in which disciplinary proceedings are conducted either before, during or after criminal proceedings for the same facts. Please complete the list where appropriate. The same applies to the type of possible sanctions (e.g. *reprimand, suspension, fine, withdrawal of a case, transfer of the file to another court or department, temporary reduction of salary, position downgrade, resignation, dismissal etc.*). Please note that disciplinary proceedings related to the breaches of integrity (such as breaches of the rules on conflict of interest, accessory activities, partiality, nepotism, tampering with the case allocation system etc.) should be included in the first category *Breach of professional ethics*.

If the disciplinary proceedings are undertaken because of several mistakes, please count the proceedings only once and for the main mistake.

Question 246-1

“Professional inadequacy” is envisaged as one of the reasons for initiating disciplinary proceedings in some systems. Which behaviours fall into this category depends on the actual definition of this term in a judicial system and developed practice of its disciplinary bodies. For that reason, the scope of this notion varies in different judiciaries, therefore CEPEJ correspondents are asked to provide more information on this particular category of offences.

Question 250 and 251

Question 250 tries to examine if public prosecutors enjoy the right to appeal disciplinary decision. If the answer is positive, please indicate which institution is competent to decide on the appeal in the following question.

Indicator 9 Alternative Dispute Resolution

Question 252 ([question 163 of the CEPEJ questionnaire](#))

“Court-related mediation”: Mediation which includes the intervention of a judge, a public prosecutor or other court staff who facilitates, directs, advises on or conducts the mediation process. For example, in civil disputes or divorce cases, judges may refer parties to a mediator if they believe that more satisfactory results can be achieved for both parties. In criminal law cases, a public prosecutor (or a judge) can refer a case to a mediator or propose that he/she mediates a case between an offender and a victim (for example to establish a compensation agreement). Such mediation may be mandatory either as a pre-requisite to proceedings or as a requirement of the court in the course of the proceedings.

Question 253 and Question 254 ([Questions 163-1 and 163-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

For certain types of disputes or certain legal areas, it is possible that the procedure codes require that a mandatory first mediation meeting, or mandatory informative session with mediator, or mandatory full mediation are conducted beforehand in order to be able to go to court. Furthermore, certain procedures give the possibility to the judge to whom a case is addressed to order a mediation procedure at the beginning of judicial proceeding or during this proceeding. If this is the case, please specify in which situations such rules apply.

For example, in Italy and Turkey, for certain types of disputes attending of a mediation information session is a procedural requirement (prerequisite) in order to initiate court proceedings.

Question 255 ([Question 164 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Private mediators: locally recognised professionals with a mediation specialisation.

For the purposes of this specific question, "civil cases" exclude family cases, consumer cases and employment dismissal cases, to be separately addressed in the specific rows further in the table.

Question 256 ([Question 165 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please indicate whether a party may benefit from court-related mediation services through a legal aid scheme (as understood in Section 2.1 “Legal Aid”) or whether court-related mediation is offered free of charge to the parties, through other means. For example, in certain countries, mediators might participate in pro-bono mediation programs within the court, in which they offer their services free of charge, or might be compensated by some other means.

Please explain the various possibilities which exist in your system.

Question 257 ([Question 166 of the CEPE Questionnaire](#))

Please indicate the number of accredited or registered mediators, either by the court or by another national authority or an NGO. The aim of this request is to have an objective basis for counting the number of mediators.

Question 258 ([Question 167 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

The interest of this question is to understand in which field court-related mediation is more used and considered as a successful process.

For the purposes of this specific question, “civil cases” exclude family cases, consumer cases and employment dismissal cases, to be separately addressed in the specific rows further in the table.

In the category “Number of cases for which the parties agreed to start mediation” please indicate the number of cases in which an agreement to mediate has been concluded in the reference year.

In the category “Number of finished court-related mediations” please indicate the number of cases which terminated in the reference year (whether by a settlement agreement, a party or both parties deciding to stop mediation, a mediator deciding to terminate the mediation, or any other reason).

In the category “Number of cases in which there is a settlement agreement” please indicate the number of mediation cases conducted within the reference year, in which the parties have reached a settlement agreement.

Question 259 ([Question 168 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Court Related Mediation should be differentiated from other Alternative Dispute Resolution procedures, in particular:

Mediation (other than court related mediation): Structured and confidential process in which an impartial third person, known as a mediator, assists the parties by facilitating the communication between them for the purpose of resolving issues in dispute.

Conciliation: Confidential process by which an impartial third person, known as a conciliator, makes a non-binding proposal to the parties for the settlement of a dispute between them.

Arbitration: Procedure by which the parties select an impartial third person, known as an arbitrator, to determine a dispute between them, and whose decision is binding.

“Other ADR”: may refer to, for example, negotiated agreement, collaborative law, collaborative practice, hybrid processes, assistance of an ombudsman, early neutral evaluation, etc. Processes in different countries may vary in both design and terminology.

Indicator 10 ECtHR

Indicator 10.1 ECHR

Questions 260 and 261 ([Questions 86 and 86-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Question 260 (Question 86 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire) concerns the monitoring system implemented in a state after the European Court of Human Rights has recognised a violation by the state related to Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, specifying civil (including commercial and administrative law cases) and criminal cases.

European Convention on Human Rights – Article 6 – Right to a fair trial

In the determination of his civil rights and obligations or of any criminal charge against him, everyone is entitled to a fair and public hearing within a reasonable time by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. Judgment shall be pronounced publicly but the press and public may be excluded from

all or part of the trial in the interests of morals, public order or national security in a democratic society, where the interests of juveniles or the protection of the private life of the parties so require, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice

This monitoring system can consist of actions such as: recognising violations at state and/or court levels (for example the implementation of a condemnations dashboard), actively informing on violations on national or court level, implementation of an internal system to remedy the established violation (for example the setting up of a review procedure – Q260 (Q 86-1 of the CEPEJ questionnaire), the implementation of internal systems to prevent other violations that are similar (for example the establishment of an effective remedy), measuring the evolution of the established violations etc.

For observers countries, the answer is NAP.

Questions 262 to 264

These data will be provided directly by the European Court of Human Rights and the department for the execution of judgments of the European Court of Human Rights.

Indicator 11 (Council for the Judiciary/Prosecutorial Council)

The notion of the Council for the judiciary must be understood in line with Opinion no.10(2007) of the CCJE on the Council for the Judiciary at the service of society.

Extracts from the opinion:

“The Council for the Judiciary is intended to safeguard both the independence of the judicial system and the independence of individual judges.

...the Council for the Judiciary has the task to set up the necessary tools to evaluate the justice system, to report on the state of services, and to ask the relevant authorities to take the necessary steps to improve the administration of justice.

Beyond its management and administrative role vis-à-vis the judiciary, the Council for the Judiciary should also embody the autonomous government of the judicial power, enabling individual judges to exercise their functions outside any control of the executive and the legislature, and without improper pressure from within the judiciary.

The relations between the Council for the Judiciary and the Minister of Justice, the Head of State and Parliament need to be determined. Furthermore, considering that the Council for the Judiciary does not belong to the hierarchy of the court system and cannot as such decide on the merits of the cases, relations with the courts, and especially with judges, need careful handling.

The Council for the Judiciary is also obliged to safeguard from any external pressure or prejudice of a political, ideological or cultural nature, the unfettered freedom of judges to decide cases impartially, in accordance with their conscience and their interpretation of the facts, and in accordance with the prevailing rules of the law[8].

In some member states judiciary councils extend their competences over prosecutors and prosecutorial organization, while in other systems prosecutors have a separate council. Its role, organization and competences are similar to the judiciary councils but modified in such way to reflect differences in prosecutors' status and roles.”

Question 265

Councils for the Judiciary exist in large number of judiciary systems in Europe. In some of the systems there is only one council competent for judges or prosecutors. Other system have two separate councils; one is competent only for judges and other for prosecutors. Lastly, some systems have one council competent for both judges and prosecutors. Please indicate your situation based on the present state in your system. Of course, models different from those described might exist, and if situation in your judiciary is such that could not be included under options offered in this question, please provide the explanation in the comment.

Question 266

The Council for the Judiciary can be either composed solely of judges or have a mixed composition of judges and non-judges (Opinion no.10(2007) of the CCJE on the Council for the Judiciary at the service of society). The question aims at exploring the composition of the councils. While it is clear that councils could be composed of judges/prosecutors from different instances, it is worth noting that they can also include members from the executive branch (such as Minister of Justice), academia (for example law faculty professors), and other legal professions

(representative of the bar chamber) etc. Please note that you should count the members from different institutions on the basis of which body/institution is authorized to propose them as members, irrespective of which body/institution is authorized to make a formal decision on their appointment (for example, in a situation where a university proposes a member and the Parliament formally appoints him/her, you should count this member under category "Academics" not the "Parliament"). If there are "other" members, please describe in the comment from which institutions they are appointed and what their number is. The number and composition might also depend on whether the system has single council for the judiciary, council for judges only and council for prosecutors only. Therefore, please provide the answer in appropriate field(s) of the table reflecting particular situation that exists in your system.

Question 267

Please describe the appointment procedure for the members of the council(s) by explaining the eligibility criteria, procedure, competent authorities for different stages of appointment etc. Considering that various procedures might exist for different members of the council(s), please explain specifics of each of these procedures. Furthermore please specify in the answer, which members are *ex officio* appointed. Please note that answer might depend on whether the system has single council for the judiciary, council for judges only and councils for prosecutors only. Therefore, please provide the answer in appropriate field(s) of the table reflecting particular situation that exists in your system.

Question 268

If your system sets specific selection criteria for appointment of members coming from outside of judiciary, such as years of experience, relevance of previous work etc., please select "Yes" and specify them in the comment area.

Question 269

Mandate of the members of the Council(s) is usually limited to a certain period of time. Please answer what is the term of office for the members, and please indicate this number in years (for example, if the term of office is 60 months, the answer should be 5 years).

Please note that, consistent with previous questions, there are three options in the table depending on whether the system has single council for the judiciary, council for judges only and councils for prosecutors only. Therefore, please provide the answer in appropriate field(s) of the table reflecting particular situation that exists in your system.

Question 270

This question refers to all the members of the Council and is applicable to both judges/prosecutors and non-judges/non-prosecutors.

The term of office might be renewable when the laws allow for a member to be appointed more than once. This situation includes possibility to be appointed second time for a shorter term of office (partially renewable).

Non-renewable term of office exists when it is prohibited for a member to be appointed after first term of office has ended.

Full time position in the Council means that a member cannot perform other professional work during the term of office.

If, however, the position is not full time and a member simultaneously performs other professional work during the term of office, please indicate if he/she can be subjected to evaluation of his/her performance in that other work place.

Please note that, consistent with previous questions, there are three options in the table depending on whether the system has single council for the judiciary, council for judges only and councils for prosecutors only. Therefore, please provide the answer in appropriate field(s) of the table reflecting particular situation that exists in your system.

Question 271

From appointment and promotion of judges to disciplinary proceedings and deciding on budgetary matters, the councils have different competencies in different systems. Please list all the competencies the council(s) have in your justice system.

Question 272

Judicial and prosecutorial councils have wide-ranging powers over the career of judges and prosecutors, ranging from their appointment to their promotion, transfer, ethics and disciplinary liability. It is therefore possible for the same judicial/prosecutorial council members to be involved in different aspects of a judge's or a prosecutor's professional life and this may well create conflicts of interests and have an impact on the effective independence in the work of the individual judges/prosecutors concerned. Opinion No. 10(2007) of the Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) on the Council for the Judiciary recognizes that there may be conflicts in the different functions performed by judicial councils and that, therefore, it is important provide a proper separation of roles in such cases. As to prosecutors, Opinion No. 13(2018) of the Consultative Council of European Prosecutors (CCPE) on Independence, Accountability and Ethics of Prosecutors calls for the process of appointment, transfer, promotion and discipline of prosecutors to be as close as possible to that of judges. The principle of separation of roles should, therefore, also apply to the different roles performed by the prosecutorial councils.

Question 273

To ensure and strengthen accountability of the Council(s), some judiciaries prescribe that Council(s) have a duty to publish activity reports. These reports usually list activities performed by the councils in all the areas of their respective competences. In addition, some of the systems require councils to publish their decisions, such as decisions on appointment of judges/prosecutors or decisions on pronouncing disciplinary sanctions against judges/prosecutors. Furthermore, sometimes it is mandatory for the councils to publish decisions and/or provide reasoning of their decisions.

Question 274

In some judicial systems, the Council(s) are competent to take certain measures in situations when there is a breach of independence or the impartiality of a judge or a pressure on a prosecutor. Please select the appropriate answer depending on what kind of council(s) exist in your system. Furthermore, please provide detailed explanations in the comment particularly pointing out the norms that regulate Council's competences in these situations, mechanisms available and procedures to be followed.

Indicator 12 Gender Equality

This section focuses on gender equality in the justice system. It aims to identify if there are steps to improve balance between males and females, as well as to discover concrete measures, regulation and competent institutions that should facilitate gender equality on both national and individual court/prosecution office level.

When answering different questions in this section, please indicate and explain measures, regulation and institutions that are specifically designed for facilitating gender equality in the justice system. Exceptionally, if only general measures, regulation and institutions exist in the system, you may explain them in the general or specific comment if they have achieved particularly significant impact in the area of justice.

Question 275 (Question 61-2 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

A very significant aspect of gender equality is ensuring balanced number of male and female professionals through the procedures of recruitment. Please answer "Yes" only in the situation when legislation provides provisions that are specifically designed for facilitating gender equality within procedures for recruiting of different listed categories (judges, prosecutors, non-judge staff, lawyers, notaries and enforcement agents), such as a system of quotas and/or similar systems of positive discrimination. If such provisions exist, please explain them in the side comment. If there have been recent developments in this area, such as adoption of new or changes of existing regulations, please describe them in the comment. Also, you may add any other relevant information in the comment.

Question 276 (Question 61-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

For gender equality it is not only important how many professionals of different gender take positions, but also which positions they take within the system. Sometimes, in spite of equal number of professionals, there might be an unacknowledged barrier to advancement in a profession for one of the genders, so-called glass ceiling. In order to tackle this issue, some systems introduce specific provisions for facilitating gender equality within procedures for promoting. Please answer "Yes" only in the situation when legislation provides provisions that are specifically designed for facilitating gender equality within the framework of the promotion procedure for the different listed categories (judges, prosecutors, non-judge staff, lawyers, notaries and enforcement agents). The promotion in this question should be understood as an advancement in a career to a position that is higher in organizational hierarchy and/or brings more managerial responsibilities. If such provisions exist, please explain them in the side comment. If there have been recent developments in this area, such as adoption of new or changes of existing regulations, please describe them in the comment. Also, you may add any other relevant information in the comment.

Question 277 (Question 61-3-1 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

A court president and head of prosecution services are considered particularly important positions of responsibility, and therefore this type of appointment should be specifically analysed. Please answer “Yes” only in the situation when legislation provides provisions that are specifically designed for facilitating gender equality within the framework of appointing only the two concerned categories: court presidents and head of prosecution services. If such provisions exist, please explain them in the comment.

Question 278 (Question 61-5 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

Please answer Yes, only if there is an overarching document that applies specifically to the judiciary. Exceptionally, the question can be answered Yes if there is a broader document that includes other sectors too, but only if there is a special part of the document targeting exclusively judiciary in more details. An overarching document should be understood as any strategic document such as policy, strategy, action plan, program and similar.

If such document exists, please provide more details in the comment and particularly specify the objectives, time frame, budget for implementation, as well as mandate and roles of the competent authorities etc.

Questions 279, 280, 281, 282 (Questions 61-6, 61-6-1, 61-6-2 and 61-6-3 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This set of questions is designed to collect information on existence and important characteristics of a person/institution specifically established to deal with gender issues in the justice system. It only concerns with authorities that have competences on a national level. In Q61-6 there are several sub-questions concerning procedures for recruitment and promotion of the three categories: judges, public prosecutors and non-judge staff. There might be a person/institution that doesn't deal with recruitment and promotion procedures, but, has competences over other relevant gender issues in the justice system. In that case, please answer “No” on the sub-questions and provide an explanation in the comment.

In the comment, please specify which issues are within the competences of this person/institution, what is the duration of its mandate, is the mandate renewable etc. Furthermore, if there have been recent developments in this area, such as adoption of new or changes of existing regulations, please describe them in the comment. Also, you may add any other relevant information in the comment.

Question 283 (Question 61-7 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This question requires information on existence of a person/institution specifically established to deal with gender issues in the organisation of judicial work. It only concerns with the authorities that have competences on a court or public prosecution services level.

In the comment, please specify which titles, competences and tasks this person / institution has, as well as what is the duration of its mandate, is the mandate renewable etc. Furthermore, if there have been recent developments in this area, such as adoption of new or changes of existing regulations, please describe them in the comment. Also, you may add any other relevant information in the comment.

Question 284 (Question 61-8 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

The purpose of this question is to determine if there are some concrete changes in the organisation and/or specific arrangements that should make the functions within courts and public prosecution services more attractive for women and facilitate their work without barriers.

The term “feminisation” in this question should be understood as having increased or prevailing number of females on certain functions within courts or public prosecution services.

Question 285 (Question 61-9 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire)

This question concerns the measures that should improve gender equality when gender imbalance had already been identified in access to different positions and functions of responsibility, as well as in promotion procedures. Such measures include for example work life balance measures, subsidies for childcare, social infrastructure etc.

The two offered answers refer to the following:

- “have been already implemented” - the measures have been implemented or the implementation has started although it hasn't been fully finalized during year of reference +1;

- “are planned” – measures are just at the stage of a proposal, public discussion, drafting a concrete official document (strategy, law etc) or similar.

-

Once you select the appropriate answer, please explain the measures and provide relevant details in the answer box.

Question 286 ([Question 61-10 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

This question refers to any official document (study, official report etc.) that identifies the main causes of possible inequalities in the areas of recruitment and promotion, as well as appointment to the positions of court presidents and heads of prosecution services. It should be noted that this is an open-ended question, and therefore, any other study that deals with causes of inequalities should be reported under “Other studies”. The main causes of possible inequalities might include for example limited pool of qualified candidates of one gender, limited availability of judgeships (at different levels), limited access to professional development opportunities, stringent requirements for judicial appointments, challenges in balancing work and life, appointment process (e.g. discriminatory practices, gender bias, lack of transparency), method of selection, gender-based stereotypes, lack of quotas/targets/positive discrimination etc. Please provide any further relevant information regarding the answer. If answer “Yes” is selected, the main identified causes should be specified as well as the reference documents.

Questions 287 ([Question 39 of the CEPEJ Questionnaire](#))

Please indicate if your system collects data on gender of persons who have been involved in any court proceedings or required some court services. This includes data on number of male/female court users, plaintiffs, accused persons, victims, defendants etc. If your answer is positive, please provide more details in the comments, and particularly explain what exact data are collected, how they are collected (from case management systems, surveys or in some other way) and provide the relevant statistics if available for the reference year.