



# PACIFIC JUDICIAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

## PJDP Phase 2: National Judicial Development Committees Final Concept Paper, November 2012

PJDP is implemented by the *Federal Court of Australia* with funding support from the *New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents.....	i
Abbreviations .....	i
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 CONTEXT .....	1
3 HISTORY .....	3
4 METHODOLOGY.....	3
5 SURVEY .....	4
a Background.....	4
b Representation.....	5
c Findings .....	5
d Analysis.....	7
e Observations.....	8
6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	9
ANNEX ONE - NJDC SURVEY TOOL.....	10

### ABBREVIATIONS

ADB	- Asian Development Bank
JEC	- Judicial Education Committee
MFAT	- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
MTA	- Monitoring and Technical Advisor
MSC	- Managing Services Contractor - Federal Court of Australia
NC	- National Coordinator
NJDC	- National Judicial Development Committee
NTC	- National Training Coordinators
ODI	- Overseas Development Institute
OECD - DAC	- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
PEC	- Programme Executive Committee
PIC	- Pacific Island Country
PJDP	- Pacific Judicial Development Programme
PJEP	- Pacific Judicial Education Programme



## 1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this concept paper in relation to National Judicial Development Committees (NJDCs) is to address Letter of Variation 8 in the Pacific Judicial Development Programme's (PJDP's) 18-month Implementation Plan, paragraph 2.4:-

Support to re-enliven each National Judicial Development Committee (NJDC) in participating jurisdictions. (In line with PEC resolution # 7 of the April 2012 PEC meeting), develop a draft concept paper about the focus, role of and process to re-enliven each National Judicial Development Committee (NJDC) in participating jurisdictions.

Letter of Variation 8 reflects Resolution 7 of the Programme Executive Committee (PEC) made at its meeting in Apia on 1-3 April 2012:-

The MSC will produce a draft concept paper for the focus and role of the NJDC - possibly as a project in the extension period - for PEC approval and comment by MFAT and the MTA prior to circulation to the Chief Justices and National Coordinators of PICs.

### Recommendations

This concept paper recommends that the PEC:-

- i. endorse the re-enlivenment of NJDCs in those PICs which require them;
- ii. recommend that each interested PIC formulate a workplan for the establishment or re-enlivenment of NJDCs for completion prior to 30 June 2013; and
- iii. task the Management Service Contractor (MSC), in addition to the support to be provided in component 2.5 of the Extension Plan, to develop a toolkit to support the re-enlivenment of NJDCs including training for the further consideration of the PEC for roll-out during the remainder of the current phase of PJDP, to include the following:
  - a. mandate, composition, role and responsibilities
  - b. governance and reporting requirements
  - c. local support requirements
  - d. capacity-building needs and training proposal.

## 2 CONTEXT

The draft concept paper was circulated for the purposes of stakeholder consideration and feedback, and read in conjunction with component 2.5 of the Extension Plan:

National Judicial Development Committee (NJDC) Re-enlivenment Project - will involve the development of a concept paper, and the presentation of this paper to the PJDP's regional leadership. The aim of the project will be to provide options to promote the re-establishment or re-invigoration of these committees as a key mechanism for locally managed judicial development. The Project will:

- Develop a draft Concept Paper on the: focus; role of; and process to re-enliven NJDCs in participating jurisdictions.
- Submission of the draft Concept Paper to the PEC for review and feedback.



- Finalisation of the Concept Paper and presentation of this to the regional leadership as part of the planned leadership workshops.
- Provide support to individual jurisdictions seeking to re-enliven their NJDC via the Responsive Fund mechanism.

At the Apia meeting of the PEC in April, members discussed the potential role of NJDCs as a key ongoing mechanism in managing judicial development at the local level.

It was recalled in discussion that this mechanism, then called the Judicial Education Committee, was an original element in the establishment of the Pacific Judicial Education Programme (PJEP) in 1998. At that time, it was envisaged that the committee be led by the chief justice and should include the national coordinator among other members in each PIC. Pacific members of PEC noted that the operation of these committees had been mixed and that their operation had largely stopped functioning after the end of the PJEP as these committees had been structured as an oversight mechanism for PJEP only.

The PEC discussed the question how to re-enliven NJDCs as a mechanism to lead and manage judicial development locally. It was variously suggested that this re-enlivenment might be enabled and made more sustainable by broadening the responsibilities of the committees to focus on broader national judicial development matters as a whole, with PJDP only forming a part of these initiatives. Membership might need to be revised to enable broader stakeholder involvement, though it was also noted that wider law and justice steering groups might become too broad.

In the context of uncertain ongoing support for PJDP, it was generally agreed by PEC members that NJDCs could become a suitable vehicle to carry on the work of PJDP locally.

As a consequence, the PEC noted the value in re-enlivening the NJDC in the project outlined above in the Extension Plan, subject to undertaking an evaluation of experience on their limited development to date, and resolved that:

- a. The purpose of the NJDC should be to focus on judicial development in terms of improvement of services provided by courts to the public;
- b. the composition of the NJDC will necessarily vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction;
- c. membership may include but not be limited to: the Chief Justice / Senior Judicial Officer [acting as Chair]; Judicial Officers; Courts/Ministry staff; and NC [acting as secretary/administrator] nominated by the group;
- d. the functional purpose of the committee will include serving as a programme/project management unit, and may include: policy-making; identification of judicial development needs; develop project proposals / designs; implementation / management of projects; monitor project implementation; and report on implementation;
- e. the MSC will produce a draft concept paper for the focus and role of the NJDC - possibly as a project in the extension period - for PEC approval and comment by MFAT and the MTA prior to circulation to the Chief Justices and National Coordinators of PICs. (PEC Resolution 7, 1-3 April 2012).



### 3 HISTORY

As noted above, a local committee mechanism has been a part of PJDP's governance concept and structure since inception of the programme on approval of the original Project Concept dated 4 November 1998.

At that time, the South Pacific Judicial Conference approved the establishment of the Pacific Regional Judicial Training Project which evolved into the PJEP and in due course into the PJDP. During this time, NJDC's have at different times been called Judicial Education Committees and National Judicial Training Committees.

The original vision of this committee mechanism was formulated and endorsed as follows:-

- **Judicial Education Committees (JEC)** - *The (National Training Coordinators) NTC will convene, with the endorsement of the chief justice, a national Judicial Education Committee in each nation. Members of the JEC will include representatives of judges, lay magistrates and court officers. The JEC is responsible to support the NTC in developing and delivering training activities at the national level (at page 26).*
- **Judicial Education Committees (JEC)** - *JEC's are established in each nation with the agreement of the chief justice. They are responsible to support the NTC's in developing and delivering training activities at the local level (at page 72).*
- **Judicial Education Committees (JEC)** - *The NTC will convene, with the endorsement of the chief justice, a national Judicial Education Committee in each nation. Member of the JEC will include representatives of judges, magistrates and court officers. The JEC is responsible to support the NTC in developing and delivering training activities at the national level. The formation of education committees provides support and coordination to the delivery of local training to judges, magistrates and court officers. This is an honorary part-time role likely to require between 2-3 hours each month, principally in participating in meetings of the education committee.*

*The role of the national education committees should be to undertake the following:*

- a) Assess the specific local needs for judicial training in each country*
- b) Plan and conduct the delivery of specific training projects locally*
- c) Coordinate delivery of training to judges, magistrates and court officers nationally*
- d) Evaluate national training programs and report to the regional coordinator*

*It is recommended that education committees convene on a monthly basis for short meetings of between 60-90 minutes (at pages 80/1).*

### 4 METHODOLOGY

The methodology for addressing this tasking relating to the focus, role of and process to re-enliven NJDCs is primarily by assessing the actual regional experience of stakeholders by survey. In selecting this methodology, it is timely to consider the need(s) to be addressed by this committee mechanism, as well as the time and resources available for this purpose. The more clearly that the needs or purpose for



this mechanism are articulated, the more likely it is to develop an optimal approach on the focus, role and process to re-enliven each NJDC.

For this reason, it is important to consider the questions: Does PJDP need NJDCs and, if so, why? In simple terms, the collective evidence of the PJDP journey over the years to this point indicates that donor support for judicial development has been sustained but also fragmentary. At the same time, some measure of donor dependence has occurred which has eroded the self-driven initiative of local actors who to some extent now wait for and depend on external assistance. Given this experience, which may be described in terms of strategic risks confronting the process of judicial development in future – and is by no means unique to either judicial development or to the Pacific region - there are a number of ways to describe the needs to be addressed. These needs relate in varying measure to promoting sustainability, devolving and strengthening local management and building the capacity and processes of key actors.

One way of exploring the issues is to focus on the challenges of promoting the sustainability of judicial development at the local level. This issue is pressing given the impending completion of the current phase of PJDP and the prospect of ongoing support being discontinued. Another way of considering the issues is to focus on the challenges of strengthening the management of judicial development at the local level, and how to support and improve the role NCs on to whose shoulders the responsibilities have largely devolved, and how to consolidate management at strategic, systematic and operational levels. Yet another way is to focus on the challenges of supporting the capacity-building of key local actor(s) responsible for judicial development. Each of these perspectives on sustainability, managerial effectiveness and capacity-building is important, pressing and to some extent inter-connected.

Over recent years, international development organisations have recognised the importance of each of these challenges and have sponsored research and the building of knowledge in how to address them. The overarching challenge of capacity-development, which remains core to the quest of PJDP, is the subject of active ongoing research and knowledge-formation, notably by ADB, ODI, OECD-DAC and the World Bank, among others. In particular, in the view of this writer, the work of Heather Baser relating to promoting competency, capability and capacity respectively - is to be commended for further consideration by PJDP. Perhaps surprisingly, however, there is a lack of prevailing development orthodoxy over how to assure addressing these challenges effectively. Indeed, it is timely to note that there is a continuing need for more research to guide our practice.

It is within this broader developmental context of addressing the needs to promoting sustainability, effectiveness and capacity in small and often fragile PICs which characterise the membership of PJDP that this concept note is endeavouring to provide practical measures for supporting key relationships and processes among local actors in judicial development across the region.

In the current circumstances, the best way of doing this is by analysing and learning from stakeholders' actual experience by way of stakeholder survey.

## **5 SURVEY**

### **A BACKGROUND**

Within the context of the intervening 14 years of actual programmatic experience, the PEC endorsed the timeliness of assessing stakeholders' actual experience in the establishment, operation and usefulness of NJDCs. This experience is directly relevant to the ongoing task to develop a draft concept paper about the focus, role of and process to re-enliven each NJDC.



Consequently, a survey was distributed to all Chief Justice and National Coordinators on 5 June 2012, with the request that responses be supplied by 17 June 2012. The scope of this survey was to inquire about actual local experience in the establishment and operation of NJDC across the region for the purpose of assisting the PEC to refine its ongoing approach to supporting judicial development, and to formulate an ongoing approach which learned lessons from this experience. A copy of this survey is found in the Annex to this report.

## B REPRESENTATION

This survey was circulated to the chief justices and national coordinators of 14 PICs, in all 28 stakeholders. Of these, a total of 12 responses were received – 5 from chief justices and 7 from national coordinators – representing an overall rate of survey response of 42.8%.

## C FINDINGS

A summary of the major findings of this survey of stakeholders is outlined below:

- **Question 1: Establishment** - 2 of 5 chief justices reported having ever established an NJDC in their PIC (40%); and 6 of 7 national coordinators reported having ever established an NJDC in their PIC (85.5%).
- **Question 2: Date established:** while many respondents could not recall, those that did variously reported between 1990 - 2005.
- **Question 3: Roles of NJDC** – all respondents, being 2 chief justices and 5 national coordinators reported: to assess training needs; plan and deliver local training; and coordinate local activities.
- **Question 4: Membership** – the 1 chief justice respondent reported membership comprised the secretary for justice, chief magistrate, registrar, and committee secretary. Of the 5 national coordinators respondents, 4 reported membership to comprise the chief justices or chief magistrate, all reported inclusion of the national coordinator, and 4 reported inclusion of the registrar; and 4 reported an additional member such as court administrator or financial officer.
- **Question 5: Activity** - the 1 chief justice respondent, reported that the NJDC was still active; of the 6 national coordinators respondents, 5 reported an NJDC was still active – representing 25% of stakeholders surveyed and 50% of respondents.
- **Question 6: if inactive, when did it stop:** the 1 chief justice responded reported not applicable; 5 national coordinators respondents reported not applicable; the other reported 'some time ago, but it has recently revived.'
- **Question 7: inactive, why did it stop:** nil response from chief justices; the 1 applicable national coordinator respondent reported on the lack of response to calls for meetings by NC; priority shifted to planning for new court complex; with revival, meetings are now held over the lunch hour fortnightly which is sufficient for present purposes and minimizes work interruptions.
- **Question 8: Strengths** – of the 2 chief justice respondents, one reported: '(PIC) gained enormous assistance from the PJDP by virtue of the role of (NC) and the direct assistance of advisers with PJDP; the fact that (PIC) has a low population and a very small judiciary (non-resident, apart from the resident magistrate) means that we really did not require a committee approach'. The other chief justice reported: 'It is able to send participants to overseas



workshops and trainings; it is able to plan and conduct workshops and trainings locally; coordinator is able to conduct survey and identify training needs'.

The 5 national coordinators respondents reported as follows: 'Our JEC is a committee established by the Chief Justice and it reports back to him/her through its reports and recommendations. It has the full backing of the Chief Justice and the other Judges. This is complemented with staff from the administrator which is called the Trovium(?) Branch of the National Judiciary Service'; 'Drawing up of yearly calendar for training development of judicial officers, clerks, secretaries and other court personnel'; 'Leadership role of a chief justice; Involvement of Justice Ministry in identifying and planning activities; Involvement of reps of all courts in that exercise'; 'Heads of the Judiciary regularly discuss and identify the training needs of the judiciary; coordinate the trainings in the judiciary'; and, 'We have been able to send participants to most PJDP trainings and workshops; We have in (PIC) four accredited trainers and they are able to design and conduct trainings'.

- **Question 9: Weaknesses** - 3 chief justices responded as follows: 'The committee way of doing things is inefficient when a committee is unnecessarily big'; 'The role of (NC) meant that in (PIC) we were able to benefit from all of the programmes than came out of the NJDCs; so our benefit was both direct and indirect'; 'I recently arrived in (PIC), but I understand that in the past (PIC) had a very ad hoc body consisting of chief justice, chief registrar & judicial trainer; but the group hardly met.'

6 national coordinators responded as follows: 'Judges are busy most of the time and it can prove frustrating to convene meetings; The committee only recommends, the chief justice has the final say; funding to carry out its training programmes is a major hindrance'; 'Not meeting at any regular basis, eg. Monthly; Confirmation and finalisation of programs are done by the office of the Chief Justice rather than NJDC'; 'Lack of periodical meetings; time constraints of members; Lack of an overall Justice Sector Plan'; 'Local trainings not implemented because of funding from local budget'; 'The NJ committee rarely meet to discuss issues related to national training for (PIC) due to other commitments, but when the need arises the committee always give its support'; 'We all have our court works to deal with; There are facilities or room set aside for training; We have to make sure that the training activities does not clash with our other commitments'.

- **Question 10: Additional comments** – 3 chief justices responded as follows: 'If the national coordinator knows the goals of Judicial Education programs and is competent, he/she and the Chief Justice would do fine for (PIC)'; 'The role of (NC) meant that in (PIC) we were able to benefit from all of the programmes than came out of the NJDCs. So our benefit was both direct and indirect. (NC) kept me informed of any programmes that seemed useful (and they all did) and was quick to make application for funding. Every programme has proved enormously valuable, so the NJDCs must be getting it right'; and, 'I recently arrived in (PIC), but I understand that in the past had a very ad hoc body consisting of chief justice, chief registrar & judicial trainer. But the group hardly met. Everything then had to be dictated from the CJ. We have now decided to re-group and have the NJDC set up.'

6 national coordinators responded as follows: 'Support staff can also be very busy on other matters and may not deliver on time'; 'Needs to be reviewed as soon as practicable'; 'The Chief Justice and I both feel that we don't need such committee(s). We believe that so long there is a great and open working relationship between the CJ and NC there is no use for such committee(s). We always consult with each other to agree with one thing and when necessary or required, consult with other court officers (department heads) to get their ideas and feedbacks'; 'A valuable creature in theory. It is the way of the future'; 'A full-time training officer





need to be appointed to coordinate trainings in the subordinate courts'; 'Important to understand that (PIC) has 3 villages hence one court in each village. The operation of each judiciary is very much in their respective village. The committee only gets involve when there is a need for a national training for all the (PIC) judicial officers here members from all the 3 villages (Courts and Police)'.

## D ANALYSIS

Local committee mechanisms, variously named, have been a part of the governance concept and operating structure of judicial development at the local level from the start of PJDP. Stakeholders experience of their operation and usefulness has however been mixed – both positive and negative across the region, and they continue to operate in some PICs only.

The finding outlined above may be indicative of the experience of all PICs, but they are not necessarily representative owing to the low-intermediate level of response (42.8%) to the survey. It is disappointing that most chief justices and national coordinators did not respond to this survey, as this would have assisted the PEC to make a better informed decision on the appropriate focus, role of and process to re-enliven each National Judicial Development Committee. As a result, much of PICs experience of the use of this committee mechanism remains unclear. There may be various reasons for non-response: non-availability owing to other pre-existing priorities, shortage of time, the lack of first-hand knowledge or possibly interest. What this means, however, is that caution should be exercised in generalising findings and analysis based on the data supplied in these responses.

Given this qualification, these responses are nonetheless relevant to and informative of the actual experience of stakeholders in operating committee mechanisms for the purpose of judicial development across the region since the establishment of PJDP.

- i. Mixed experience - as might be expected, this experience has been mixed across the region: some PICs have evidently operated and continue to operate NJDCs and have found this committee mechanism to be useful; others have not used these committees or have let them fall into disuse for a variety of reasons. One PIC has recently reactivated its NJDC. At least two others report that what is more important is a sound collaborative relationship between chief justice and national coordinator – rather than the existence or otherwise of a committee.
- ii. Membership – almost universally, most NJDCs have comprised a core membership of chief justice or chief magistrate, national coordinator and court registrar, with various other members as required.
- iii. Responsibilities – equally universally, respondents reported that the core functions of NJDCs were to (i) assess training needs; (ii) plan and deliver local training; and (iii) coordinate local activities – this is significant because it omits the (d) evaluative function originally mandated, outlined above.
- iv. Benefits – some respondents reported positively that they experienced benefits by operating NJDCs in their PICs. These benefits, or strengths, mainly included providing a leadership mechanism, promoting communication, and assisting in the planning and coordination of training. It may be surmised from these responses that the institutionalizing process of establishing and running a committee provided an organizational process which addressed and enabled judicial development to operative.
- v. Weaknesses – marginally more respondents reported that they experienced shortcoming in operating NJDC's in their PICs. These shortcoming, or weaknesses, mainly including



inefficiency, unnecessary organization, ad hoc, irregularity and infrequency of operation. Some measures of frustration were reported in how some committees worked or could not work with any devolved responsibilities, constraints of time and budget, colliding commitments, and a lack of participation at scheduled meetings were also reported.

## E OBSERVATIONS

Given the regional experience outlined above, a number of observations can be offered at this stage based on the lessons of actual experience for the PEC relating to the focus, role of and process to re-enliven each NJDC:

- a) Any initiative to reactive NJDCs should recognise the diversity of situation and the needs across the region; some PICs have evidently benefited from using NJDCs, but others have not, preferring instead to focus on the key relationship between chief justice and national coordinator. It is evident that experience of NJDCs has been mixed across the region and has, only on some occasions, proved to be useful:
  - i. the benefits of operating NJDCs have included providing an institutional mechanism for the leadership, communication and coordination of judicial development at the local level. These benefits may be seen as contributing to integrating PJDP activities within the broader operation of the courts locally, and providing a community of management and support for the national coordinator;
  - ii. the shortcomings of operating NJDCs have arisen from shortages of people, time and resources as well as capacity limitations – which exist beyond the control of PJDP - and may reflect some 'siloing' of PJDP business and a lack of integrated team-building at the local level.
- b) It is evident from experience that the sustainability of PJDP at the local level is not necessarily directly dependent on the existence of NJDCs. Other possibly more important factors relate to the quality of the relationship between chief justice and national coordinator – whether directly or as part of a committee structure; the integration of PJDP development processes and activities within the broader operations of local courts; and limitations in locally-available capacity to manage developmental programming.
- c) Balancing the diversity of experience across the region, it is now timely for each PIC to determine whether establishing / re-enlivening a NJDC is a useful mechanism to re-enliven NJDCs as a means to integrate PJDP in the local organisation of the courts, based on the assessment of the experience with the mechanism from around the region outlined in this paper.
- d) It is timely for the PEC to encourage – though not to prescribe – the re-enlivenment of NJDCs as a means to consolidate the management of judicial development at the local level, to improve team-work on judicial development, and to promote its sustainability.
- e) Based on the regional experience, possible rationales for establishing / re-enlivening NJDCs may include promoting the spread of workload to support the national coordinator; developing a community of development practice, and promoting sustainability of judicial development.
- f) The core membership of NJDCs should comprise the chief justice – to provide apex level leadership - the national coordinator as key actor, and the court registrar to ensure integration with broader court operations. Consideration should be extended to include a representative of the bar and the community as other members in order to promote a more accessible and



transparent decision-making process, and possibly also improving cross-sectoral communication and coordination

- g) The key functions of NJDCs should comprise (i) assessing organisational capacity-building and training needs; (ii) planning and delivering local training; and (iii) coordinating local court development activities. It will be helpful to elicit agreement on these functions and who is responsible to exercise what role to avoid the frustration and competing priorities experienced in some PICs. For this reason, it may be useful for each interested PIC to develop a charter for its NJDC based on its individual needs so that its functions, roles and responsibilities are clear.
- h) Review role of National Coordinators – given the evolutionary practice over the years towards centralizing functional responsibility on the NCs, it is timely to consider and review the role of NCs within any emerging context which focuses on re-enlivening NJDCs. Does this have any implications on the role and responsibility of NCs and, if so, what? This re-enlivenment is likely to have programmatic implications, notably, on the process of formulating, managing and delivering annual judicial and court development plans, while avoiding overburdening available PIC resources.
- i) The possible role of the National Coordinators Working Group should be considered as a part of any ongoing process to re-enliven NJDCs.
- j) As an operational guide, meetings of NJDCs should be scheduled on a quarterly basis, though not more frequently unless required to avoid unnecessary burdening.

## 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This concept paper recommends that the PEC (i) endorse the re-enlivenment of NJDCs in those PICs which require them, (ii) recommend that each interested PIC formulate a workplan for the establishment or re-enlivenment of NJDCs for completion prior to 30 June 2013, and (iii) task the development of a toolkit to address the findings and observations outlined above during the remainder of the current phase.



## ANNEX ONE - NJDC SURVEY TOOL

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this survey is to inquire about your local experience with the establishment and operation of a National Judicial Development Committee (NJDC). NJDC's have been a core part of the governance concept and operating structure of judicial development at the local level from the start of PJDP. Since then, their operation has had a mixed experience across the region.

Please complete the attached survey, after reading the background information below, to provide information on the nature of your local experience with NJDC's in order to assist the PEC to refine its ongoing approach to supporting judicial development across the region.

### 2.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

At its meeting in Apia on 1-3 April 2012, the PEC resolved to support the reestablishment and ongoing operation of National Judicial Development Committees (NJDC's). NJDC's, which were originally called National Judicial Training Committees, have been a part of PJDP's governance concept and structure since its conception on approval of the project concept dated 4 November 1998 (available on request).

At that time, the South Pacific Judicial Conference approved the establishment of the Pacific Regional Judicial Training Project which evolved into the Pacific Judicial Education Programme (PJEP) and then the Pacific Judicial Development Programme (PJDP). It resolved that:

- Judicial Education Committees (JEC) - The (National Training Coordinators) NTC will convene, with the endorsement of the chief justice, a national Judicial Education Committee in each nation. Members of the JEC will include representatives of judges, lay magistrates and court officers. The JEC is responsible to support the NTC in developing and delivering training activities at the national level (page 26).
- Judicial Education Committees (JEC) - JEC's are established in each nation with the agreement of the chief justice. They are responsible to support the NTC's in developing and delivering training activities at the local level (page 72).
- Judicial Education Committees (JEC) - The NTC will convene, with the endorsement of the chief justice, a national Judicial Education Committee in each nation. Member of the JEC will include representatives of judges, magistrates and court officers. The JEC is responsible to support the NTC in developing and delivering training activities at the national level. The formation of education committees provides support and coordination to the delivery of local training to judges, magistrates and court officers. This is an honorary part-time role likely to require between 2-3 hours each month, principally in participating in meetings of the education committee.

The role of the national education committees should be to undertake the following:

- a. Assess the specific local needs for judicial training in each country
- b. Plan and conduct the delivery of specific training projects locally
- c. Coordinate delivery of training to judges, magistrates and court officers nationally
- d. Evaluate national training programs and report to the regional coordinator
- e. It is recommended that education committees convene on a monthly basis for short meetings of between 60-90 minutes (pages 80/1)



### 3.0 QUESTIONS

Question 1: Has your country ever established a NJDC: (please tick / check one, only)

Yes                      No

If 'yes' go on to Question 2.; if 'no' go on to Question 8.

Question 2: If 'yes' to Question 1., when was your country's NJDC established?

\_\_\_\_\_

Question 3: What was/is the role of the NJDC:

<i>NJDC's Role</i>	Yes	No
a) Assess local needs for judicial training		
b) Plan and conduct the delivery of training projects locally		
c) Coordinate delivery of training to judges, magistrates, court officers		
d) Other - please describe what the other role was:		

Question 4: Describe the membership of the NJDC:

<i>NJDC's Membership</i>	Yes	No
a) Chief Justice		
b) National Coordinator		
c) Chief Registrar		
d) Other - please describe who:		

Question 5: Is a NJDC still active in your country?

Yes                      No

Question 6: If 'yes' to on to Question 8.; If 'no', when did your country's NJDC stop operating?

\_\_\_\_\_



Question 7: If 'no' to Question 5., please describe why it stopped operating:

---

---

---

---

---

Question 8: In your experience, please describe the strengths of NJDCs:

---

---

---

---

---

Question 9: In your experience, describe the weakness of NJDCs:

---

---

---

---

---

Question 10: Do you have any other comments on NJDC's?

---

---

---

---

---

---



Please return the completed form to Ms. Nicole Cherry (by email: [Nicole.Cherry@fedcourt.gov.au](mailto:Nicole.Cherry@fedcourt.gov.au) ; or by facsimile: (+ 61-2) 9223 1906) on or before 17 June 2012.

Thank you for completing this survey.