

Serbia Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Justice Sector Support 2014 Annual Report



Introduction

This report presents the implementation progress of the MDTF-JSS from 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2014. It focuses on how the MDTF-JSS is supporting the Serbian justice sector to fulfil the requirements of the EU accession process and implement needed reforms.

For more information about the MDTF-JSS, including recent activities and reports, see <http://www.mdtfjss.org.rs/en>.

Context Brief of the MDTF-JSS

Rationale for Creating and Contributing to the MDTF-JSS

At its inception, the MDTF-JSS was established in order to:

- Provide an innovative mechanism for donors to coordinate support for Serbia's justice sector in line with government and EU integration priorities and contributors' financing priorities;
- Ensure synergies with the key development partners in Serbia's justice sector;
- Provide focused short-term support to Serbia for justice sector capacity-building, analytical and advisory work, peer-based learning and other technical assistance to the Ministry of Justice (MoJ), the judiciary and the Ministry of Finance of Serbia;
- Improve aid effectiveness in the justice sector through actions to increase on-budget programmatic donor support to Serbia's justice sector;
- Promote stakeholder participation in supporting Serbia's justice sector; and
- Facilitate tracking and reporting progress on justice reform implementation and impact.

Objective of the MDTF-JSS

The stated development objective of the MDTF-JSS is to '*support the strengthening of the justice sector of the Republic of Serbia in order to facilitate its integration into the European Union*'.

The MDTF-JSS builds on and strengthens the existing dialogue and coordination arrangements between the executive, judiciary, development partners, civil society, and academia. The MDTF-JSS also promotes external stakeholder participation in supporting Serbia's justice sector and tracking progress in reform implementation.

Members of the MDTF-JSS

Nine donors have at one time contributed to the MDTF-JSS, namely: the EU Delegation, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Contributions have varied, with the smallest coming from Slovenia (USD 108,000) and the largest contribution coming from Sweden (over USD 4,000,000).

The United Kingdom, Norway and the Netherlands are no longer members of the MDTF-JSS. They continue to participate in Management Committee meetings as observers.

Structure of the MDTF-JSS

The MDTF-JSS has two substantive components and two administrative components.

The two substantive components of the MDTF-JSS are:

1. *A Bank-executed advisory services component* that provides analytical advisory services to support diagnostics and reform proposals that support the justice sector's EU integration effort. Advisory work focused on meeting analytic gaps in areas such as fiscal impact analyses, comparative analyses, analyses of competing reform proposals, specialized surveys etc. For *Bank Executed Activities*, funds are used to finance (a) staff costs, (b) media and workshops, (c) consultants fees, (d) contractual services, (e) extended term consultant costs, (f) temporary support staff costs, (g) travel expenses, (h) associated overheads, and (i) equipment lease.
2. *A Government-executed technical assistance component* that provides predominantly local technical assistance to support the implementation of reforms across the sector. The Serbian European Integration Office is formally the recipient of the grant that funds this work, but in practice the execution is led by a Program Implementation Unit that exists inside the MOJ. Recipient-led work ensures the design of the activity is locally-owned and needs-driven, with support from and policy dialogue with the Bank. Procurement of services was led by the MOJ using Bank procurement guidelines and the MOJ is responsible for managing performance and ownership of results. The Recipient-led component is further divided into two sub-components: Reform, Accession and Facilitation, and Access to Justice. Government-executed *activities* funds finance: (a) consultants' services (excluding salaries of government employees), (b) training, (c) goods, and (d) operating costs.

The two administrative components of the MDTF-JSS are:

1. *Trust fund management*, which includes the administration of the trust fund, donor coordination, logistics, etc.; and
2. *Supervision of the Government-executed component*, which provides oversight of the financial and procurement management of activities executed by the MOJ.

This 'hybrid' structure for the MDTF-JSS has provided maximum flexibility to enable the project to support a range of activities that include both advice and implementation, while ensuring effective management and fiduciary controls.

Continual Oversight by the MDTF-JSS Management Committee

The Management Committee provides general oversight and direction for the MDTF-JSS. The Committee is consulted on activities to be financed from the fund, excluding activities concerning Trust Fund management, administration, and monitoring and supervision of Government-executed activities.

The Committee comprises the key representatives, namely the MOJ, the Supreme Court of Cassation (SCC), the High Judicial Council (HJC), the Republic Prosecutor Office (RPPO), the State Prosecutorial Council (SPC), the Serbian European Integration Office (SEIO), contributing donors, and the World Bank. Meetings are held periodically (approximately once per quarter) and minutes shared among members. Members are also consulted via email. The World Bank chairs the meetings and provides the secretariat functions.

The MDTF-JSS Management Committee has become an active forum for stakeholder dialogue and increased the robustness of consultation and analysis conducted by the MDTF-JSS. The meetings themselves have become a dynamic platform for Serbian institutional stakeholders, together with donors,

to voice their thoughts on the sector's needs and how the MDTF-JSS should support them. The EU Delegation has been active in this dialogue.

Activities Undertaken During the Reporting Period and Results Achieved

The main activities of the MDTF-JSS in 2014 included the following:

- Advisory services to the MoJ and the Judiciary provided through individual consultants;
- Multi-stakeholder perception survey and presentation of results;
- Workshops, seminars and learning events on topics relevant to Serbia's justice sector reform efforts;
- Preparation of the Judicial Functional Review;
- Technical assistance provided by the Reform and Accession Facilitation Unit and Project Implementation Unit within the MoJ to implement recipient-executed activities;
- On-going support to the organization of the Partners' Forum;
- Ongoing development of the MDTF-JSS website to improve outreach and increase public awareness of justice sector reforms and MDTF-JSS program activities;
- Full time program coordination in Belgrade.

Key Development in the Justice Sector

- The most recent reform of the courts and prosecutors' networks entered into force on January 1, 2014. The number of courts and prosecutors' offices at first instance has significantly increased: from 34 to 66 courts and 34 to 58 prosecutors' offices. This is the second significant change of the courts networks from 2010.
- A new Criminal Procedure Code introduced prosecutorial investigation and entered into force on October 1, 2013. This Code introduced significant changes to the roles parties to criminal procedures (i.e. judges, public prosecutors, defendants, attorneys), and also transferred part of the costs from courts to prosecutors' offices. As a consequence, the State Prosecutorial Council needed to increase its capacity related to the budget planning process.
- Laws on judges and public prosecution were amended in 2014 and a law on whistleblowers was adopted for the first time with the aim to provide comprehensive protection to whistleblowers.
- Implementation of the law on notaries began in September 2014 which resulted in a four-month strike by attorneys. During this period the whole justice system was blocked and the rate of hearings declined. The strike was resolved by the MoJ and the Bar Association who agreed to amend the law on notaries and reduce areas of exclusive competence by notaries.
- On February 6, 2014 the Constitutional Court decided the statutory preference for appointment of trainees from the Judicial Academy was no longer valid. This decision jeopardized initial trainings organized by the Judicial Academy.
- To foster alternative dispute resolutions, Parliament adopted a new law on mediation in 2014 to be implemented the following year.

World Bank Executed Activities

Component 1. Bank Executed Advisory Services

A major series of advisory services was carried out alongside delivery of the Judicial Functional Review. The Judicial Functional Review Report, with a series of complementary deliverables, fell under both subcomponents. For the purpose of reporting, these are disaggregated in the two sub-components below.

Sub-Component 1.1: Provision of Advisory Services for Justice Sector Reform

Under this component a range of advisory services was provided during 2014.

1. Judicial Functional Review Report

A major contribution to the EU Accession process was the Judicial Functional Review. The MDTF-JSS responded to requests by the Management Committee and the client, merging several individual activities into an integrated product. The benefits were high strategic relevance for justice reform in Serbia and strong stakeholder engagement for an activity with high profile and high visibility.

The Review provided a baseline and analytical input for the accession negotiations between Serbia and the EU. It assessed the current functioning of the institutions of the broader judicial system in Serbia and outlined options, recommendations and risks to inform Serbia's ongoing and planned justice reform initiatives in view of EU accession.

The Review thus provided analytical and advisory input to enable the Serbian authorities to adjust their strategic framework to improve and measure the performance of the judicial system. It was then used by the Serbian authorities as a base for developing the Action Plan for Chapter 23 for the accession negotiation process.

The Review focused on the courts as the main vehicle for justice service delivery and the primary institutions of justice in Serbia. The scope included all types of services provided primarily by the courts and covered litigious and non-litigious aspects of civil, commercial, administrative and criminal justice. The focus was on actual implementation and day-to-day functioning of the institutions, rather than just on the law on the books. The scope also included other aspects of the functioning of the other institutions to the extent to which they enable or impede service delivery by the courts. These included: the MOJ, the High Judicial Council, the State Prosecutorial Council, the courts, prosecutor's offices, the Judicial Academy, the Ombudsman's Office, the police, prisons and justice sector professional organizations (the Bar, notaries, bailiffs, mediation etc.).

The Review focused on three areas of performance in terms of justice service delivery: efficiency of service delivery; quality of services delivered; and access to these services. The analysis also covered judicial system performance in managing a range of resources, such as financial, human and technology resources, including the allocation, distribution and execution of those resources to meet justice service delivery needs. It also looked at the management of these resources, their geographic distribution, performance management tools, training and the use of alternative forms of dispute resolution (ADR), and newly introduced judicial services (such as notaries and bailiffs) to improve justice service delivery.

The Justice Performance Framework was developed in close coordination with stakeholders as a tool to measure performance of the justice system. It identified the performance indicators, their data source and relevant European standards. The Judicial Functional Review therefore had a strong emphasis on data, particularly on collecting, generating, and organizing data to measure and manage justice system performance according to the Justice Performance Framework. In addition to the final report, a number of outputs financed by the MDTF-JSS have focused on data collection and generation and informed the analysis.

2. Background information on Serbian Judiciary and Desk Review

To build on available analyses for the Judicial Functional Review and avoid duplicating efforts, a desk review of available analytical work on justice sector issues in Serbia was carried out. Relevant aspects of

the content were summarized in a report that has been widely shared and is available on the MDTF-JSS website.

In addition, background information was compiled on recent judicial reforms in Serbia, the current structure and governance arrangements of the judiciary, and on the relevant stakeholders in the judicial system.

3. Caseload and Fiscal Data Collection (Megatable)

To ensure the Judicial Functional Review was based on solid data, a dedicated team collected caseload and fiscal data from various fragmented systems over several months. The process of obtaining, cleaning and presenting the data was subject to extensive consultation with Serbian stakeholders. The data was consolidated in a Megatable, which is available on the MDTF-JSS website. It is the first time in Serbia that all relevant caseload and fiscal data has been consolidated in one document.

4. Multi-Stakeholder Perception Survey

A comprehensive Multi-Stakeholder Perception Survey was carried out in 2013-2014 as a follow up to a 2009 baseline survey. This was a significant output, and is the most comprehensive justice sector stakeholder survey conducted outside of an OECD advanced judiciary. Indeed, there are few judiciaries even within the OECD who conduct such insightful and reliable surveys of court users and institutional stakeholders to inform policy-making. The questionnaires were developed to capture insights of the functioning of the judicial system from judges, prosecutors, administrative staff, lawyers, businesses and individuals (with and without recent court experience). The survey exercise was followed by a thorough data analysis presented in a final report. A series of dissemination events and workshops held throughout Serbia also increased awareness of the results. The survey is also available on the MDTF-JSS website.

5. Access to Justice Survey and Focus Group Discussion Findings

Moreover, an access to justice omnibus survey and focus group discussions were finalized to provide a solid empirical basis for the Access to Justice Chapter of the Judicial Functional Review. This was a deliberate effort to generate data about issues that would otherwise not be captured in available administration data from within the system. The omnibus survey in particular sought views as to why the general public are deterred from taking cases to court, and what barriers to justice are most pertinent for different demographic groups. The survey and focus group discussions looked at access to justice for the general population as well as the particular challenges faced by farmers, owners of small enterprises, and LGBT groups. The reports are also available on the MDTF-JSS website.

6. Process Maps to Measure Implementation Gaps

During the reporting period, the MDTF developed a new tool to measure implementation gaps – i.e. to identify the differences between procedures according to the ‘law on the books’ and the actual practice for certain rules-based processes in Serbia. The process maps generated through this exercise focus on criminal proceedings involving domestic violence, divorce proceedings, eviction procedures including enforcement, and utility bill procedures and enforcement. The maps were further analyzed to identify bottlenecks for access to justice in particular and the findings were presented in a publicly available final report. The process maps are also available on the MDTF-JSS website.¹

¹ The process maps were awarded the World Bank Innovation Award for Europe and Central Asia for 2015 for their innovative approach to identifying implementation gaps. A video of the methodology was developed here -

7. Essay and Photo Competition

In order to generate fresh and original suggestions from a wider group of stakeholders on how to improve accessibility, quality, or efficiency of justice services, the World Bank, in cooperation with IPSOS and Belgrade Center for Human Rights, organized an essay and photo competition. The goal of the essay competition was to outline in 500 words or less suggestions for improvements of the justice in Serbia. Participants in the photo competition shared their visions for the future of justice in Serbia post-accession to EU. We have received more than 100 essays and over 60 photos.

8. Stakeholder Workshops

Throughout the Judicial Functional Review process, a series of workshops and consultations were carried out under the MDTF-JSS in Belgrade and throughout the country. In earlier stages, the workshops focused on the proposed methodology and scope of the Functional Review process. Subsequently, a workshop was organized on the Performance Framework including all indicators and data sources to be used as an empirical basis for the Judicial Functional Review. As the analysis progressed, workshops were organized with Serbian justice sector officials as well as civil society organizations and European Commission representatives to share results for feedback and guidance.

9. Facilitation of Policy Dialogue and Donor Coordination

The MDTF-JSS also provided support to the MOJ in organizing various sessions of the Partners' Forum as a more formal outlet for sharing information among donors and stakeholders and facilitating policy dialogue. One such Partners' Forum was organized for the presentation of the initial findings of the Judicial Functional Review and to present and discuss the Government's draft Action Plan for Chapter 23 accession negotiations in October 2014. The MDTF-JSS Coordinator also made various presentations at the Annual Conference of Judges and other occasions to contribute to the policy dialogue on justice.

10. Knowledge Dissemination

In order to improve outreach and increase public awareness of MDTF-JSS advisory activities, a dedicated web portal has been maintained and adapted over time. The site also serves as a one stop shop for anybody interested in analytical work on the Serbian judicial system. The portal can be accessed at <http://mdtfjss.org.rs/en>.

Sub-component 1.2: Provision of Additional Advisory Services for Continued Justice Sector Reform

Several of these activities were amalgamated within the Judicial Functional Review process, as per the Functional Review Concept Note. This had the advantage of ensuring a comprehensive and integrated product while increasing stakeholder buy-in and reducing overhead and duplication.

1. Preparation of roadmap of projects to be used for planning and implementation of future initiatives in the Serbian Justice Sector

The recommendations under the Judicial Functional Review provide for a roadmap of activities to be used for planning and implementation of future reforms. The recommendations are comprehensive and cover the entire spectrum of Chapter 23 requirements. They are divided into short, mid-term, and long-term recommendations in order to ensure good sequencing. They also specify which institution of the sector should be responsible for implementation. These recommendations also provide input for the preparation

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-pngwL9sK2E> and a presentation was held in Brussels to showcase the utility of the methodology.

of Serbia's Chapter 23 Action Plan, the ultimate roadmap for future initiatives in Serbia's Justice Sector. They also act as a donor coordination tool.

2. Training

The MDTF-JSS has provided very limited formal training to Serbian justice sector officials during 2014. The approach of the MDTF-JSS to date has focused more on knowledge exchange and peer-to-peer learning through workshops that raise awareness and understanding of challenges and opportunities, and increase the appetite for more structural reform. For example, the MDTF-JSS organized a workshop on measuring justice system performance for judges, prosecutors and other officials which led to the development of the Justice Performance Framework (workshops in Nis and Belgrade in February 2014).

The MDTF-JSS Coordinator also presented at training events for judges and prosecutors on activities under the MDTF-JSS, such as the Multi-Stakeholder Perception Survey which increased understanding of user concerns to inform changes to policy and practice (Novi Sad, Nis and Belgrade workshops in March and April 2014).

Analytical input for improving training has been provided by the relevant section of the Judicial Functional Review and the analysis of the role of the Judicial Academy. The recommendations focus on strengthening the continuing training program through the development of a comprehensive training needs analysis and a large-scale investment in training of existing judges, prosecutors and court staff across the sector.

3. Development and promotion of a sector wide approach to supporting the sector:

Under the Government-executed component, the Reform and Accession Facilitation Unit (RAFU) has also provided critical support taking a sectoral approach.

The RAFU was also instrumental in drafting the Chapter 23 Accession Action Plan and conducting its various consultations across the sector. Without this support, the MOJ reports that the development of a Chapter 23 Action Plan would not have been possible.

At the same time, the MDTF-JSS ensured effective donor coordination as another necessary step towards the development of a SWAP. In itself it provides a mechanism for international cooperation in the area of justice for donors who contributed to the Trust Fund, but it also actively participated in bi-lateral and multi-lateral donor coordination meetings.

The MDTF-JSS Coordinator kept regular contacts with all donors outside the Trust Fund, such as USAID, GIZ and OSCE, and kept them informed of the progress of activities. As a result there was no overlap between the MDTF-JSS activities and other donor assistance to the Serbian judiciary.

On the substance of a SWAP, the Judicial Functional Review has taken a sector-wide approach to map system performance. This will allow donors to link their support to specific recommendations under the Review, create synergies and avoid overlap.

The Judicial Functional Review also informed the Chapter 23 Action Plan and the MOJ has undertaken to use it as the basis for their planning. For further progress on a SWAP in future, additional direction would be required from the Serbian European Integration Office (SEIO), which has purview over such matters.

4. Support for Development of Justice Sector Performance Indicators

The Justice Performance Framework provided in annexes 2 and 3 of the Judicial Functional Review Report is the result of an effort with all stakeholders to map relevant aspects of the functioning of the

judicial system to relevant indicators based on international and European best practice. At the same time, they are adapted for the Serbian context identifying the relevant data sources within the Serbian systems.

The Review itself identifies throughout its chapters the most suitable ways to measure relevant performance aspects, as well as their limitations. The framework has prompted dialogue within the MOJ and SCC regarding what data will need to be generated to drive performance improvements, and how that should be collected and compiled to enable prompt responses to requests from the Commission and others.

At the same time, the Performance Framework developed under the Judicial Functional Review provides guidance on what kind of data can be collected in the future for management purposes. Based on the analysis and indicators identified, detailed recommendations map the next steps towards the establishment of a statistical system to inform management decisions. In the course of the work, the dialogue on statistic data has also encouraged the judiciary to improve statistical practices, including their methods for collecting, analyzing and presenting data for SCC Annual Reports and SPC Annual Reports, and ways in which the Performance Framework can be adapted for the Judiciary's use. The SCC is continuing this work.

5. Advisory Support to the Development of Free Legal Aid

Under the Bank-executed component, two key analyses were produced to support the development of a legal aid system in Serbia.

A Comparative Analysis of Mechanisms for the Delivery of Legal Aid considered different delivery models of Free Legal Aid in Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina (Brčko), Lithuania, Croatia and Slovenia. The field work and data collection was conducted from November 2013 to January 2014. The report analyzes how these systems designed their beneficiary structure, the procedure for applying for legal aid, types of legal aid, non-eligible expenditures, legal aid providers, funding mechanisms, registers of providers and quality control mechanisms. The report also highlights good practices and lessons learned to inform the Legal Aid Working Group in Serbia as it considers options for legal aid service delivery.

Building on the comparative piece, the Fiscal Impact Analysis of Options for Delivery of Legal Aid in Serbia assessed the fiscal impact of the proposed Law on Free Legal Aid in Serbia (as drafted by December 2013). The analysis was prepared at the request of the Serbian Ministry of Justice and Public Administration. The data collection and interviews with legal aid providers were conducted in the period from August 2013 to January 2014.

This analysis looked at the fiscal impacts of different models in the Serbian context, noting that fiscal sustainability will be a key element to ensuring the success of a legal aid system. The report found that fiscal sustainability will require important decisions be made regarding the scale and scope of public access to legal aid.

The eligible population was defined as households / individuals currently receiving social benefits. The scope of services costed include all primary and secondary legal aid (as specified by the Serbian Constitution and draft Law on Legal Aid) related to Basic and Higher Court case demand. The report estimates case volume based on the historic patterns of case activity at municipal levels and uses those patterns to allocate current court caseloads back to municipalities. Cases considered include criminal (investigative and fault), civil litigation, uncontested civil cases, and execution/enforcement cases. The number of cases of each type expected to emerge from the demand of the target population (social benefit eligible population) is then estimated. These estimates are based on statistical models, which estimate the

relationship between municipal economic and demographic factors, including aid eligible population, on annual case volumes.

The final step was to estimate the costs of these cases based on alternative modes of delivering legal aid services. Costs are estimated for each case type at the municipal level and aggregated up to each basic and Higher Court and to the nation as a whole. The expected costs for different payment and delivery vehicles are also included.

The report was combined with two workshops together with the Free Legal Aid Working Group – one at a midway point in the process, and another event once the report was in a draft form. The Working Group was instrumental in ensuring the success of this process, which can inform the future design of the legal aid system.

Component 2. Supervision of Government-executed activities

The supervision of Government-executed activities included regular exchanges by email, phone or in person. Supervision includes periodic missions and policy dialogue, the provision of no objections to activities and ensuring that all financial management, procurement, safeguards, governance and anti-corruption, and related administrative and fiduciary obligations are met for the Government-executed activities. During 2014, the task team conducted ten missions to Serbia comprising various international and regional experts. For more information about each mission, see the relevant Aide Memoires that are available on the MDTF-JSS website.

Component 3. Trust Fund Administration and Program Management

The Trust Fund was managed and administered in accordance with trustee responsibilities. Major efforts went into donor coordination among the MDTF-JSS donors and with donors who do not contribute to the Trust Fund to exploit synergies and avoid overlaps. During the reporting period, this component also funded work in amending the Administration Agreement with the EU Delegation and the Grant Agreement with the MOJ, both of which were required to effect the reallocation of funds from the Government-executed component to the Bank-executed advisory services component to enable the Functional Review to commence.

Government-Executed Activities

Component 4. Technical Assistance

Sub-Component 4.1: Justice Sector Reform (and Accession) Facilitation Unit

One category of activities funded under the MDTF-JSS focuses on capacity-building within the MOJ and judiciary to design, coordinate and implement judicial reform and modernization programs.

Technical assistance conducted under this sub-component has been undertaken over two distinct phases during the reporting period. Up to December 2013, much of the technical assistance was provided via a Reform Facilitation Unit (RFU) at the MOJ. From January 2014 to date, such technical assistance has been provided by a Reform and Accession Facilitation Unit (RAFU) that is housed in the MOJ but operates more sectorally.

The transition from a RFU to a RAFU was a decision taken by the donors at the Management Committee in late 2013 and became effective in January 2014. The graduation to a second phase of technical assistance reflects the evolution of the MDTF-JSS support to the sector. Consultants has gradually shifted from short-term in-house roles within the MOJ to a more sector-wide approach that places a higher value on capacity building, sustainability, and a greater focus on results.

Under the RAFU, individual consultants are required to conduct daily twinning tasks with government officials to share information, research and lessons learned, in recognition that the agencies currently lack the capacity to conduct this work alone. In order to provide the MOJ with the required capacity for the EU accession negotiation process, the donors decided to continue funding this unit with an explicit focus on EU accession. (Hence the change of the unit's name to Reform *and* Accession Facilitation Unit).

The RAFU aims to support more effective consultation and coordination across agencies. For example, RAFU consultants have been instrumental in conducting consultations on the Chapter 23 Accession Action Plan, including dialogue with professional associations and CSOs.

Each consultant is required to produce certain results that are linked in their Terms of Reference with the accession process and elements of the draft Chapter 23 Accession Action Plan, and the Assistant Minister for European Integration at the MOJ is responsible for reporting these results directly to the Management Committee.

The donors approved this modified arrangement for initially one year, until the end of 2014, subject to satisfactory performance and budget.

Throughout 2014, the MDTF-JSS funded twelve consultants for the following areas:

1. Consultant for the Reform of Criminal Justice System,
2. Consultant for the Reform of Civil Law System,
3. Consultant for Access to Justice,
4. Consultant for the Reform of the Judicial Network,
5. Consultant for Judicial Academy Competency/Education,
6. Consultant for Constitutional Framework,
7. Consultant for Outreach and Communication,
8. Consultant for the Reform of Legal Professions,
9. Consultant for Human Rights,
10. Consultant for Anticorruption,
11. Consultant for Justice Sector Data Analysis/ Budgeting,
12. Consultant for Administrative Courts System.

In late 2014, the MDTF-JSS donors approved an extension of the RAFU arrangement for 2015. Twelve consultants to be based in the MOJ were approved for the following areas:

1. Consultant for the Reform of Criminal Justice System,
2. Consultant for the Reform of Civil Law System,
3. Consultant for Access to Justice,
4. Consultant for the Reform of the Judicial Network,
5. Consultant for Judicial Academy Competency/Education,
6. Consultant for Constitutional Framework,
7. Consultant for Outreach and Communication,
8. Consultant for the Reform of Legal Professions,
9. Consultant for Human Rights,
10. Consultant for Anticorruption,
11. Consultant for Justice Sector Data Analysis/ Budgeting,
12. ICT Consultant for Support to the Judicial Modernization,

In addition, it was decided to provide RAFU support to the SCC by three consultants in the areas of:

1. Senior Legal Advisor – Court Jurisprudence Specialist,

2. Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist,
3. Senior ICT Advisor – Court Automation and Caseload Statistics Specialist.

These consultants report directly to the President of the SCC and support the President's cabinet to spearhead and implement reforms across the court network. They work across the reform agenda but with specific focus on issues of high relevance to EU integration, in particular backlog reduction, case harmonization and improvements in statistical reporting and monitoring of reforms.

Sub-Component 4.2: Access to Justice

No significant Government-executed activities under this Access to Justice Component were carried out during the reporting period. An Access to Justice Consultant is based at the MOJ and has supported the development of a draft Free Legal Aid Law. Several retreats and workshops have also been funded. However, the FLA Law did not pass in 2014, despite multiple versions of the draft law apparently reaching near-consensus among stakeholders. The passage of the law is a pre-requisite to the further activities planned under this Component, including the development of by-laws, training, a public awareness campaign, etc.

In the intervening period therefore, access to justice activities focused on the Bank-executed advisory services – the comparative analysis and the fiscal impact analysis – as well as ensuring comprehensive coverage of access to justice as part of the Serbia Judicial Functional Review.

For information regarding the recipient executed component, see the Annual Report of the Grant prepared by the PIU which is available on the MDTF-JSS website.

Visibility Measures

The MDTF-JSS has ensured its various donors receive equal visibility. All publications and the website prominently feature the logo or flag of the respective donor, including the European Commission, and their contributions are explicitly acknowledged. At public events, the MDTF-JSS team routinely thanks the MDTF-JSS donors for their generous contributions.

Visibility of the MDTF-JSS and its donors was also highlighted through various external relations activities which sought to disseminate project results among broader target groups. These included various dissemination events, press releases, TV interviews, photo and essay competitions, infographics, blogs and social media posts. Through these varied efforts, the MDTF-JSS managed to reach beyond traditionally narrow institutional stakeholders to raise awareness of justice sector reforms being supported by donors.