



## PEER REVIEW/VALIDATION WORKSHOP REPORT

The above workshop was held between 1-3 April, 2008, at the Amari Watergate Hotel, Bangkok, with the full programme attached in **Annex One**.

The aim of the Peer Review/Validation Workshop was to maximise the quality and relevance of the proposed publication's content, and promote ownership of the initiative within the APJRF's membership. The workshop's objectives were to provide a forum to:

- enable chapter authors and reviewers to interact and discuss the feedback developed on each chapter contribution;
- further develop the network of engaged judicial reform actors interested in developing effective reform activities in the region; and
- formally sign off on the content, scope and direction of the publication.

A total of 29 participants were involved in the workshop. The facilitation team was the APJRF Network Facilitator, Mr. Lorenz Metzner, the project's Technical Editor, Mr. Livingston Armytage, and UNDP Programme Specialist, Justice and Human Rights, Ms. Emilia Mugnai. In addition, members of the: Project Board; Peer Reviewers; APJRF Secretariat; International Commission of Jurists; and UNDP Regional Centre Bangkok participated. A full list of participants is found in **Annex Two**.

While the workshop's principal focus was on the publication, the first day also focused on the network-related aspects of the project. In the plenary discussion on '*Visions for the APJRF Network*' participants strongly emphasised the need for future APJRF activities to focus on maximising the impact of the know-how developed in the publication. This was seen as important, so that it becomes possible to: actively disseminate the know-how developed in member countries; begin contextualising the know-how at the country-level; and undertake ongoing networking activities to connect, inform, and empower reform actors across the region. A summary of the outcomes of this discussion is found in **Annex Three**.

The second and third days of the workshop focussed exclusively on finalising the review process and strengthening the technical aspects of the chapter contributions. Through a combination of facilitated plenary discussions and chapter-based small team interactive sessions, the content and feedback developed for each chapter contribution were discussed, fine-tuned, and finalised. The sessions also provided validation of the experience-based approach underlying the drafting approach - namely, that by:

- using practical reform experience as the basis of each chapter contribution; and
- developing know-how from critical self-analysis of strengths and weaknesses of this experience,

concepts of good practice in judicial reform relevant to the regional readership are being developed.

This has been a significant evolution in the nature of the publication. A consequence of the volume's analytical focus is that it will be a useful resource for a wider audience than originally anticipated. It also has the impact that the title will need to be reviewed, as the term 'handbook' no longer aligns with the content as developed.

The review and validation process formally concluded at the end of the second day with the second Project Board meeting. Key publication-related outcomes included:

- Formal signing off by the Project Board on the focus, scope and content of the



volume, thereby completing the Peer Review and Validation process.

- Exploring the best method(s) to publish, with the possibility of professional publication now being explored.
- Discussing the way forward - principally; the publication's launch, its dissemination, use of the know-how developed, and promoting the wider APJRF network.

The workshop participants were requested to complete a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the workshop at its conclusion. The responses received, illustrate that the workshop was very successful with the mean score for the workshop as a whole being assessed at almost 85% (details of the evaluation are found in **Annex Four**.) In qualitative feedback received, participants expressed the views that the interactive discussions between authors and reviewers on individual chapters had been extremely useful to finalise the content. They also noted that, given the positive engagement, additional time could have been allocated in substantive interaction on chapter contributions to maximise the benefit of the presence of authors and reviewers.

The Peer Review/Validation Workshop focussed on finalising the volume's content and direction - the outcomes achieved show that this was accomplished. In addition, the workshop provided a valuable forum for expanding the APJRF network. By further developing a core group of engaged reform actors, a resource is being created for the APJRF to support its future publication- and network-related activities.



## ANNEX ONE - PROGRAMME-AT-A-GLANCE

Day One (1 <sup>st</sup> April, 2008 - Tuesday) Theme: THE APJRF NETWORK		Responsibility
<b>Those Involved:</b> ◆ Peer Reviewers; ◆ Chapter Authors (CA); and ◆ Facilitation Team		
<b>11:00-11:30 Tea &amp; Coffee</b>		
11:30-11:45	<i>Welcome:</i> - Chair Project Board - Chair APJRF Secretariat - UNDP Representative	Chair PB/ UNDP/Chair APJRF
11:45-12:30	<i>Introduction to the Workshop:</i> - Introductions of review panel and chapter authors - Overview of the Judicial Reform Handbook project - Aims of the Workshop - Outcomes from the Workshop	Network Facilitator (NF)
<b>12.30-14:00 Lunch</b>		
14:00-15:45	<i>'Visions for the APJRF Network'</i> Panel/Facilitated Group Discussion	Chair APJRF
<b>15.45-16.00 Afternoon Break</b>		
16.00-17.15	<i>Judicial Reform Handbook:</i> - Drafting the Handbook's content and style - Review, refinement and validation - Ideas and suggestions from the Panel - Reviewers invited to speak in plenary on Handbook generally, or on chapters <i>other than</i> their dedicated review-chapter	Technical Editor (TE)
17:15-	Wrap-up of the day's activities	NF
<b>19.00- Dinner Reception</b>		



<b>Day Two (2<sup>nd</sup> April, 2008 - Wednesday)</b>		<b>Responsibility</b>
<b>Theme - APJRF HANDBOOK: FEEDBACK</b>		
<b>Those Involved:</b>		
◆ Peer Reviewers; ◆ CA; and ◆ Facilitation Team		
<b>8:00-8:30</b>	<b>Tea &amp; Coffee</b>	
8:30-10:00	Chapter Authors' individual statements of Key Messages (5 min each.)	CA/All
<b>10.00-10.15</b>	<b>Morning Break</b>	
10:15-13:00	<i>Interactive Discussion on, and Review of, Chapters:</i> Chapter topic-based 'teams' (combining chapter authors and dedicated reviewers) to discuss the chapter contributions	All
<b>13:00-14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
14:00-16:30	<i>Facilitated Plenary Discussion:</i> Summary of each teams' chapter topic-based discussions to inform the group of the outcomes for each chapter	CA/All - facilitated by TE
16:30-16:45	Wrap-up of the review activities of the Workshop	NF/EM
<b>16.45-17:00</b>	<b>Afternoon Break</b>	
17:00-17:50	<i>Project Board Meeting:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sign off on the Handbook drafting and review processes, and the outcomes of the workshop</li> <li>- Confirmation of approval of project reports/activities to-date</li> <li>- Discussion on other project-related matters/activities</li> <li>- Other matters</li> </ul>	PB & NF/TE/EM
<b>Day Three (3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2008 - Thursday)</b>		<b>Responsibility</b>
<b>Theme - SETTLING The HANDBOOK</b>		
<b>Those Involved:</b>		
◆ CA; and ◆ Facilitation Team		
<b>8:30-9:00</b>	<b>Tea &amp; Coffee</b>	
9:00-9:30	Discussion between CAs for 3 <sup>rd</sup> chapter topic and Facilitation Team to discuss what is required to finalise were chapter	CA/Facilitation Team
9:30-10:00	Discussion between CAs for 2 <sup>nd</sup> chapter topic and Facilitation Team to discuss what is required to finalise were chapter	CA/Facilitation Team
10:00-10:30	Discussion between CAs for 4 <sup>th</sup> chapter topic and Facilitation Team to discuss what is required to finalise were chapter	CA/Facilitation Team
10:30-11:00	Discussion between CAs for 1 <sup>st</sup> chapter topic and Facilitation Team to discuss what is required to finalise were chapter	CA/Facilitation Team
11:00-11:30	Discussion between CAs for 5 <sup>th</sup> chapter topic and Facilitation Team to discuss what is required to finalise were chapter	CA/Facilitation Team
<b>12.00-13:30</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	



## ANNEX TWO - WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

### A2.1 PROJECT BOARD/PEER REVIEWERS

Name	Position
Fr. Ranhilio Aquino	- Chair, PHILJA Department of Jurisprudence and Legal Philosophy
Hon. Anthony Carpio	- Justice, Supreme Court of Philippines
D'ato Param Cumaraswamy	- Honorary Member, International Commission of Jurists
Ms. Lynnsay Rongokea Francis	- Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development
Hon. Kenneth Hayne	- Justice, High Court of Australia
Dr. Fakir Hussain	- Law and Justice Commission, Pakistan
Mr. Sudarshan Ramaswamy	- Justice and Law Reform Advisor, UNDP Regional Centre, Bangkok (RCB)
Mr. Warwick Soden	- Principal Registrar and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Court of Australia

### A2.2 CHAPTER AUTHORS

Name	Position
Hon. Dr. Ananda BHATTARAI	- Justice Appellate Court (Nepal), National Judicial Academy, Core Faculty
Ms. Ayesha DIAS	- Program Director, HR & International Natural Resources Industry and Corporate Social Responsibility, University of Dundee, Scotland
Hon. Zenaida ELEPANO*	- Court Administrator and Professor, Philippines Judicial Academy
Prof. Myrna FELICIANO	- Professor and consultant to the Supreme Court of the Philippines
Dr. Mohan GOPAL	- Director, National Judicial Academy, Bhopal, India
Ms. Anita JOWITT	- Lecturer, School of Law, University of the South Pacific, Vanuatu
Mr. Hari PHUYAL	- International Commission of Jurists (Nepal)
Mr. Aria SUYUDI*	- Supreme Court of Indonesia Judicial Reform Team Member & Program Director, Center for Indonesian Legal & Policy Studies (Pusat Studi Hukum & Kebijakan Indonesia (PSHK))
Mr. Ly TAYSENG*	- General Secretary of the Cambodia Bar Association, Royal School for Judges and Prosecutors, Faculty

### A2.3 FACILITATION TEAM

Name	Role
Mr. Livingston ARMYTAGE	- Technical Editor & Session Facilitator
Mr. Lorenz METZNER	- Network Facilitator & Session Facilitator
Ms. Emilia MUGNAI	- Programme Specialist, Justice & Human Rights, UNDP RCB

\* **Note:** The PHILIPPINE JUDICIAL ACADEMY, Hon. Sathavy KIM, and Hon. Prof. Dr. Paulus LOTULUNG respectively nominated the identified authors to represent them at the Peer Review/Validation Workshop.



## A2.4 SELECTED PARTICIPANTS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>
Ms. Radhika BEHURIA	- Programme Analyst - Gender, UNDP RCB
Ms. Helen BURROWS	- Director International Programs, Federal Court of Australia
Ms. Elain CHAN	- Project Officer, International Commission of Jurists, Asia-Pacific Programme
Mr. Paul GREEN	- Legal Officer, International Commission of Jurists, Asia-Pacific Programme
Ms. Marcia KRAN	- Officer in Charge, UNDP RCB
Ms. Roohi METCALFE	- Gender and Governance Specialist, UNDP RCB
Ms. Mary O'SHEA	- Programme Analyst - Justice and Human Rights, UNDP RCB
Ms. Chandra ROY	- Coordinator, Regional Initiative on Indigenous Rights and Development, UNDP RCB
Ms. Panvirush VITTAYAPRAPHAKUL	- Governance Practice Team Assistant, UNDP RCB



## **ANNEX THREE - NOTES FROM THE WORKSHOP SESSION 'VISIONS FOR THE APJRF' POSSIBLE FUTURE DIRECTIONS**

### **1) *Disseminating the chapters and learning in each country:***

- Disseminate/involve civil society to generate demand for reform.
- Partner with existing networks to disseminate and expand the influence of the handbook.

### **2) *Interact with Sub-regional groups (initially using a 'pilot project' approach) focussing on chapters/content, to:***

- Identify countries to develop linkages with based on existing engagement and interest (then generate lessons and additional knowledge to engage others.)
- Facilitate discussions on judicial reform.
- Support pilot implementation of judicial reform based on the knowledge in the Handbook.
- Disseminate/involve civil society to generate demand for reform.
- Members/champions of the network that have expertise and experience in areas of judicial reform to give peer to peer support to other countries.

### **3) *Support for developing locally relevant 'Handbooks' as practical guide to the process for judicial reform (start from mapping of country experience):***

- Map judicial reform experiences in AP countries.
- Prioritise countries for judicial reform based on existing engagement and interest (then generate lessons and additional knowledge to engage others.)
- Handbook as a living document that needs to be piloted and then continuously amended.

### **4) *Peer to peer networking between courts etc:***

- Members/champions of the network that have expertise and experience in areas of judicial reform to give peer to peer support to other countries.

### **5) *Connect different stakeholders in the justice sector to support reform (including donors.)***



## ANNEX FOUR - WORKSHOP EVALUATION (1-3 APRIL, 2008)

The end-of-workshop evaluation (both qualitative and quantitative elements) was completed by all eight chapter authors. The qualitative evaluation was based on the following questions:

1. Was the workshop **useful** to discuss future directions for the Handbook/APJRF Network?
2. Was the workshop **practical** and **useful** to discuss and finalise the Handbook's content?
3. Did you find that the workshop facilitation was **effective** and allowed for adequate **participation, discussion, and interaction**?
4. Overall, were you **satisfied** with the workshop?

Responses received were as follows:

<b>Workshop-as-a-Whole Evaluation</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
1. Workshop - Useful to discuss future directions	87.88%
2. Workshop - Practical and Useful to finalise Handbook's content	84.85%
3. Effectiveness of Participation, Discussion & Interaction	87.88%
4. Overall Satisfaction with the Workshop	78.79%
<b>Workshop Mean Score:</b>	<b>84.85%</b>

In addition qualitative feedback was also sought with a number of key feedback 'themes' identified, including that:

- Interactive discussions on individual chapters between authors and reviewers was very useful;
- Plenary discussions on handbook content and substantive issues could have been longer "...there were interesting discussions and comments";
- The session on vision for APJRF network was interesting but not all participants were familiar enough with the APJRF to fully contribute;
- "The overall planning and administration of the programme so far has been very impressive..."