



European Judicial Training Network
Réseau Européen de Formation Judiciaire

Compendium of Best Practices identified by Participants in an EJTN Judicial Exchange



**Funded by
the European Union**

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Foreword

When the European Parliament called for the creation of exchange activities for justice practitioners in 2005, it marked the beginning of a new chapter in European judicial training. A year later, in 2006, the European Commission formalised this ambition by entrusting the European Judicial Training Network with the responsibility for organising exchanges and recognising EJTN as the most appropriate authority to give this important initiative a truly European dimension.

Twenty years later, the EJTN Exchange Programme has grown into one of the cornerstones of European judicial training. It has welcomed a total of more than 30,000 justice practitioners, who have been eager to engage with their peers from different European countries, to broaden their understanding of EU law, and to strengthen cross-border cooperation and other areas central to the common European judicial culture.

To build on the 20-year success of the programme, this publication was developed to collect and share the insights, reflections, and innovative approaches identified by participants during their exchanges. It highlights best practices, demonstrates the impact of exchanges at the national level, and promotes their sharing and application to support a strong Europe of Justice.

The publication is composed of two complementary parts: a compendium listing the best practices, and a research report that contextualises these practices, and provides analysis and comparison of the most effective approaches. Together, these sections offer a unique perspective, capturing first-hand experience and practical knowledge. Of course, the practices highlighted are subjective experiences by participants and should not be taken as the only effective approaches. However, I believe they provide a foundation for learning and continued innovation.

The EJTN Exchange Programme would not be possible without the active involvement of our Members, Associate Members and Partners, and I want to express my sincere thanks for their dedication and hard work. I am also grateful to the European Commission for its continued support in making our activities possible.

I hope this publication will serve as a valuable tool for EJTN Members and Associate Members, judicial authorities, exchange participants, and other stakeholders involved in judicial training and cross-border cooperation across the EU.

Ingrid Derveaux
EJTN Secretary General

Acknowledgement

This Compendium of Best Practices is the result of an initiative from the EJTN Exchange Programme Working Group which is in charge of planning and implementing judicial exchanges. It involved the support and dedication of several key contributors who made this publication possible.

EJTN would like to acknowledge the continued financial support of the European Commission, which has enabled justice practitioners to gain first-hand experience of the judicial systems across EU Member States over the past 20 years.

Special thanks to the Editorial Committee members whose time, insights, review and direction were essential: Raf van Ransbeeck, Belgian Judicial Training Institute; Kalina Tzakova and Stanimir Keremidchiev, Bulgarian National Institute of Justice; José Pablo Carrera Fernández, Spanish Judicial School; and Valter Batista, Portuguese Centre for Judicial Studies.

EJTN would like to thank those Exchange Programme national contact points for their invaluable support in verifying the tables contained in this Compendium and for providing additional information where needed. The views expressed in this publication are extracted from the participants' reports submitted after their exchange and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of EJTN's Members and Associate Members or of EJTN.

The data analysis and synthesis of the participants' reports as well as the side research contained in this publication were conducted with the help of Madeline Garber, EJTN intern and student at the American University, under the supervision and guidance of the EJTN secretariat, particularly Aude Magen, Head of Unit, and Chrystelle de Coligny, Senior Project Manager. Special attention was given to the presentation and dissemination of this publication by Iiris André, EJTN Communications Manager.

Finally, EJTN wishes to acknowledge the efforts and support of all judges, prosecutors, court staff and trainers willing to host their colleagues from other EU Member States and the 1,109 participants who took part in a judicial exchange and observed the best practices highlighted in this Compendium.

Contents

Foreword	2
Acknowledgement	3
Introduction	6
Background, Timeline and Methodology	7
1. Background	7
2. Project Timeline	7
3. Research Methodology	8
Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices	10
Austria	11
Belgium	12
Bulgaria	13
Croatia	15
Czech Republic	16
Estonia	17
Finland	18
France	19
Germany	21
Greece	23
Hungary	25
Ireland	26
Italy	27
Latvia	29
Lithuania	30
Malta	31
Netherlands	32
Poland	34
Portugal	36
Romania	38
Slovakia	39
Slovenia	40
Spain	41
Sweden	43

Part 2 – Research Report on Best Practices	44
1. Individual Practices	45
1.1. Communication and Collaboration	45
1.2. Emotional Well-Being and Work-Life Balance	46
2. Institutional Practices.....	48
2.1. Digitalisation.....	48
2.2. Protection and Safety of Victims	49
2.3. Reforms in Penal Systems.....	52
2.4. Judicial and Court Structure	54
2.5. Cross-Border Relations	55
2.6. Specialised Departments and Units	57
2.7. Social Assistance Programmes	59
Works Cited.....	60

Introduction

As the principal platform and promoter for the training and exchange of knowledge of the European judiciary, the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) play a key role in developing a European judicial culture based on mutual trust between judicial authorities in the European judicial area. Each year, EJTN organises over 1,000 judicial exchanges enabling judges, prosecutors, court staff and judicial trainers across the EU to gain valuable insights into the judicial system and daily practice of their counterpart and how European instruments are implemented in other EU Member States.

In addition to discovering the legal environment of their host country, participants observe, compare and share views and experiences on the best legal and institutional practices. Through an EJTN exchange, participants are exposed to practices and legal traditions that differ from their home country. While many participants have noted that there were similarities between their judicial system and the one of the host country, many observed practices worth highlighting and which could be beneficial for implementation across other EU Member States.

This Compendium of best practices is based on the observations of 1,109 participants in the EJTN Exchange Programme 2024¹. These practices are subjective in nature as the analysis relies on the opinions of the participants themselves. Furthermore, practices underlined in this Compendium should not undermine the existence of other best practices in the EU Member States that were either not put forward by the participants or discussed during the exchange experience.

This Compendium underscores the best practices implemented by specific host institutions and identified by the participants (part 1 – Compendium Tables) and is further supplemented by outside resources to legitimise the observations made by the participants (part 2 – Research Report). It is comprised of individual practices – i.e. measures or initiatives that can be implemented on an individual or smaller scale – and institutional practices – i.e. specific structures, measures or tools that are derived from the institution itself or broader judicial policies and may take longer to implement.

This Compendium aims to serve as a comprehensive resource for the network and beyond, capturing a wide range of practical knowledge and insights gained through shared experience and discussions between the participants and their counterparts.

¹ Data collected is based on the evaluation reports completed by the participants after their general exchange, specialised exchange or exchange for judicial trainers. This Compendium does not include data from the participants in an exchange for judicial leaders given the different evaluation tools applied under this category of exchange.

Background, Timeline and Methodology

This section presents the background, timeline and methodology that led to the Compendium of Best Practices identified by Participants in an EJTN Judicial Exchange. It details the rationale and process that initiated such a project and the methodology that was followed to analyse, synthesise and contextualise the best practices comprised in this Compendium.

1. Background

After their EJTN judicial exchange, participants are invited to reflect on their exchange experience and its impact and benefits. In particular, they are asked to elaborate on best practices they observed during their exchange, and compare and contrast them with their own judicial system. In an effort to share the benefits of such reflection on best judicial practices to a wider scale, the EJTN Exchange Programme Working Group launched the development of a publication that consolidates the most valuable practices shared by the participants in an EJTN judicial exchange.

2. Project Timeline

This Compendium project was implemented following a three-phase structure. Each phase is further detailed in the following paragraphs.

The first phase included the specialised aspects of the project with the analysis and research into the data collected in the reports of the 1,109 participants in the EJTN general, specialised and judicial trainers exchanges in 2024. The methodology is further explained in the next section (*3. Research Methodology*). In addition, following the launch of the project by the EJTN Exchange Programme Working Group, several Working Group members volunteered to take part in the Editorial Committee whose role was to oversee and direct the development of the publication. It consisted of representatives from the following EJTN members: Belgian Judicial Training Institute, Bulgarian National Institute of Justice, Spanish Judicial School, and Portuguese Centre for Judicial Studies. Once the analysis and research were completed, the Editorial Committee convened to validate the research process and next steps of the project.

The draft Compendium tables and Research report were then presented together with the proposed next steps to the Exchange Programme national contact points and Working Group. This initiated the second phase of the project which consisted in a consultation of the national contact points to verify the best practices listed in part 1 of this Compendium. Once this consultation was completed, the Editorial Committee planned the next steps.

The third phase of the project implied a thorough review of the draft tables and research in light of the comments received from the national contact points. A final draft was prepared and submitted to the Editorial Committee that proofread the entire document before publication.

Overall, the below chart shows the timeline of the project from the data collection to the publication of this Compendium of Best Practices identified by Participants in an EJTN Judicial Exchange.



3. Research Methodology

The analysis and research that was conducted aims to identify and compare the most effective judicial practices observed by participants in EJTN judicial exchanges. It aims to showcase not only the benefits of the exchanges themselves, but also to create a practical tool that can guide the implementation of best practices across other EU Member States. This resource offers valuable insights into the different legal systems, providing a foundation for future improvements and continued legal and judicial collaboration among EU Member States. The following paragraphs outline the methodology used to synthesise, analyse and contextualise the feedback of the participants.

The first step in the research process required the organisation of the raw data provided by the survey results. Each set of data was separated according to the category of exchange (i.e. general, specialised, trainers). This data was subsequently reorganised by country, which allowed for further understanding of legal and judicial trends commonly found within the specific host countries.

Exchanges for judicial leaders were however not included. The evaluation tools for this type of exchanges differ from other categories of exchanges and a reflection on the best practices observed in their host country is required with a six-month delay after completion of their exchange. The research was conducted early 2025, when the data on the best practices was not yet available as not all delayed surveys had been sent to the participants in an exchange for judicial leaders.

The second step in the research process was the synthesis of the newly organised data. This was the more abstract part of the process given that there was no official definition of a “best practice”, however many of the survey responses provided comprehensive explanations and comparisons of practices within the EU. Because there were many qualifications of “good practices”, the analysis was conducted on a broader scale by making note of individual practices – i.e. measures or initiatives that can be implemented on an individual or smaller scale – and institutional practices – i.e. specific

structures, measures or tools that are derived from the institution itself or broader judicial policies and may take longer to implement. These practices were similarly divided by country and category of exchange. The results of this synthesis, presented in a table format by country, may be found in part 1 of this Compendium.

The third step of this methodology was narrowing the scope of the findings through extensive research and feasibility of implementation. The data analysis was supplemented by outside sources. These sources confirmed facts as well as contextualised many of the observations made by the participants. The following sources were consulted to ensure credibility: academic literature, news reports, and institutional databases. The results of this research may be found in part 2 of this Compendium.

Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices

This first part of the Compendium presents in a table format the best practices by host country – i.e. country who welcomed participants in an EJTN judicial exchange in 2024. Practices that were included are based on the data collected through the online reports completed by the participants immediately after their exchange. Each country table includes the individual and institutional practices organised according to the following categories of exchange:

- **General exchanges**, which enable judges, prosecutors and court staff to learn about the judicial system of the host country by attending court hearings, visiting relevant judicial institutions and meeting with their peers. In the tables, the best practices identified by judges and prosecutors are separated from the best practices identified by court staff.
- **Specialised exchanges**, which offer judges, prosecutors and court staff an in-depth exchange experience in their field of expertise in the court or prosecution office of another EU Member State.
- **Exchanges for judicial trainers**, which allow trainers of judges, prosecutors and court staff to exchange experience and actively explore other judicial training cultures and their training methodologies, tools and initiatives.

The below definitions should be considered when consulting the tables included in this part:

- **Individual practices** are measures or initiatives that can be implemented on an individual or smaller scale.
- **Institutional practices** are specific structures, measures or tools that are derived from the institution itself or broader judicial policies and may take longer to implement.
- The mention '**not applicable**' means either that no best practice was reported by the participants or that the host country did not organise exchange under the specific category of exchange.

The practices highlighted in the following tables are subjective in nature as the analysis relies on the opinions of the participants themselves. Furthermore, practices underlined in this Compendium should not undermine the existence of other best practices in the EU Member States that were either not put forward by the participants or discussed during the exchange experience.

AUSTRIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Host institution was extremely organised - Advanced digital tools for case management - Emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration	- “CLOSE TO project” - Developing integration of AI in the courts - Strong judge competences - ‘Sprengelrichter’(district judges) who can be flexibly deployed in the district - Mediation and alternative dispute resolution
General exchanges for court staff	- Communicative and professional during court proceedings and between the administrative bodies and courts - Effective division of labour - Court staff was professional and enthusiastic about their jobs	- Parties during an asylum case could have their grievances heard during the court hearing - Specialised finance court: judges had professional experience in finance and acquired practical expertise - Effective and streamlined process of judicial enforcement - MoVo App for bailiffs organises progress and protocols (contributes to the digitalisation of legal systems) - Bailiff can enter a home without an additional court order if debtor is unresponsive
Specialised Exchanges	- Collaborative environment	- Panel deliberation in some procedures in family law cases as opposed to one judge
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

BELGIUM

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Emphasis placed on collaboration and emotional intelligence	- Additional investigation phase with a competent investigating judge - Progressive prison “Haren” with the goal of reintegration - High Council for Justice (HCJ) which is independent of the executive and legislative branches
General exchanges for court staff	- Strict subdivisions of duties - Digital connection to police divisions within Belgium - Organised and flexibility in hiring new staff	- Synchronised sharing platform that streamlined communication and access to changing information - Advanced criminal mediation institute - Advanced form of victim support services - First-instance court- <i>tribunal de première instance</i> - Frequent pre-trial detention hearings - Emergency magistrate
Specialised exchanges	- Speed and quality of the trial stood out	- Comprehensive legal support is provided
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Emphasis on continuous training practices so that professionals can adapt and remain updated on new laws and procedures on both national and international levels	- Access to both online and in-person training resources

BULGARIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- High levels of cooperation between courts and other judicial institutions - Notable transparency and digitalisation - Computerised allocation of incoming cases	- Continuous training, particularly development of soft skills beyond technical skills - Emphasis on the protection and safety of minor victims - Use of lay judges in court hearings in criminal cases in the first instance (in a panel with professional judge/s) - Anti-corruption units
General exchanges for court staff	- Digital court management system - Educational programmes (open doors initiatives) for youth, promoted by the court - Members of court were noted to be extremely professional	- Digitalisation of files and court procedure allows citizens a better opportunity to stay informed - Advanced form of Alternative Dispute Resolution - Blue Rooms intend to provide a child-friendly and non-intimidating atmosphere for minors involved in legal proceedings (whether as a victim or witness in a criminal case, or in a family court procedure)
Specialised exchanges	- In bigger courts judges have specialisations depending on their knowledge base (e.g. insurance)	- Judges with relevant specialisation meet with the children on family cases. Children are included in the decision making that affect their lives - Mediation centre
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Training material was engaging with access to gamified learning tools	- Access to online training materials - Programme council at the judicial school in Bulgaria contributes to the quality of the training

		- Access to library of electronic resources for justice officials
--	--	---

CROATIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- E-filing to streamline case handling and reduce court delays	- Specialised court equipped to handle insolvency cases - Specialised courts to handle misdemeanours
General exchanges for court staff	- Effective digitalisation system with direct communication with the police - Rapid exchange of information contributes to greater transparency, thus giving rise to an increase in trust in judicial institutions	- Specialised courts/commercial courts-dealing with insolvency cases - Interview of victims of domestic violence crimes are carried out separately from the court or police station - Publishes all court decisions for transparency but anonymises them using AI - Probation Office that implements social programmes that emphasise rehabilitation and reintegration
Specialised exchanges	- Mention of the development of a “Barnahus” or a childhood house, interagency model to respond to child violence and witness of violence	- Formal recording of witness evidence: lawyers sign off on a recording of the proceedings - Educational Institution for Juvenile Delinquents and Centre for Providing Services to the Community A large focus on education and rehabilitation to encourage adolescents to re-enter society (helps prevent recidivism rates) - Assistance for familial supervision and professional help
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

CZECH REPUBLIC

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Emphasis on the principle of judicial independence- courts operate independently of political and governmental influence - Notable efficiency and speed of cases	- Operational use of the secretariat to avoid complexities brought on by the bureaucratic nature of the justice system - Significant role of the Constitutional Court - National Drug Headquarter
General exchanges for court staff	- Work of judicial staff is divided among clerks and assistant judges - High-tech security measures at the court facilities - Transparency through public access to records and court proceedings	- Continuous training and education programs implemented for the development of judicial staff - Emphasis placed on alternative dispute resolution (arbitration and mediation)
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	Not applicable
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	- ASJA- powerful IT tool that offers seminars and online training, while simplifying research and collaboration - Institute of Criminalistics which reduces judicial conflict and errors - Jiřice prison which contains accommodation facilities and open prison concept modelled after the Nordic prison system

ESTONIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Advanced digitalisation process- fully developed digital identity for all Estonian citizens - High levels of communication and efficiency among all levels of the court system - Efficient division of labour	- Successful integration of technology which allows for direct communication among parties involved in each proceeding- also allows for 24-hour access to public services - Recordings of court hearings and automated transmission of said recordings - Summary of each party's defence before court proceedings begin
General exchanges for court staff	- Considered one of the most efficient legal systems due to digitalisation	- Legal procedures are notably faster than other countries due to the management of documents online - Telematic criminal trials which could help in the backlogging of other legal proceedings
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	Not applicable
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

FINLAND

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- High level of public trust in the Finnish judicial system - Notable communication and engagement - Praise of work-life balance and comfortable work environment	- Mediation (ADR) is emphasised as an alternative to a lengthy and relatively expensive trial - Finnish prison system coincides with Nordic prison goals - Language in court must be understandable to the defendant allowing citizens to testify and be heard in their native language
General exchanges for court staff	- Extremely friendly work environment - Open work-space to encourage collaboration and positive relations among court staff - Advanced in digitalisation (comprehensive electronic case management) - Promotion of a healthy work-life balance which contributes to overall workplace wellbeing and efficiency	- Mediation as a negotiation facilitated by judges and specialised lawyers (ADR) - A panel of judges or a panel of a judge and layperson provides quality to the assessment of the case and is a learning opportunity for the more inexperienced (junior) judges. - Participation and taking of evidence is widely possible via videoconference/remotely. - National Enforcement Authority, independent of the judicial system for neutrality - Citizen accessibility to courts, i.e. free legal aid and simplified process for certain claims
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	Not applicable
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

FRANCE

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Efficient cooperation between the prosecutor's office and the court - Use of IT programs for rapid communication - Staff was helpful and open-minded	- Presence of registry officers that ensure operational functioning and organisation in the administrative courts - Mediation as an alternative to court - Emphasis on the protection of victims of domestic violence (emergency phone, GPS, psychological counseling) - Specialisation of judges - "comparution immédiate"
General exchanges for court staff	- Economic and efficiency benefits to digitalisation of documents and court proceedings	- National School of Clerks that offers free and complete training to court clerks - Accessibility and information on display in courts that highlight judicial proceedings, citizen rights, etc.
Specialised exchanges	- Constant development and reception of feedback among the interagency of the judiciary	- CDAD- public orientation service that aims to provide people with initial information on the justice system - Specialisation in divisions- (further environmental specialisations with no added cost or resources) - "rapid justice" and immediate appearance with an individual brought before a prosecutor within 48 hours of police custody - Development of a new unit to ensure a more productive exchange between actors involved in domestic

		violence cases (i.e. juvenile judge and child support services) - AFA: centralised anti-corruption agency
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Emphasis on the organisation and responsibilities of each individual - Emphasis on the evolving nature of contemporary legal issues	- Effective teaching methods such as (case study, facilitation of a round table, presentation, work in subgroups) - Structured curriculum with a combination of theoretical knowledge and practical exercises (active engagement is extremely beneficial for information retention)

GERMANY

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- A strong work ethic among staff - High levels of trust and confidence in the German judiciary - Developing technology to contribute to digitalisation of the court and court files- courts are equipped with technology - Mentorship opportunities	- Common training between the judges that also allows them to select an area of expertise - Bewährungs and Gerichtshilfe: probation and court assistance - Central Cybercrime Department and ZenTer NRW: centralised approach to cybercrime and terrorism cases - Support for victims through the use of social workers, forensic medicine department) - Emphasis on continued professional development - Childhood House
General exchanges for court staff	Not applicable	- Liaison officer between the police and the prosecutor's office. In some federal states, there are specific contacts within the public prosecutor's office or the police for specific areas. - Electronic file management system (e-Akte) - LGBT consultant in German courts. This role is performed either by the equal opportunities officer or a victim protection officer.
Specialised exchanges	- Reduction of paper-based documents (eco-friendly) - Remote hearings which can allow for more access to legal resources and reduction of the court backlog	- In both juvenile law and the cases of sexual violence against women, the victim only has to give a statement in front of a judge, rather than police forces, etc. If someone is summoned by

	- Observed a cooperative atmosphere throughout court proceedings - Strong use and presence of social services - Transparency through digitalisation	the police, he or she is only obliged to appear and testify if the summons is based on an order from the public prosecutor's office (Section 163 (3) sentence 1 StPO). To avoid the risk of re-traumatisation through multiple interrogations, the use of judicial video interrogation under Section 58a StPO will be expanded. This will help ensure that such interrogations take place in a less stressful setting for victims and replace interrogations at the main hearing. - Significant social worker presence, especially in the area of cases that involve victims (i.e. investigation of living conditions, no contact with the perpetrator etc.) - Encouragement of specialisation for judges in cases such as cybercrime and financial crime - Regarding asylum cases, judges are specialised by country (i.e. specific knowledge regarding the geopolitical situation, language, etc.) - Methods of mediation are prioritised (alternative dispute resolution)
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Interacted with professional and kind employees and supervisors	Not applicable

GREECE

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Strong cooperation among members of the judiciary	- Hellenic Financial Intelligence Unit - Prioritise drug rehabilitation which is governed by the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Education and Science - CYBERKID
General exchanges for court staff	- Electronic court (e-court) - Judicial matters are made accessible to the public- goes back to the idea that justice should be a public matter and is not to be concealed from its citizens - Cohesion and collaboration among court employees - Courts are very open to the public, allowing transparency, which increases trust in legal and judicial institutions	- Cohesiveness among the judge and the judicial employee for each trial - Mixed jury courts - Case Management System of the Administrative Court, a unified database that reduces operating costs and improves quality of services provided - Specialisation of Greek administrative judges (dedicated chambers for tax law etc.) - Greater number of judges aids handling cases which greatly reduces backlog - Specialised youth court designed to create a comforting environment and supported by psychologists and social workers
Specialised exchanges	- Collaborative efforts extend from Greece's National School of Judiciary (continued learning and education)	- Streamlined application process for asylum seekers - Community building and integration programmes involving local communities, particularly in supporting asylum seekers and encouraging social integration

Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	- Greek prisons prioritise individual work with the prisoners. There are drug rehabilitation and educational programmes. - Support and assistance programs for post-prison release - Procedural laws are synchronised with EU legislation to remain consistent with human rights and fair principles
--	----------------	--

HUNGARY

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Establishment of a judge's network with expertise to promote international cooperation	- Separate hearings and interview process for children in cases of family law to avoid influence of parental pressure
General exchanges for court staff	- Recorded court hearings- quicker than dictating to the notary - Hearing by videoconference	- Effective mediation system - Juvenile Detention Centre with a focus on re-education - Procedural pre-trial chamber
Specialised exchanges	- Healthy cooperation between court staff and judges	- Specialised advisory group for EU law and EU case law. Judges can ask questions and receive preliminary advice
Exchange for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

IRELAND

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	Not applicable	Not applicable
General exchanges for court staff	Not applicable	Not applicable
Specialised exchanges	- Welcoming and friendly environment	- The existence of the International Protection Appeals Tribunal (IPAT) for asylum cases
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

ITALY

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Improvement of judicial cooperation in the wake of EU expansion - Accessible and friendly climate - Civil cases are fully electronic - Notable court security - All judges are subject to evaluations every four years - Videoconference for witness statements and, basically, for civil hearings (increases accessibility) - Use of AI tools for efficiency, but not for solving cases or getting decisions	- Close relationship with investigative services, inter-court cybercrime unit - Specialisations within the civil court (commercial, property, professional, family) - “incidente probatorio” is used to get evidence before the trial - High levels of cooperation between different branches located within the Sicilian judicial system in countering mafia activity - Court of First Instance for Minors
General exchanges for court staff	- Law clerk position reduces the workload of the judges - Court staff is heavily involved in each judiciary phase - Prosecutor sits next to defendant and their lawyer instead of next to the judge unlike other countries which may demonstrate a more impartial environment	- Civil courts have been entirely digitised - Closing arguments are recorded so that the judge can be familiar with the arguments presented - Red Code- crimes handled urgently and deemed high priority, particularly crimes involving women and children - Centralised app where court staff and judiciary members can access the case lists - Specialised section with specialised judges within the Ordinary Court to handle asylum seekers. This is also the case for cases related to trademarks and patents
Specialised exchanges	- Developing an online filing system and increased use of electronic activity	- Preventive Measures Department (specialisation

		for mafia cases and organised crime) - First instance hearings are held by individual judges. Only when specifically provided, hearings are held by a panel of three or more (e.g. Corte di assise) judges - 'Anti-mafia code' applied independently of a criminal conviction (allows for the freezing of assets even if someone has not been acquitted or charged) - Emphasis on the rights of children in family law cases and cases pertaining to minor victims - Whistleblower protection programme for individuals that disclose information about the mafia
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

LATVIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Digitalised files and court recordings - E-cases and online files allow for greater consistency among judges, magistrates, and clerks	- Strong role attributed to the victim of a case who can challenge the decision of the judges - Reform to prevent repetition in court statements - Inmates in prison can have long-term or frequent visits from family members- maintain a family connection 'traffic light system' to evaluate the performance of prosecutors
General exchanges for court staff	Not applicable	Not applicable
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	Not applicable
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

LITHUANIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Emphasis on remote procedures - Organised and well-structured	- LITEKO software: integration of databases for efficient information sharing - Judge advisers who assist the judge with the case load, ensuring that cases can move at a decent pace
General exchanges for court staff	- Much of the work can be conducted virtually- assists with court backlog and access for citizens to legal assistance	- Financial incentives provided to citizens to settle cases electronically
Specialised exchanges	- Prioritise transparency	- Singular computer programme which provides more communication and ease of access of information by various members of the judiciary
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

MALTA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Unified handling of cases with police officers taking on greater responsibilities (eases the strain of judicial resources)	- Judges are specialised in certain fields (i.e. cybercrimes, drug crimes, etc.) - Tribunals for minor offences- instead of utilising resources for full court procedures - Promotion of the use of ADR and mediation
General exchanges for court staff	Not applicable	Not applicable
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	Not applicable
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

NETHERLANDS

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGES	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- High public trust in judicial and legal institutions - Technology integration for both files and the courtroom	- Heavy use of supporting court staff - ADR and alternatives to solve civil disputes - Specialisation of Dutch judges - High levels of cooperation with outside services (representatives from victim aid and child protective services)
General exchanges for court staff	- Efficient judicial system with notably fast court proceedings - Continuous learning and knowledge sharing	- EU law coordinators- creation of newsletters featuring European case law, emphasising the interconnectedness of the EU - Digitalisation to reduce court backlog - Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) - Streamlined process for civil disputes - ZSM- handling of cases in a short time frame
Specialised exchanges	- Advanced digital platforms to streamline case management which enhances accessibility and efficiency	- Efficient mediation system- alternative to court - The needs and rights of minors are prioritised and considered in the Juvenile Justice System- resulted from the special protection detailed in legislation that notes that juveniles are individuals in development - Rehabilitation is the goal of the justice system in the Netherlands
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Access to digital training	- Training emphasises soft-skills and emotional

		intelligence- skills beyond retaining information - Use of psychologists for judicial training
--	--	---

POLAND

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Advanced and updated resources for technical and scientific investigation - Effective IT programs utilised in the prosecutor's office - E-court - Strong cooperation between police and prosecutors	- Reserve judge on the panel of a court case for the purpose of avoiding the re-administration of evidence in case a judge on the panel must leave for various reasons (retirement, transfer, promotion) - Increase in specialised courts (economic, family, administrative) - "Blue Room" in the District Court in Łódź, used to take statements to be used in court in advance from victims who are determined to be especially vulnerable - Centre for Continuous Training and International Cooperation
General exchanges for court staff	- Digitalisation- added perspective of a primarily digital filing system as environmentally conscious	- Electronic Court- dedicated court where procedures occur online entirely (i.e. insolvency cases) - Emphasis on the importance of the assistant judges and assistant prosecutors
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	- Well-established family law departments accompanied by psychologists and social workers who are equipped to address any situation - Youth Detention Centre- focuses on education both on academics and life skills
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Selective when picking trainers	- Prioritise the development of soft skills and practical application (mock trials and moot court over class lectures)

		- Theoretical training combined with practical training (alternate between the school and the court)
--	--	--

PORTUGAL

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Electronic case management system (CITIUS) - Effective distribution of workload and sufficient resources - Witness examination by videoconference	- Separation of units within the Department of Investigation (corruption, money laundering, cross-border crime) - Psychologists employed to assist prosecutors and victims of abuse - Collaborative efforts by members of the judiciary to reduce burn-out and promote a healthy work-life balance
General exchanges for court staff	- Emphasis of the EU resources available to the courts (i.e. mutual legal assistance) - Notable communication and collaboration among Portuguese court staff	- Specialised family court with a room for children while they are waiting for their parents during the hearing. - "CITIUS": registry programme containing all the documents related to a case (modern interface) - Mixed jury courts
Specialised exchanges	- Digitalisation with an emphasis on encryption and controlled access to ensure the privacy of court information (CITIUS)	- Portuguese Social Assistance Office which intervenes for the protection of minors and also can provide funds for children
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- International Judicial Cooperation both in civil and commercial matters - Open access to source material online - Distance learning - Flexibility in relocation for operational needs	- Court proceedings open to the public - Combined approach of sociological and psychological training - Specialisation in protection of women and minors - "working groups" that are occupied with monitoring, management, and optimisation

		- Portuguese Directorate of Judicial Administration and Justice (DJAJ) that provides on-site training - Use of AI in the judicial process (improve fingerprint analysis)
--	--	--

ROMANIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Collaboration among police and investigating prosecutors - Emphasis on the continuous training of magistrates - Notable work ethic of court employees	- National Anti-Corruption Directorate and Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism - Supervisory judge that works specifically in an office in the Romanian prisons - Emphasis on rehabilitation of offenders (e.g. prison reintegration programmes) - 'Children's House' for child victims of mistreatment and abuse
General exchanges for court staff	- SMIA and ECRIS digital tools	- Establishment of the National Anti-Corruption Directorate that enhances transparency and accountability in the judicial process - Advanced military courts and military prosecutors - Teletrials - Court is quite open to the public and media which encourages transparency leading to greater institutional trust
Specialised exchanges	- High levels of collaboration between national and international law enforcement agencies	- DIICOT (Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism)
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Praise of the practical nature of the training provided at the National Institute of Magistracy - Continuous training and professional development	- Establishment of independent national schools- specialised training environment for members of the judiciary and court staff - Psychological health and welfare is heavily prioritised

SLOVAKIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Digitalisation - Strong emphasis on continued judicial training	- ADR and mediation for minor offences and are encouraged for civil disputes - Designated resources for child victims and family law cases - Heavy focus on anti-corruption through specialised courts and legislative reforms - Slovak Constitutional Court which is a unique jurisdiction that protects fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution or international treaty (unique competence that addresses issues that would otherwise have to be addressed in the European Court of Human Rights)
General exchanges for court staff	Not applicable	Not applicable
Specialised exchanges	Not applicable	Not applicable
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

SLOVENIA

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Well-structured court system	- Risk assessment utilising artificial intelligence during the investigation process - Children's House (Barnahus) - Prominent role of the investigating judge
General exchanges for court staff	- Organised training system of judicial officials	- Function and presence of legal advisors - Centre of Expertise and IT within the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office which contributes to the overall effectiveness of the digitalised court and technology developments that have arisen
Specialised exchanges	- Digitalisation of the Prosecutor's office	- Children's House (Barnahus)
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

SPAIN

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Recorded court proceedings and digitalisation to eliminate paper use and conservation of physical material - Streamlined criminal process - Sophisticated system of case management allocation	- Specialists and specialised departments for organised crime and complex economic crimes - Infrared technique to analyse narcotics in the forensic and investigative phase - Joint investigation team (JIT) between Spain and Sweden for drug trafficking and cybercrime cases - Centralised approach for coordinating specialized prosecutorial units, especially in areas like economic crime, money laundering, cybercrimes - ‘Solo Sí es Sí’ - Presence of a forensic medicine unit within the court as well as psychologists - Special unit within courts for individuals struggling with addiction - ‘Barnahus’
General exchanges for court staff	- SIRAJ- national filing system - Continuous training and online learning materials provided	- Specialised court- Violence Against Women Court (both civil and criminal jurisdiction) - “Sala Gessell”- a room that ensures the protection and security of victims that are minors (also with psychologist on-site)
Specialised exchanges	- Advanced innovation for addressing violence against women	- Judge specialisation in the labour sector of the Court of Appeals
Exchanges for judicial trainers	- Encouragement of practical experience and training	- Effective division of labour. Clerks have administrative

	- High levels of collaboration among legal and judicial entities	responsibilities so that the judges and prosecutors can prioritise the cases and investigations
--	--	---

SWEDEN

CATEGORY OF EXCHANGE	INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES	INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES
General exchanges for judges and prosecutors	- Complete digitalisation-advanced penal system - Positive work environment with updated facilities	- Joint investigation teams between prosecutors from different countries for cross-border investigations (i.e. Spain and Sweden task force) - Connection between police and prosecution ensures efficiency and speed of court and investigative proceedings
General exchanges for court staff	Not applicable	Not applicable
Specialised exchanges	- Court is efficient and well-organised - Collaboration and multiple positions within the court	- Technical expertise obtained by judges primarily in environmental law
Exchanges for judicial trainers	Not applicable	Not applicable

Part 2 – Research Report on Best Practices

This second part of the Compendium further explores some of the best practices highlighted by the participants in an EJTN judicial exchange and provide additional context to some of the best practices detailed in the Compendium Tables (part 1). In this part of the Compendium, best practices are supported with data from academic literature, news reports, and data to legitimise the findings and observations of the participants.

On the one hand, this research report includes the individual practices, i.e. measures or initiatives that can be implemented on an individual or smaller scale. Individual best practices can be overlooked due to perceptions of priority; however, it is clear through the observations of the participants that these skills are vital to the functioning of the legal and judicial systems. Many participants observed these practices in real time and noted that they intended on developing and utilising these habits in their professional endeavours.

On the other hand, this research report includes institutional best practices, i.e. specific structures, measures or tools that are derived from the institution itself or broader judicial policies and may take longer to implement. Institutional best practices were grouped under wider judicial topics to provide clear and easy navigation into concrete examples from different EU Member States.

1. Individual Practices

When examining best court practices, the most notable are concerned with pursuing justice and maintaining the integrity of the judiciary while also prioritising court efficiency. Because of this, smaller practices such as collaboration among court employees and the promotion of emotional intelligence can fall by the wayside and are not active pursuits by certain courts. When these simple practices are not pursued, it can lead to disorganisation, court backlogs, and general disfunction within the legal system. Furthermore, to effectively develop and implement large-scale programmes such as rehabilitation and education for prisoners or medical and psychological services for child victims, the smaller practices must be present and honoured by all members of the judiciary and legal system.

Historically, courts around the world have experienced case and court backlogs, cumbersome filing systems, and ineffective communication. Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, these issues were exacerbated through court shut-downs and a halting of traditional judicial procedure. According to a report written by the Legal Experts Advisory Panel of Fair Trials, the pandemic affected virtually every aspect of the legal and judicial processes, from the functioning of courts, an individual's ability to "exercise defence rights", and the strength of policing and investigative procedures². Due to these factors, court efficiency was almost non-existent, and countries had to implement solutions that could address the new legal environment. This gave rise to the prevalence of court digitalisation which encompasses all aspects of a court's functioning such as digitalisation of files, electronic court proceedings, and hybrid work environment models³. According to a report conducted by the European Commission, the digitalisation of the justice systems across the EU has increased "cross-border judicial cooperation", facilitated more access to the legal system and its resources, and has assisted courts in the organisation of their files through a cohesive communication network⁴. Each of these aspects has vastly improved the pile-up of cases, accessibility to legal and judicial services, and has improved the communication and the work-life balance and environment. Through the examination of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on court systems in the EU, beyond the benefits of court digitalisation, it is clear that court efficiency is of the utmost priority, and often relies upon smaller practices such as effective communication and collaboration as well as the organisation and structure of court documents and resources.

1.1. Communication and Collaboration

From the data provided by the participants in the EJTN Exchange Programme, there were many countries that were notably praised for their emphasis on collaboration and communication among employees of the court or prosecution office (e.g. court staff and judges) as well as inter-service communication (e.g. prosecutors and investigative services). Improving communication within the legal and judicial systems is essential to the functioning of the courts and prosecution offices and can be implemented on an individual level as many participants noted that they would be sure to utilise this practice in their own courts. According to participants in the general exchanges, countries such as Estonia, Finland, and Portugal fostered a communicative environment among the staff, which in turn

² Fair Trials & Legal Experts Advisory Panel. (2020).

³ European Commission. (n.d.).

⁴ Ibid.

improves the overall work environment. While each of these countries may have differences in certain procedures or customs, the common trend between them was the remark of constant communication shared among the members of each individual court or prosecution office⁵.

Former attorney and current judicial trainer Mark Segal notes that communication in the legal and judicial setting is crucial in the development of a court culture. For this culture to be harmonious and effective, communication among judges, law enforcement, court staff, administrative staff, and social services must occur. Segal finds that “communication, judicial performance, and ethical standards [...] are intricately connected”⁶. Thus, the integrity of the justice system and the role of each member of the court is strengthened through effective communication. Small practices such as improving and strengthening communication may have a beneficial effect on other court systems throughout the EU where perhaps there is a lack of trust in the judiciary or there is considerable disorganisation and backlog. Furthermore, this baseline good practice can be promoted and disseminated through judicial training programmes and networks that already exist. Finally, this practice can be encouraged to countries that are seeking EU candidate and membership status in an effort to improve and cultivate institutional trust.

1.2. Emotional Well-Being and Work-Life Balance

Another best practice observed among certain courts and prosecutions offices was the prioritisation of emotional well-being and emotional intelligence. All of the host institutions are well-known for their focus on continuous training and professional development for its employees. While it is certainly necessary to implement technical skills and keep court members updated on recent legal reforms and changes to international law, emotional health and intelligence is often overlooked. From the data collected from the surveys, participants in Belgium, the Netherlands, and Portugal praised their courts for the presence of training in soft-skills or emotional intelligence⁷. The participants in the Netherlands and Portugal also made note of the use of psychologists in judicial training, which contributes further to staff being prepared and emotionally sound in their role and necessary work.

Often emotional well-being is undervalued in the courts and prosecution offices; however, judges, prosecutors and court staff experience high stress and tension, especially in the criminal justice sector⁸. In a study measuring the psychological impact of judicial work, the authors found that judges and court employees report experiencing “elevated rates of non-specific psychological stress” and are susceptible to high levels of depression, anxiety, and cynicism⁹. Given the nature of the cases that court and prosecution office members can be subjected to, mental health support and resources is a clear necessity to promote well-being and integrity within the judicial system.

Based on a survey conducted by the Global Judicial Integrity Network, the Corruption and Economic Crime Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), reported that the mental health of court officials directly correlates with the integrity of the court and the judicial system. Poor

⁵ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 17, 18, 36

⁶ (Segal & American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative, 2018)

⁷ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 12, 32, 36

⁸ (Staglin, 2021)

⁹ (Schreier et al., 2019, pp. 163-164)

mental health can lead to a “decreased quality and timeliness of reasons” as well as “delays in decision making” which in turn “erode[s]” public trust in the system¹⁰. Furthermore, the authors noted that the negative factors of poor mental health are not compatible with “impartiality, independence, efficiency and effectiveness” which are all vital to a successful legal and judicial system¹¹. While the promotion of mental health and emotional well-being may be a smaller action, it most certainly be classified as a best practice, given the broad impact that poor mental health can have on court employees and subsequently the judicial system.

An aspect of emotional well-being that is also overlooked is the promotion of a healthy work-life balance. The participants that completed their exchange in Finland and Portugal observed good work-life balance, which of course promotes mental health and prevents burn-out and fatigue. As stated previously, poor mental health can negatively affect the judicial process and diminish the public trust in the legal institutions. Emphasis on mental health and an awareness of the benefits of high emotional intelligence is a practice that can be implemented by court employees while also supplemented with provided support (e.g. psychologists and counselling).

¹⁰ (Veress & Corruption and Economic Crime Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2022)

¹¹ Ibid.

2. Institutional Practices

2.1. Digitalisation

As the capabilities of technology continue to develop, so does its integration into societal structures. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, the functioning of the justice system has changed drastically as court backlogs and limited staff due to shutdowns have pushed the legal system into a digital age. According to the European Commission, “digital technologies have great potential to improve the efficiency of and access to justice” both within EU Member States and cross-border¹². While many steps have been taken by the EU as a whole to digitalise the justice system, the judicial authorities of the various Member States do so at their own pace. From the data provided by the survey results, there are certain countries that have accelerated their court’s digitalisation, while other EU Member States are falling behind. Methods of digitalisation include centralised technology programmes for e-filing and organisation of caseloads, online witness testimonials, holding electronic court, and utilising AI for non-sensitive tasks.

2.1.1. *E-Court/Electronic Witness Examination*

The telematic trials and e-Court existed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic but its prominence has certainly grown since the court shutdowns that occurred as a result of the pandemic. These virtual court hearings have proven to be beneficial in reducing court backlog as well as increasing access to judicial and legal resources. In many EU countries there are specifics regarding the platform that is used and the online security measures that are taken to ensure confidentiality and that the judicial process is upheld to the fullest extent¹³. Many of the countries in the EU have either begun to implement or have fully developed their telematic trials, for example Finland, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, and Portugal as per the survey data. Beyond holding electronic court, some courts have started utilising conference calls to conduct electronic witness examinations. In July 2023, legislators in the EU Parliament adopted a “legislative package” that “will introduce a coherent EU framework for handling electronic evidence, speed up the process of evidence gathering, and maintain safeguards for fundamental rights”¹⁴. This legislation applies to EU Member States to assist and speed up the process of cross-border investigations, but individual countries have been utilising virtual witness examinations for their own jurisdictional matters. The implementation of this practice allows for a faster criminal investigative process and increases access and safety for witnesses both during and after the investigation. From the observations in the data, Bulgaria, Croatia, Italy, and Portugal have effectively implemented this resource in their court systems¹⁵.

2.1.2. *Artificial Intelligence*

Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a broad practice can have negative connotations. However, there are some courts that have utilised AI in a productive way that assists but does not compromise the integrity of

¹² (*Digitalisation of Justice*, 2020)

¹³ (Sanders, 2021)

¹⁴ (European Parliament, 2023)

¹⁵ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 13, 15, 27, 36

the court nor make the court entirely reliant on it. For example, participants in general exchanges in Slovenia noted that their courts and law enforcement utilise AI to assess risks during an investigation process¹⁶. Other AI uses in courts relate to the forensic process during investigations with countries like Portugal using AI to improve fingerprint analyses¹⁷. Expert in technology and AI, author Efim Lerner writes that fingerprint analysis has improved exponentially when artificial intelligence is applied as it “improve[s] accuracy and efficiency in forensic investigations”¹⁸. In this rapidly evolving digital age, resources such as AI and virtual communication platforms are only growing in prevalence. As these technologies embed themselves in society, old-fashioned legal and judicial structures must remain up to date. The ways that the court systems in the EU are applying technology and digitalising their systems is an indication of a continuous commitment to efficiency and the pursuit of justice.

2.2. Protection and Safety of Victims

EU Member States have implemented several initiatives to emphasise the protection and safety of victims, and particularly women and children that have been subject to violence. Based on findings gathered from the survey data, there are certain countries that have implemented practices and legislation to demonstrate their further commitment to this matter. Strengthening old legislation and/or adopting new legislation concerning this matter emphasises the need to protect and provide support to vulnerable persons. From separated rooms in courts to protections in local legislation, EU Member States have developed practices that are worth making note of for the consideration of other Member State as well as institutions on an international scale.

2.2.1. *Child Victims*

Blue Rooms

A practice commonly used in Bulgaria, Blue Rooms are specially equipped interrogation rooms in the courts for minors involved in legal proceedings, whether they are a victim in a case or a witness to a case. These rooms were created with the intention of fostering a safe and comfortable environment for children, often coupled with access to social workers and psychologists.

Sala Gessell

Like a Blue Room, Spain has “Sala Gessell” which is a room designed to make children that are victims or witnesses feel more comfortable in sharing their experiences for evidence collection. This room utilises a camera in a two-way mirror to record testimonials¹⁹. Instead of utilising police or judicial staff to ask questions, they have a psychologist on staff to work with the child – both by obtaining evidence and prioritising mental and physical well-being. The use of a “Sala Gessell” ensures that perpetrators of child violence and abuse are held accountable, while also preventing further trauma and victimisation for the child involved.

¹⁶ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 40

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 36

¹⁸ (Lerner, 2024)

¹⁹ (Martínez, 2024)

Barnahus

The Barnahus, a child-friendly office, is another approach to child-friendly justice. Countries that implement the Barnahus have access to resources such as “law enforcement, child protective services, and mental health workers” who function as a cooperative body to “assess [...] the situation of the child and decide upon the follow-up”²⁰. Countries who are members of the Barnahus Network include Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Poland, Spain, and Sweden²¹. This practice underscores the importance of protecting and assisting vulnerable populations, particularly in the instance of justice.

Separate Questioning/Hearings

To ensure safety and comfortability of victims, many countries have implemented separate questioning facilities and hearings. For example, participants in a general exchange in Hungary found that in the case of family law and custody cases, there is a separate questioning and hearing process so that children do not feel parental pressure and thus their statements are not influenced by external factors²². This separation seems to occur at the behest of the judge assigned to the case, thus varying when this occurs²³.

More information about this practice was obtained via the Hungarian Judicial Academy. Based on international and national regulations²⁴, “the aim of the Hungarian judiciary is to apply a system that ensures the highest level of respect for and effective enforcement of children’s rights, giving primary importance to the best interests of the child in all proceedings involving or affecting them. In justified cases, it is possible to conduct a separate hearing of the child. The separate hearing of children is intended to serve the above goals, allowing the child to make a statement in a matter affecting them free from influence and fear.

In Hungary, most courts have established child hearing rooms. These rooms allow the court to hear minors under the age of 14 – primarily victims or witnesses in criminal cases, and those involved in family law disputes or cases involving the unlawful removal of a child abroad – in an environment that complies with international standards, adapted to the child’s age and needs, and designed to be friendly and reassuring. This ensures the full protection of the child's interests while also promoting the effectiveness of procedural actions. In courts without a dedicated child hearing room, the judge asks the parents and legal representatives to leave the courtroom and remains alone with the child, attempting to create a relaxed atmosphere within the available possibilities.

The website www.birosag.hu includes a child-centred justice submenu, primarily providing assistance to minors in understanding questions related to the justice system, with information tailored to their age. This includes information about child hearing rooms as well.”

²⁰ (About Barnahus – Barnahus Network, n.d.)

²¹ (Progress in Europe – Barnahus Network, n.d.) – “Membership is [...] a commitment to working to progressively meet the [Barnahus Quality] Standards.”

²² See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 25

²³ (Parental Responsibility - Child Custody and Contact Rights - Hungary, 2024)

²⁴ Notably, article 3 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, article 21 of the Brussels IIb Regulation, section 4:171 (4) of Act V of 2013 on the Hungarian Civil Code, and section 473 of the Hungarian Code of Civil Procedure

Like Hungary, Portugal has designated rooms for children in the case of family court. This is not for the purpose of questioning, but rather for the comfort and safety of the child while their guardians are attending court or mediation in the family court²⁵.

2.2.2. *Victims of Abuse*

The EU has recently taken steps to address and prevent domestic violence and abuse on a legislative level. In 2011, the Council of Europe convened in Istanbul to formulate a human rights treaty designed to “protect women against all forms of violence, and prevent, prosecute and eliminate violence against women and domestic violence” as well as provide a “comprehensive framework, policies and measures for the protection of and assistance to all victims of violence against women and domestic violence”²⁶. All EU Member States signed this treaty and have taken their own initiatives to implement this directive into their local legal and judicial systems.

Red Code

To address gender-based violence, Italy has reformed its Criminal Code and Code of Criminal Procedure in 2019 by adopting Law n. 69 also colloquially known as the Red Code. The goal of the Red Code is to provide “a multidisciplinary culture able to fight gender-based violence”²⁷. Through this legislation, Italy can impose harsher penalties against perpetrators of this nature of crime as well as criminalise actions that were not previously deemed offences such as “acid attacks” and “revenge porn”²⁸. Furthermore, through the Red Code, Italy bears the responsibility of pressing charges in cases of child rape instead of requiring “the victim to press charges” which creates further protections and prevents secondary victimisation²⁹. Beyond legislative developments, Italy has also created and employed a help line that specialises in violence and stalking. These measures taken by Italy demonstrate its innovative approaches to implementing the directives from the agreed upon Istanbul Convention to further the goal of preventing and addressing violence and abuse towards vulnerable groups.

‘Incidente probatorio’

Translated to “evidentiary incident”, this Italian legal reform allows prosecutors to request a judge to “proceed” to introduce evidence in a rapid and discreet manner particularly when concerning crimes related to minors or vulnerable persons such as “mistreatment in the family, stalking, child pornography, and sexual violence”³⁰. This process accelerates the collection of evidence for sensitive cases. This initiative is another positive step in prioritising the safety and security of women and children in the legal system.

‘Solo Sí es Sí’

Spain has taken its own initiatives to reach the goals of the Istanbul Convention, particularly with a new law, ‘Law of Integral Guarantee of Sexual Freedom’, better known as ‘Solo Sí es Sí’ (only yes is yes). The purpose of this legislative act is to establish that “sexual conduct without consent will be

²⁵ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 36

²⁶ (Council of Europe, 2011)

²⁷ (Staff, 2021)

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ (Acquaviva, 2018)

considered aggression and will be punished with different penalties depending on the circumstances and aggravating factors of the case”³¹. Furthermore, this law “eliminates the distinction between sexual abuse and assault” which had previously been held to legal standards in Spain³². Some have argued that this practice conflicts with the idea of presumption of innocence. This legislation has only been in effect for around three years, so it would be productive to request further information from Spanish courts and judicial staff to hear their opinion on the constitutionality and effectiveness of this law. Despite the potential criticisms that have been raised, the passing of this law denotes Spain’s progressive measures towards protecting women from domestic and sexual violence and punishing those that inflict harm in these areas.

2.2.3. *Victim Support and Resources*

From the survey data, participants noted that many of their host countries had advanced forms and access to victim support and resources. Most notable were Belgium, Germany, Latvia, and the Netherlands³³. Much of these countries utilise outside resources and have “high levels of cooperation with outside services” such as child protective services and representatives from victim aid organisations. Other countries such as France have advanced resource protocols for domestic violence victims that prioritise safety including access to an emergency phone, GPS, and other psychological resources³⁴. Beyond collaborative advancements made by courts, many courts have implemented other forms of support and resources within their own procedures and structure.

Medical Judiciary Department

Participants of the Exchange Programme noted the advances that some courts had in their forensic units. Germany and Spain in particular were praised for their medical departments and use of social workers to ensure continuity within an investigation and provide proper medical examination for evidence when necessary³⁵. In a study within the Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine the researchers found that strong forensic capabilities prevent court backlog, especially because “incomplete and inaccurate medico-legal report (MLR) often slow down the court trials and lead to incorrect judgments”³⁶. Thus, the authors conclude that it is “necessary to employ forensic experts at every healthcare facility not only to prevent lawsuits but also to strengthen the judiciary”³⁷. Forensic and strong medical units advance the competencies of the court and judiciary by encouraging expertise and accuracy, leading to increased court efficiency and institutional trust.

2.3. Reforms in Penal Systems

There is much debate on the role of penal systems – whether they are established for the purpose of providing a form of societal retribution, individual rehabilitation and reintegration, or incapacitation

³¹ (BBC News World, 2022)

³² Ibid.

³³ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 12, 21, 29, 32

³⁴ (Dila, 2023)

³⁵ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 21, 41

³⁶ (Chaudhary et al., 2020)

³⁷ Ibid.

and protection. In many ways, prisons can serve many of these reasons depending on the case and the viewpoint of the local population. European countries tend to have more progressive outlooks and goals when it comes to the purpose of prison, but of course, some countries are more progressive than others.

2.3.1. *Education, Rehabilitation, and Reintegration Programmes*

The most common and well-known penal reform is the implementation of educational resources founded on the principles of successful rehabilitation and then gradually, reintegration into society. Countries such as Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, and Greece were notable in the data concerning educational programmes within their adult prisons. Participants mentioned that these prisons and programmes were modelled after the Nordic prison system. Exchange participants in Belgium had the opportunity to visit the Haren prison which is structured similarly to a small village with communal living units and workshops and classes that prepare inmates for re-entry back into society³⁸. Likewise, participants in Czech Republic made note of the open prison concept, Jiřice. Although this prison opened just two years ago, the recidivism rate for prisoners is extremely low. Jiřice Prison provides access to educators and psychologists and encourages participants to participate in activities such as gardening³⁹. This prison structure creates an environment that fosters education and encourages inmates to re-enter society successfully.

Education and reintegration are essential for adult inmates; however, it is especially important for the juvenile population. Access to education in juvenile justice has a direct correlation on reoffending rates, especially if individuals struggle with re-entering society. From the survey data, countries like Croatia, Hungary, and the Netherlands particularly stood out in the success within education that has been implemented in their juvenile detention centres⁴⁰. Beyond education within the actual systems themselves, participants noted that countries such as Bulgaria and Croatia provided instructional programmes to the general youth of their communities as a form of outreach and prevention⁴¹. The practice of education on both the adult and juvenile levels prove essential to reducing recidivism rates and increasing ease of societal reintegration.

2.3.2. *LGBT Consultant*

According to a court staff participant that went to Germany for their exchange, they found that there is an LGBT consultant within the German courts. This role is performed either by the equal opportunities officer or a victim protection officer⁴². Statistics show that members of the LGBT community are “at a heightened risk for violence while incarcerated”⁴³. The implementation of an LGBT consultant could be a beneficial practice to ensure the physical safety and mental well-being of the members of this community is prioritised, particularly when they are incarcerated.

³⁸ (*Plus D’informations Sur La Prison De Haren* | Service Public Federal Justice, n.d.)

³⁹ (Insider, 2025)

⁴⁰ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 15, 25, 32

⁴¹ Ibid. pp. 13, 15

⁴² Ibid. p. 21

⁴³ (Death Penalty Information Center, 2024)

2.3.3. Probation and Court Assistance

Each country in the EU handles probation differently. Probation as an option for criminal punishment places less strain on prison resources but requires outside resources to ensure that probation requirements are met, and that recidivism is diminished. Despite the fact that each EU country implements the option of probation, Croatia was noted as having a particularly advanced probation office that also carries out “social programmes that emphasise rehabilitation and reintegration”⁴⁴. In an analysis of Croatia’s probation system, the authors note that it “has been developing itself with the continuous support of EU projects which facilitated the adoption of good European practice which simultaneously became part of the legislative framework”⁴⁵. In cooperation with the EU and the goal of upholding good legal and judicial practices, Croatia has advanced its probationary resources which further contribute to crime prevention and the reduction of reoffending.

2.4. Judicial and Court Structure

Each EU Member State court is structured differently with emphasis on various resources and judicial methods. Many participants in an EJTN judicial exchange made note of some of the structures and roles in the courts that they visited, including the use of mediation, the implementation of the National Enforcement Authority, and the role of the reserve judge. These practices may be dependent on the specific legal and judicial formations of the EU Member State, however each of these observations were notable and could be applied to or strengthened in other EU Member States.

2.4.1. Alternative Dispute Resolution

Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is as its name states a form of legal negotiation that does not take place in a traditional court nor adhere to the same standards as traditional litigation. The form of ADR most mentioned in the survey of best practices was mediation. Countries such as Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, and the Netherlands received high praise for their commitment to ADR and advanced use of mediation⁴⁶. Legal alternatives to court are cost effective for all parties involved and often speed up the decision-making process. While all EU Member States utilise ADR to some extent, the countries previously mentioned seem to have prioritised its development leading to further access to legal and judicial resources while diminishing backlog in the courts. If more EU Member States prioritise ADR, they could effectively reduce strain on court and public resources by diverting efforts into legal alternatives while continuing to pursue justice.

2.4.2. National Enforcement Authority

An interesting judicial structure observed was by a participant in a general exchange for court staff in Finland. According to the data, the National Enforcement Authority (NEA) is a legal enforcement body that is independent of the judicial system. The NEA has only been existence since 2020 and it combined

⁴⁴ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 15

⁴⁵ (Todosiev et al., 2021, p. 4)

⁴⁶ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 11, 13, 16, 22, 32

all 22 of the regional enforcement offices into one, giving rise to centralisation and efficiency⁴⁷. This organisation “enforces court judgments and collects directly enforceable receivables, such as fines, taxes and insurance premiums upon application and possesses both the rights and the obligations within the sphere of an authority”⁴⁸. Although the NEA is new, participants noted its benefits and more information regarding this centralised agency may provide further insight into its functions and how combining enforcement authorities can be achieved in other EU Member States.

2.4.3. Judge Specialisation

Other judicial structure observations that stood out in the data included that in many EU Member States, judges have specialisations in topics such as environment, cybercrime, and geopolitics. A notable example of this in the data was an observation made by a participant during an exchange in Germany who noted that judges in asylum cases have specialisations by country⁴⁹. Thus, a judge dealing with these cases will have specific knowledge regarding the current geopolitical situation of said region. While judge specialisation is certainly not required by EU Member State courts, it could prove to be beneficial and contribute to the judicial integrity of the courts.

2.5. Cross-Border Relations

The creation of the European Union has broken down non-tariff barriers and has encouraged the free movement of persons and goods. This movement initially posed legal obstacles such as questions of jurisdiction and rights of individual citizens. However, over time, cross-border relations have been strengthened in many areas, particularly through law enforcement and judicial cooperation. In the observational data recorded by participants of the EJTN Exchange Programme, many of them made note of the various institutions and structures that contribute to the greater legal and judicial cooperation among EU Member States.

2.5.1. National Anti-Corruption Directorate

Participants in an exchange in Romanian noted that there was an established institution by the name of the National Anti-Corruption Directorate (DNA) that exists to enhance transparency and accountability in the judicial process⁵⁰. According to the DNA database, they conduct “criminal proceedings for corruption crimes and crimes assimilated to them” and it is particularly specialised as it deals with cases of “high and medium level corruption” while also working in tandem with the EU⁵¹. The establishment of an organisation that prioritises anti-corruption on a national and international level is certainly a good practice that benefits the legal and judicial area as well as encourages institutional trust. The DNA has physical offices, and they also have an online database that allows users to report potential corruption related matters to law enforcement. The most fascinating aspect

⁴⁷ (Björkqvist, 2021)

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 22

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 38

⁵¹ (Directia Nationala Anticoruptie, n.d.)

of this specialised office is how interconnected it is with the international community, as it simultaneously prioritises investigating crimes such as fraud and financial crimes that directly impact the EU community⁵². This practice can be feasibly implemented in other EU Member States, especially given the international implications and logistics of establishing a specialised unit like the DNA.

2.5.2. Cross-Border Units

Within other parts of the survey, participants noted specialised cross-border investigative units among the EU Member States. With these efforts, Member States aim to increase the enforcement of justice and resources that promote cooperation and information sharing. Participants in both Spain and Sweden noted the advanced Joint Investigation Team that exists among the two countries to address drug trafficking and cybercrime cases that extend beyond technical borders⁵³. Joint Investigation Teams are useful tools that “facilitate the coordination of investigations and prosecutions conducted in parallel across several States” and should be more widely used among EU Member States⁵⁴. Other practices noted in the observations included the Directorate for Investigating Organised Crime and Terrorism (DIICOT) in Romania⁵⁵. This investigative unit was established in 2004 “with the aim of dismantling organi[s]ed, border and cross-border criminal groups and combating terrorism”⁵⁶. Specialised directorates such as Romania’s DIICOT demonstrate a commitment to the pursuit of justice, especially on fronts that may be more challenging to address legally, such as organised crime or terrorism.

Likewise, participants in Italy made note of a similar institution, known as the Preventive Measures Department⁵⁷. This department specialises in addressing mafia cases and organised crime in Italy, and subsequently the organised crime spillover into neighbouring countries. Given the upward trend in cases of this nature in this region specifically, Italy has adapted to effectively addressing these cases through strengthened legal and judicial means⁵⁸. While mafia activity and organised crime may not be as crucial to address in other EU Member States, the practice of designating cross-border departments with unique resources to fit the needs of the judiciary may be productive and beneficial.

2.5.3. EU Law Coordinators

Participants in the Netherlands observed the practice of the inclusion of EU law coordinators within their host institution⁵⁹. According to the database, Court Coordinators in European Law (CCEs) “are national judges specialised in EU law” and there are currently seven EU Member States that participate in this project⁶⁰. The presence of CCEs is supposed to increase interconnectivity among EU Member States and ensure that rule of law on EU level can be maintained. As this programme grows, other

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 41-43

⁵⁴ (*Joint Investigation Teams - JITS* | Europol, n.d.)

⁵⁵ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 38

⁵⁶ (Directorate of Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism (DIICOT), n.d.)

⁵⁷ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 27

⁵⁸ (Cardamone, 2016)

⁵⁹ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 32

⁶⁰ (*CCE Networks*, n.d.)

EU Member States may have the opportunity to participate and host permanent CCEs. Through this practice, there can be more cohesiveness between EU law and national law, which will further integrity and transparency within differing judiciaries.

2.6. Specialised Departments and Units

Many EU Member States have specialised departments and units designed to fit within the bounds of their judicial priorities. Some Member States like Croatia, the Netherlands, and Portugal have advanced specialised departments designated for juveniles while other Member States like Greece and Spain have made notable advancements in the area of drug and addiction resources in courts.

2.6.1. Specialised Courts

Specialised courts are present in many EU Member States, with concentrations in various matters such as financial court, family court, and juvenile court. These courts take strain off the general courts as well as provide alternative forms of dispute resolution. This lessens the financial burden placed on citizens as well as speeds up the legal process, leading to timely results. From the data provided by the survey, exchange participants in Croatia praised their methods of addressing juvenile delinquents, including the establishment of an educational institution for young offenders⁶¹. When education is prioritised, particularly in the case of juvenile delinquents, rehabilitation and re-entering society is at the forefront of programming which subsequently reduces recidivism rates. The practice of establishing and integrating education programmes both for juveniles and for adult offenders must be considered by EU Member States, particularly if the goal is to reduce recidivism and overall crime rates.

Another form of specialised court that was noted were the drug and addiction courts. Countries like Czech Republic, Greece, and Spain were noted by the participant to be particularly advanced in their prioritisation of drug and addiction assistance in their courts. Treating drug addiction and providing these resources in the judicial and penal systems is necessary as it “provides a unique opportunity to decrease substance abuse and reduce associated criminal behavior”⁶². According to a publication by the Government of the Czech Republic, drugs and addiction are handled through “a comprehensive and coordinated set of preventive, educational, therapeutic, social, regulatory, control and other measures”⁶³. Like Czech Republic, Greece and Spain have both prioritised drug rehabilitation and education programmes to work with offenders in prison to prepare them for re-entrance into society⁶⁴. If drug use and addiction is treated, recidivism rates decrease and the health and well-being of members of society is clearly prioritised. Addressing and treating drug addiction is a practice that has seen success in participating Member States and would be beneficial to differing Member State courts if implemented properly.

⁶¹ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 15

⁶² (Chandler et al., 2009)

⁶³ (Government of the Czech Republic, 2024)

⁶⁴ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), pp. 23, 41

2.6.2. Central Cybercrime Department

As technology has developed, so too has the need for cybersecurity measures and legislation to address cybercrime. A specialised unit noted by exchange participants is the Central Cybercrime Department present in Germany⁶⁵. The vast nature of the Internet makes identifying and prosecuting cybercrime rather challenging, so this specialised unit takes the burden of investigative measures as well as communicates growing threats to legislators and law enforcement. Other EU Member States like Greece, Italy, and Malta have implemented cybercrime specialisations into their courts⁶⁶. This practice is relevant and will continue to grow given the rapid rate of Internet development. Another practice related to online activity is the CYBERKID campaign designed and implemented by Greece's legal and judicial bodies. This campaign provides a secure Internet environment for children, alerts citizens of new threats and "measures of protection", and allows for direct contact with the Hellenic Cyber Crime Division⁶⁷. These practices prove to be effective steps in addressing legal and judicial shortcomings in the Internet landscape.

2.6.3. ZenTer NRW

Domestic and international terrorism pose an ever-evolving threat to security across the globe, and some EU Member States have implemented specialised measures to centralise mitigating terrorist threats. Germany has done so through the establishment of a specialised unit known as the Central Office for the Prosecution of Terrorism North-Rhine Westphalia (ZenTer NRW). This office was set up in 2018 by the Attorney General and collaborates with courts and other judicial actors to ensure cohesion in combating terrorism as well as encourage the development of strategies to prevent terrorism from occurring⁶⁸. This practice may be worth considering implementing across all EU Member States given the increased threat of domestic terrorism, particularly far-right domestic terrorism.

2.6.4. Centre of Expertise and IT

Exchange participants in Slovenia made note of the Centre of Expertise and IT located within the Supreme State Prosecutor's Office. According to the observers, this specialised office "contributes to the overall effectiveness of the digitalised court and technology developments"⁶⁹. As noted in the section of digitalisation, technological court advancements have risen to popularity. Thus, a department that is equipped to handle Internet capacities and keep technology updated within the courts is a practice that seems logical and applicable to other EU Member States.

⁶⁵ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 21

⁶⁶ Ibid. pp. 23, 27, 31

⁶⁷ (Greece: Cybercrime Division and Cyberkid Campaign | EUCPN, n.d.)

⁶⁸ (Zentralstelle Terrorismusverfolgung Nordrhein-Westfalen (ZenTer NRW) | NRW-Justiz, n.d.)

⁶⁹ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 40

2.7. Social Assistance Programmes

2.7.1. *Bewährungs and Gerichtshilfe (BGBW)*

Social assistance programmes are present in EU Member States at various capacities. Exchange participants made note of some of the programmes that were integrated into their host country's courts as best practices and worth considering as large-scale implementation across the EU. For example, Germany has a known probation and court assistance organisation known as Bewährungs and Gerichtshilfe (BGBW)⁷⁰. According to their mission statement, BGBW offers “high-quality justice-related social work throughout the state according to uniform quality standards”⁷¹. This can include probation services, counselling, conflict resolution, and other rehabilitative services, allowing offenders to receive support while they complete their probationary sentence. The BGBW serves not only those sentenced to probation but also the victims of crime, ensuring that there is a balance between the rehabilitation of the offender and the restoration of justice for the impacted parties.

2.7.2. *Centre for Providing Services to the Community*

Like BGBW, participants in Croatia noted the prominent role of the Centre for Providing Services to the Community⁷². This programme, according to the participants, provides services related to re-entering society to prevent recidivism and assist former inmates with their adjustment back into everyday life. The primary focus is on social re-entry, which includes connecting ex-offenders with housing, employment, and mental health services, and supporting them through the process of becoming law-abiding citizens again. Furthermore, the programme fosters collaboration between law enforcement, social services, and community groups to provide a comprehensive approach to reducing crime and promoting social cohesion.

2.7.3. *Close To Project*

Another notable programme from the data is the ‘Close To Project’ in Austria⁷³. The goal of this programme is to pair new and learning drivers with individuals that hold driving offenses in order to warn new drivers of the risk of driving recklessly or driving under the influence. This programme not only provides education opportunities for learning drivers but allows drivers that had offended previously to confront their mistakes and make up for the damage they caused⁷⁴. The ‘Close To Project’ is a great example of how education and restorative justice can be integrated into broader social assistance strategies. This programme could serve as a model for other areas of law, such as domestic violence or drug offenses, where offenders could be involved in educational programmes that focus on empathy, responsibility, and the restoration of trust within society.

⁷⁰ See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 21

⁷¹ (Baden-Württemberg, n.d.)

⁷² See [Part 1 – Compendium Tables of Best Practices](#), p. 15

⁷³ Ibid. p. 11

⁷⁴ (*Peer Training of Learner Drivers by Offenders in Austria*, n.d.)

Works Cited

- About Barnahus – Barnahus network.* (n.d.). <https://barnahus.eu/barnahus/about-barnahus/>
- Acquaviva, M. (2018, August 14). Incidente probatorio: cos'è? La Legge per Tutti. https://www.laleggepertutti.it/219171_incidente-probatorio-cose#google_vignette
- Baden-Württemberg, B. U. G. (n.d.). *Unser Leitbild*. Bewährungs- Und Gerichtshilfe Baden-Württemberg. <https://www.bgbw.landbw.de/pb/,Lde/Startseite/Ueber+uns/Unser+Leitbild>
- BBC News World. (2022, November 17). “Solo sí es sí”: en qué consiste la nueva y polémica ley de consentimiento sexual en España. BBC News Mundo. <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-internacional-62694510>
- Cardamone, D. (2016). CRIMINAL PREVENTION IN ITALY. In *CRIMINAL PREVENTION IN ITALY*. http://www.europeanrights.eu/public/commenti/bronzini1-Cardamone_Criminal_prevention_in_Italy_2.0.pdf
- CCE networks. (n.d.). <https://court-coordinators.european.law/cces/#:~:text=Court%20coordinators%20in%20European%20law%20%28CCEs%29%20are%20national,law%20when%20they%20come%20across%20a%20challenging%20case.>
- Chandler, R. K., Fletcher, B. W., & Volkow, N. D. (2009). Treating drug abuse and addiction in the criminal justice system: improving public health and safety. *JAMA*, 301(2), 183–190. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2008.976>
- Chaudhary, B., Shukla, P. K., & Bastia, B. K. (2020). Role of clinical forensic medicine unit in quality and standardization of medico-legal reports. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 74, 102007. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2020.102007>
- Council of Europe. (2011). Council of Europe Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence. In Council of Europe Treaty Series (No. 210). <https://rm.coe.int/168008482e>
- Death Penalty Information Center. (2024, September 25). *Issues impacting LGBTQ+ prisoners*. <https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/policy-issues/biases-and-vulnerabilities/lgbtq-people/issues-impacting-lgbtq-prisoners>
- Digitalisation of Justice. (2020). European Commission. https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/digitalisation-justice/general-information_en
- Dila. (2023, November 27). 3919 accompanies women victims of violence. *République Française*. <https://www.service->

public.fr/particuliers/actualites/A16929?lang=en#:~:text=The%203919%20is%3A%201%20a%20free%20and%20anonymous,addresses%20the%20victims%27%20entourage%20and%20the%20professionals%20concerned

Directorate of Investigation of Organised Crime and Terrorism (DIICOT). (n.d.). DIICOT. <https://www.diicot.ro/>

Directia Nationala Anticoruptie. (n.d.). DIRECȚIA NAȚIONALĂ ANTICORUPȚIE. <https://www.dna.ro/>

European Commission. (n.d.). *Communication on Digitalisation of justice in the European Union and Proposal for e-CODEX Regulation*. https://commission.europa.eu/strategy-and-policy/policies/justice-and-fundamental-rights/digitalisation-justice/communication-digitalisation-justice-european-union-and-proposal-e-codex-regulation_en

European Parliament. (2023, June 13). *Electronic evidence: new rules to speed up cross-border criminal investigations* | News | European Parliament. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/press-room/20230609IPR96203/electronic-evidence-new-rules-to-speed-up-cross-border-criminal-investigations>

Fair Trials & Legal Experts Advisory Panel. (2020). *Beyond the Emergency of the COVID-19 Pandemic: Lessons for Defence Rights in Europe*. In *Fair Trials*. Fair Trials. <https://www.fairtrials.org/app/uploads/2021/11/beyond-the-emergency.pdf>

Government of the Czech Republic. (2024, December 2). Copyright (C) 2009 - 2024 Office of the Government. <https://vlada.gov.cz/en/ppov/protidrogova-politika/government-council-for-the-coordination-of-addiction-policy-196563/>

Greece: *Cybercrime division and Cyberkid campaign* | EUCPN. (n.d.). <https://eucpn.org/document/greece-cybercrime-division-and-cyberkid-campaign>

Insider, P. (2025, February 17). *Czech Republic: first czech open prison reports record-low reoffending rate*. *Prison Insider*. <https://www.prison-insider.com/en/articles/tchequie-first-czech-open-prison-reports-record-low-reoffending-rate>

Joint Investigation Teams - JITS | Europol. (n.d.). Europol. <https://www.europol.europa.eu/partners-collaboration/joint-investigation-teams>

Lerner, E. (2024, November 21). *Revolutionizing Forensics: How AI is transforming fingerprint analysis*. *Medium*. <https://medium.com/@efim.lerner/revolutionizing-forensics-how-ai-is-transforming-fingerprint-analysis-b611b12da588>

Martínez, F. M. (2024, July 27). *Cámara Gesell: qué es, para qué sirve y por qué se llama así* | LP. LP. <https://lpderecho.pe/camara-gesell-que-es-para-que-sirve-por-que-se-llama-asi/>

- Parental Responsibility - Child Custody and Contact Rights - Hungary.* (2024). European Justice. https://e-justice.europa.eu/302/EN/parental_responsibility_child_custody_and_contact_rights?HUNGARY
- Peer training of learner drivers by offenders in Austria.* (n.d.). Governance International. <https://www.govint.org/our-resources/case-studies/case-study/peer-training-of-learner-drivers-by-offenders-in-austria>
- Plus d'informations sur la prison de Haren | Service public federal Justice.* (n.d.). https://www.justice.belgium.be/fr/themes/prisons/prisons_belges/plus_dinfos/plus_dinformations_sur_la_prison_de_haren
- Progress in Europe – Barnahus Network.* (n.d.). <https://barnahus.eu/barnahus/the-practice-in-barnahus/progress-in-europe/>
- Sanders, A. (2021). Video-Hearings in Europe before, during and after the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal for Court Administration*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.379>
- Segal, M. & American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative. (2018). *PRACTICAL GUIDE TO COMMUNICATION FOR JUDGES.* <https://marksegal.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/CommunicationForJudges.pdf>
- Schmitz, M. (2021, February 10). *A new National Enforcement Authority in Finland.* <https://www.uihj.com/2021/02/10/a-new-national-enforcement-authority-launched-in-finland/>
- Schrever, C., Hulbert, C., & Sourdin, T. (2019). The Psychological Impact of Judicial Work: Australia's First Empirical Research Measuring Judicial Stress and Wellbeing. *Journal of Judicial Administration*, 28(3). <https://findanexpert.unimelb.edu.au/scholarlywork/1396485-the-psychological-impact-of-judicial-work-australia-s-first-empirical-research-measuring-judicial-stress-and-wellbeing>
- Staff. (2021, October 12). *Code Red Law: an innovative approach to tackle gender-based violence - Artemis.* Artemis. <https://www.artemis-europa.eu/2021/09/17/code-red-law-an-innovative-approach-to-tackle-gender-based-violence/>
- Staglin, G. (2021, March 23). Why judges, lawyers and court employees need more mental health support. *Forbes.* <https://www.forbes.com/sites/onemind/2021/03/23/why-judges-lawyers-and-court-employees-need-more-mental-health-support/>
- Todosiev, D., Ricijaš, Izv. prof. dr. sc., Ministry of Justice and administration, & University of Zagreb, Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences. (2021). *Probation in Europe* (A. Van Kalmthout & I. Durnescu, Eds.). CEP, Confederation of European Probation. <https://www.cep-probation.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/Croatia-2021-final.pdf>

United Nations & Government of Germany. (n.d.). *United Nations standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)*. https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson_Mandela_Rules-E-book.pdf

Veress, T. & Corruption and Economic Crime Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2022). *Exploring Linkages between Judicial Well-Being and Judicial Integrity* (By Global Judicial Integrity Network; B. Strobel-Shaw, C. San Juan Serrano, & Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network, Eds.). https://www.unodc.org/res/ji/resdb/data/2022/exploring_linkages_between_judicial_well-being_and_judicial_integrity_html/Global_Report_Judicial_Well-being.pdf

Zentralstelle Terrorismusverfolgung Nordrhein-Westfalen (ZenTer NRW) | NRW-Justiz. (n.d.). https://www.justiz.nrw/JM/justizpol_themen/zentralstellen_schwerpunkt-sta/zenTer

European Judicial Training Network (EJTN)

Rue du Commerce 123

1000 Bruxelles, Belgium

www.ejtn.eu | ejtn@ejtn.eu | +32 22 80 22 42