

## Annex 10: References

***The Functional Review conducted a comprehensive Desk Review of all recent analytic works related to justice reform in Serbia. The full Desk Review is available at <http://www.mdtfjss.org.rs/en/serbia-judicial-functional-review>***

*Additional references are below.*

*American Bar Association (2013). Detention Procedure Assessment for Serbia: Pre-Disposition Stages.*

*Asian Development Bank (2001), "What is Public Expenditure Management (PEM)?" The Governance Brief Issue 1 2001, available at <http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/LearningProgram/anticorrupt/GovernanceBrief-Issue.pdf>*

*Barkai, John and Elizabeth Kent (2014) "Let's Stop Spreading Rumors about Settlement and Litigation: A Comparative Study of Settlement and Litigation in Hawaii Courts", Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution, Vol 29: 85-160.*

*Blankenburg, Erhard (1999) Civil Justice: Access, Cost, and Expedition. The Netherlands, in A.A.S. Zuckerman, Civil Justice in Crisis: Comparative Perspectives of Civil Procedure. Oxford University Press; 442-463.*

*Bachmeier, Lance, Patrick Gaughman Null, and Norman R. Swanson. (2003) The Volume of Federal Litigation and the Macroeconomy. International Review of Law and Economics 24(2):191-207.*

*Bossi, Elena (2012), The execution of the ECtHR judgments in Italy: measures to reduce domestic excessive length of proceedings*

*Constitution of the Republic of Serbia, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 98/2006*

*Consolidated version of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE), European Charter on Statute of Judges, Strasbourg, 17 November 2010*

*Conference of Prosecutors General of Europe (2005), European guidelines on ethics and conduct for public prosecutors (Budapest guidelines)*

*Council of Europe Consultative Council of European Judges Opinions:*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No. 1 (2001) on standards concerning the independence of the judiciary and the immovability of judges*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.2 (2001) on the funding and management of courts with reference to the efficiency of the judiciary and to the article 6 of the European convention on human rights*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No. 3 on the principles and rules governing judges' professional conduct, in particular ethics, incompatible behavior and impartiality*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No. 4 (2003) on training for judges*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No. 6 (2004) on fair trial within a reasonable time and judge's role in trials taking into account alternative means of dispute settlement*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.7 (2005) on justice and society*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.9 (2006) on the role of national judges in ensuring an effective application of international and European law*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.10 (2007) on the Council for the Judiciary at the service of society*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.11 (2008) on the quality of judicial decisions*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.13 (2010) on the role of Judges in the enforcement of judicial decision*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.14 (2011) on Justice and information technologies (IT)*

*Consultative Council of European Judges (CCJE) Opinion No.16 (2013) on relations between judges and lawyers*

*Council of Europe Recommendations:*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (81) 7 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on measures facilitating access to justice*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (84) 5 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the principles of civil procedure designed to improve the functioning of justice*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (86) 12 of the committee of Ministers to Member States concerning measures to prevent and reduce the excessive workload in the courts*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (87) of the Committee of Ministers to Member States encouraging discretionary prosecution, summary procedures and the simplification of ordinary judicial procedures*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (93) 1) of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on effective access to the law and to justice for the very poor*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (94) 12 of the Committee of Ministers on the independence, efficiency and role of judges*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (95) 5 of the Committee of Ministers to member states concerning the introduction and improvement of the functioning of appeal system and procedures in civil and commercial cases*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (99) 4 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on principles concerning the legal protection of incapable adults*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2000) 19 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the role of public prosecution in the criminal justice system*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2001) 2 of the Committee of Ministers to member states concerning the design and re-design of court systems and legal information systems in a cost-effective manner*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2001) 3 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the delivery of court and other legal services to the citizen through the use of new technologies*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2002) 10 of the Committee of Ministers to member state on mediation in civil matters*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2003) 15 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on archiving of electronic documents in the legal sector*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2003) 17 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on enforcement*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2003) 16 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the execution of administrative and judicial decisions in the field of administrative law*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2006) 2 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on the European Prison Rules*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2007) 7 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on good administration*

*Council of Europe, Recommendation No. R (2010) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to member states on judges: independence, efficiency and responsibilities*

*Council of Europe, European Judicial Systems – Edition 2012 (2010 Data)*

*Council of Europe, Interim Resolution CM/ResDH(2009) 42 (available at <https://wcd.coe.int/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1423157&Site=CM>)*

*Council of Europe CPT/Inf (2012), Report to the Government of Serbia on the visit to Serbia carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 1 to 11 February 2011*

*Council of Europe, The Right to Trial within a Reasonable Time and Short-Term Reform of the European Court of Human Rights, Roundtable organized by the Slovenian Chairmanship of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe, 2009.*

*Commission of the European Communities, Serbia 2009 Progress Report, SEC (2009) 1339*

*De Pala, Giuseppe and Mary B. Trevor, eds., EU Mediation Law and Practice, Oxford University Press, 2012.*

*Department for International Development (2004), Serbian Civil Service: Assessment of Pay and Benefits System*

## Decisions of European Courts

*Federico Cipolla C-94/04 v Rosaria Fazari, née Portolese and Stefano Macrino and Claudia Capoparte C-202/04*

*v. Roberto Meloni, Judgment, European Court of Justice, 5 December 2006*

*Crnišani v. Serbia, Application no. 35835/05, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 13 January 2009*

*EVT and others v. Serbia, Application no. 3102/05, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 21 June 2007*

*Kacapor and others v. Serbia, Application no. 2269/06, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 15 January 2008*

*Maresti v. Croatia, Application no. 5575907, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 25 June 2009.*

*Petrovic v. Serbia, Application no. 75280/10, Judgment, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 18 February 2014*

*Vlahovic v. Serbia, Application no. 42619/04, European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 16 December 2008*

*Vuckovic and Others v. Serbia, Application no. 17153/11, Judgment (preliminary objection), European Court of Human Rights, Strasbourg, 25 March 2014*

*Draft report submitted to World Bank (on file in the World Bank) (2006), 'Civil and Criminal Justice – Swedish experiences'*

*Directive 2008/52/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 May 2008 on certain aspects of mediation in civil and commercial matters*

*Diagnostic Report For the Ministry of Justice and Public Administration of the Republic of Serbia (2013), Consultancy Services to Develop an ICT Strategy and Implementation Roadmap for the Justice Sector in the Republic of Serbia*

*ECHR Serbia Country profile, last updated: March 2014 and ECHR Annual Reports for 2011 and 2012.*

*European Commission, Directorate-General for Justice (2014), The EU Justice Scoreboard 2014*

*European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission), Report on European Standards as regards the independence of the judicial system (2010)*

*European Charter of Lay Judges, 11 May 2012*

*European Council (EU) Decision of 25 September 2008 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Community, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption (2008/801/EC)*

*European Commission (2004), European Code of conduct for mediators*

*European Commission (2012), Directorate-General for Justice, Positive Action Measures to Ensure Full Equality in Practice between Men and Women, including on Company Boards*

*European Ombudsman (2012), The European Code on Good Administrative Behavior*

*Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors, Havana, 27 August to 7 September 1990, U.N.*

*European Commission for the efficiency of justice (CEPEJ 2006), Compendium of “best practices” on time management of judicial procedure*

*European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ 2013), Analysis of data, Judicial systems of the European Union countries*

*European Commission for the efficiency of justice (CEPEJ 2014), Study on the functioning of judicial systems in the EU Member States, Strasbourg: Council of Europe*

*European Commission for the efficiency of justice (CEPEJ 2014), Report on European judicial systems – Edition 2014 (2012 data): efficiency and quality of justice*

*EBRD (2014), The Life in Transition Survey. <http://www.ebrd.com/pages/research/economics/data/lits.shtml>. Esposito, Gianluca, Sergi Lanau, and Sebastiaan Pompe*

*Federal Court of Malaysia and the World Bank (2011), The Malaysian Court Backlog and Delay Reduction Program: A Progress Report*

*Gartner Consulting (2012), Gartner IT Key Metrics, Data*

*Genn, Hazel (2010), Judging Civil Justice, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press*

*Government of the Republic of Serbia (Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia No. 71/2013 and 55/2014), The Action Plan for the Implementation of the National Judicial Reform Strategy for the period 2013-2018*

*Government of the Republic of Serbia, Anti-Corruption Council, Report on Judicial Reform (2014)*

*Gupta, Poonam, Rachel Kleinfeld, and Gonzalo Salinas (2002), Legal and Judicial Reform in Europe and Central Asia, The World Bank Operations Evaluation Department, Working Paper Series*

*<http://www.politika.rs/rubrike/Hronika/Pravda-je-zenski-posao.lt.html>.*

*<http://www.politika.rs/rubrike/Pogledi-sa-strane/Da-li-apelacioni-sudovi-sude-ili-obucavaju.sr.html>*

*<http://www.vss.sud.rs/doc/izbor-predsednika-sudova/Spisak-kandidata-koji-su-podneli-prijave-na-oglas-za-izbor-predsednika-sudova.pdf>.*

*IMF Working Paper No. 14/32, Judicial System Reform in Italy— A Key to Growth, Washington D.C. (available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2014/wp1432.pdf>)*

*Interim Resolution CM/ResDH (2009)42 of the Committee of Ministers, of March 19, 2009*

*ISO 15704, Standard for Enterprise Architecture.*

*ISO/IEC TR 10032:2003, Framework for Coordination of the Development of Standards for Data Management in Information Systems*

*ISO/IEC 11179, Standard for Representing an Organization's Data in a Metadata Registry)*

*ISO 8000, Standard for Data quality and Master Data*

*Judicial Systems of the European Union Countries, Analysis of data by the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) Council of Europe, June 2013, available at <http://www.canestrinilex.com/assets/Uploads/en/CEPEJ-report-2013.pdf>*

*Kritzer, Herbert (2000), Using Public Opinion to Evaluate Institutional Performance: the Experience with American Courts. The World Bank, PREM Note no. 45*

*Legal Action Group (2013), Paths to Justice: A Past, Present and Future Roadmap, Centre for Empirical Legal Studies, University College London.*

*Legal Action Group (1999), Paths to Justice: What People Do and Think about Going to Law, Hazel Glen, Hart Publishing.*

*List of Serbian Laws and Regulations:*

*Budget System Law, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 54/2009, 73/2010, 101/2010, 101/2011, 93/2012, 62/2013, 63/2013, 108/2013*

*Code on Criminal Procedure, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 72/2011, 101/2011, 121/2012, 32/2013, 45/2013 and 55/2014*

*Draft Free Legal Aid Law, available at <http://www.mpravde.gov.rs/sekcija/53/radne-verzije-propisa.php>*

*Rules on the Internal Regulation and Systematization of Job Positions at the Administrative Office, High Judicial Council, Republic of Serbia, April 2013.*

*Law on Civil Procedure, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 72/2011, 49/2013 – CC Decision, CC – Decision 55/2014*

*Law on the Organization of the Courts Republic of Serbia, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 116/2008, 104/2009, 101/2010, 31/2011, 78/2011, 101/2011 and 101/2013*

*Law on Public Prosecution, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 116/2008, 104/2009, 101/2010, 78/2011, 101/2011, 38/2012 - Decision of the CC, 121/2012, 101/2013*

*Law on Judicial Academy, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 104/2009 i 32/2014 – Decision of the CC*

*Law on Court Fees, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 28/94.*

*Rules of Court Procedure, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 110/2009, 70/2011, 19/2012 and 89/2013*

*Rules of Court Procedure, "Official Gazette of the Republic of Serbia" No. 110/2009, 70/2011, 19/2012 and 89/2013*

*Rules on the Internal Regulation and Systematization of Job Positions at the Administrative Office, High Judicial Council, Republic of Serbia, April 2013*

*Magaloni, Ana Laura and Layda Negrete (2001), El poder judicial y su politica de decidir sin resolver, CIDE Working Document*

*Megadata Table, World Bank. (Available at: <http://www.mdtfjss.org.rs/en/serbia-judicial-functional-review>)*

*National Center for State Courts (2004), Core Competencies, Human Resource Management Resource Guide, <http://www.ncsc.org/topics/human-resource-management/human-resource-management/resource-guide.aspx>*

*National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia (2013), National Judicial Reform Strategy 2013-2018*

*OSCE Office of Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (2011), Law Drafting and Legislative Process in the Republic of Serbia: an Assessment. Legis Paper-Nr.: 200/2011 YA*

*OECD (2007), Competitive Restrictions in Legal Professions (available at <http://www.oecd.org/regreform/sectors/40080343.pdf>)*

*OECD (2014), OECD Framework for Regulatory Policy Evaluation (available at <http://www.oecd.org/regreform/framework-for-regulatory-policy-evaluation.htm>)*

*Partners for Democratic Change Serbia (2012), Mediation in Serbia: Achievements and Challenges, Belgrade.*

*Pasara, Luis (2014). 'Qué impacto tiene la reforma procesal penal en la seguridad ciudadana?' in Carlos Basombrio (ed.) A dónde vamos? Análisis de políticas públicas de seguridad ciudadana en América Latina. Washington D.C. Wilson Center: 203-226*

*Petrus C. van Duyne, Elena Stocco (2012), Corruption Policy in Serbia, from Black Box to Transparent Policy Making*

*Reiling, Dory (2009), Technology for Justice: How Information Technology Can Support Judicial Reform, Leiden: Leiden University Press*

*Report by Nils Muižnieks Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe (2012), CommDH (2012)26*

*Robinson, Marc. 2013, Program Classification for Performance-Based Budgeting: How to Structure Budgets to Enable the Use of Evidence. IEG Evaluation Capacity Development Series. Washington, DC: World Bank. License: Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 3.0*

*Rulebooks on Criteria for Determining the Number of Court Staff in Courts and PPOs (Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia No. 72/2009 and 79/2009)*

*Seibert-Fohr, Anja (ed.) (2012), Judicial Independence in Transition, Heidelberg: Springer*

*State Prosecutorial Council Annual Report, 2012.*

*Svensson, Bo (2005). 'Managing the flow of appeals – Swedish experiences.' Draft report submitted to World Bank (on file in bank)*

*Transparency International (2014), Corruption Perceptions Index (available at <http://www.transparency.org/cpi2013/results>)*

*Transparency International (2014), Global Corruption Barometer (available at <http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013>)*

*The Bertelsmann Stiftung's Transformation Index (2014), (available at <http://www.bti-project.org/index>)*

*The EBRD-World Bank (2013), the Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey (BEEPS)*

*United States Agency for International Development (2012), Best Practices Guide: Backlog Prevention & Reduction Measures for Courts in Serbia*

*Tobin, Robert (2004), Trial Court Budgeting, National Center for State Courts Trial Court Budget*

*Tourangeau, R. Rips, L. and Rasinski. K. (2000), The Psychology of Survey Response, Cambridge University Press,  
UN (2007).*

*United Nations, Measures for the Effective Implementation of The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, adopted by the Judicial Integrity Group*

*United Nations, The Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its Optional Protocol (A/RES/61/106) adopted on 13 December 2006*

*UNDP (2014), Attitudes of Serbian Citizens towards Corruption, Eighth Research Cycle, question No 5, available at <http://www.rs.undp.org/content/serbia/en/home/presscenter/articles/2014/02/12/presentation-of-the-eighth-corruption-benchmarking-survey-in-serbia/>*

*UNDP Survey (2013) Impressum, Judicial Reform through the interaction of Citizens and States (Judicial Studies Series Volume II)*

*UNDP, Attitudes of Serbian Citizens towards corruption Public opinion research, December 2013*

*UN Economic and Social Council (2002), Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct*

*Vesna Rakić-Vodinelić, Ana Knežević Bojović, Mario Reljanović, The Center for Advanced Legal Studies (2012), Judicial Reform in Serbia 2008-2012*

*Venice Commission (2005), Opinion on the Provisions on the Judiciary in the Draft Constitution of the Republic of Serbia*

*Venice Commission (2007), Opinion on the Constitution of Serbia*

*World Bank (2002), An Analysis of Court Uses and Users in Latin America, Washington D.C.*



*World Bank (2009), 'Justice and Citizen Security,' Strengthening Performance Accountability in Honduras: Institutional Governance Review: Background Chapters, Washington D.C. (available at <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/3181>)*

*World Bank (2010), Uses and Users of Justice in Africa: The Case of Ethiopia's Federal Courts, Washington D.C.*

*World Bank (2011), Serbia: Spending for Justice: A Judicial Public Expenditure and Institutional Review, Washington D.C.*

*World Bank (2013), Comparative Analysis of Free Legal Aid Options, Washington D.C.*

*World Bank (2013), Serbian Free Legal Aid Fiscal Impact Analysis: Volume, Costs and Alternatives, Washington D.C.*

*World Bank (2014), Draft Comparative Court Budgeting Analysis, June, 2013, Case Study – Court Budgeting Practices in Serbia, Washington D.C. (unpublished)*

*World Bank (2014), Judicial Process Maps in Serbia (forthcoming)*

*World Bank (2014), Access to Justice in Serbia, Washington D.C.*

*World Bank (2014), Court Performance Measurement: International Perspectives and Approaches, Washington D.C.*

*World Bank (2014), Multi-Stakeholder Justice Survey, Washington D.C.*

*World Economic Forum (2014), Global Competitiveness Report (available at <http://www.weforum.org/reports/global-competitiveness-report-2014-2015>)*

*World Justice Program (2014), Rule of Law Index (available at [http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/files/wjp\\_rule\\_of\\_law\\_index\\_2014\\_report.pdf](http://worldjusticeproject.org/sites/default/files/files/wjp_rule_of_law_index_2014_report.pdf))*