



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL JUSTICE and CONSUMERS

Directorate A
Unit A4: Programme management

JUST/2015/ACTION GRANTS

ANNEX 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

Name of the Applicant organisation	Istituto di Ricerca sui Sistemi Giudiziari, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche
Project Title	Handle with care: assessing and designing methods for evaluation and development of the quality of justice
Priority reference	Court Practices for judicial quality evaluation, development and assurance

NOTICE

All personal data (such as names, addresses, CVs, etc.) mentioned in your application form will be processed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data. Your replies to the questions in this form are necessary in order to assess your grant application and they will be processed solely for that purpose by the department responsible for the Union grant programme concerned. On request, you may be sent personal data to correct or complete it. For any questions relating to this data, please contact the Commission department to which the form must be returned. Beneficiaries may lodge a complaint against the processing of their personal data with the European Data Protection Supervisor at any time (Official Journal L 8, 12.1.2001).

PART 1 – GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT AND APPLICANT ORGANISATION

1.1. Summary of the project (max. 4000 characters)

Describe briefly the project's objectives and activities, the type and number of persons who will benefit from the project, the expected results and the type and number of outputs to be produced.

This should be identical to the summary contained in section 4.3 of the *Grant Application Form*.

Note: You are requested to include information under all headings mentioned below and to respect the limit of 4000 characters indicated above.

Objectives

The main objective is to identify better methods to evaluate and develop the quality of justice at national and EU level. This is pursued through an unbiased, in-depth investigation of the methods currently used by 5 EU justice systems to evaluate and develop the quality of justice. These data will be compared to identify the conditions of failure and success, and used to provide inputs to those that, at EC/EU level are currently engaged in judicial quality evaluation. This will provide the empirical and theoretical background to develop the innovative methodological framework to evaluate and improve the quality of justice delivered by the project.

Activities

- Development of a coherent research methodology
- In depth case study analysis at national level
- Comparative analysis of national case studies
- Analysis the findings to provide inputs relevant for EU/EC judicial quality evaluation and development
- Methodological framework development
- Workshop to discuss the findings with national experts
- Workshop to discuss the findings with EU/EC officials engaged in judicial evaluation
- Participation at 5 international conferences to disseminate the results
- Publication of the research findings (reports and ebook) in a website

Type and number of persons benefiting from the project

- EU citizens involved in judicial proceedings (several millions per year)
- Judges, lawyers and all the practitioners involved in the delivery of justice (more than one million in EU)
- All those directly engaged in evaluation and development of quality of justice at national level within EU member states (2 or 3 hundreds)
- National judicial policy makers (one hundred)
- EU officials and agents engaged in the evaluation and development of quality of justice (few dozens)
- The academic community engaged in applied legal studies and quality management (two hundred)

Expected results

- A better knowledge on quantitative and qualitative methods currently used by national judicial systems to evaluate and develop the quality of justice based on in-depth case study analysis

- An identification of common and divergent approaches, as well as conditions of failure and success through the comparative analysis of the national studies
- The exploitation of the knowledge acquired to provide inputs relevant for those engaged in judicial quality evaluation and development activities at EU/EC level.
- An empirically and theoretically grounded proposal for an innovative methodological framework to evaluate and develop the quality of justice
- A proper dissemination of the findings during and after the project.

Type and number of outputs to be produced

The project findings, will be organised in the following outputs

- **1** report describing the **research methodology** to be followed in the national studies
- **5 National reports** (one per participating judicial system);
- **1 Comparative report**
- **1 EU report** examining the project findings in the light of EU/EC activities in the fields of evaluation and promotion of the quality of justice of member states and of the countries involved in the accession programme.
- 1 report providing the outline of a **methodology framework**, a proposal for future evaluation and development of quality of justice.

Given the short timeframe of the project, the dissemination will be based on:

- The publication of the reports on the web site already developed by the by the EU financed project CFMnet, also in the form of an e-book.
- **1 Workshop** to discuss the project findings with court leaders and national specialists in judicial quality evaluation and development.
- **1 EU workshop** to present the findings at EU/EC stakeholders.

Participation at **5 international conferences** to present the interim and final findings of the project.

1.2. Definition of the problem, needs assessment and objectives of the project

What are the problems and/or the current situation? Which are the needs that the project aims to address?

In relation to these problems and needs, what are the major objectives that the project should attain? Who are the target group(s) of your activities and why were they chosen?

Note:

You are expected to provide here a needs assessment for your proposed activities. Such needs assessment should include relevant and reliable data and should contain a robust analysis clearly demonstrating the need for the action. The applicant can refer to existing research, studies, previous projects which had already identified the need. The needs assessment must make it clear to what extent the action will meet the need and this shall be quantified. You are requested to be specific and focus on the actual needs that your project will aim to address and not limit the analysis to general statements and information about the problems and needs of the target group in general.

Definition of the problem – In the past few decades it has become obvious that courts are not only representatives of the public authority, but in the same time, service providers for citizens and other institutions. This is why one of the eminent interests of EU member states is to pay attention to quality issues of the judicial activity. Budget constraints, a growing attention to the services delivered by public institutions, and the ‘justice for growth’ agenda are some of the reasons pushing European justice systems to improve and evaluate the quality of justice. Such attempts have been

promoted by international organisations, court administrations, national policymakers and individual judges, passing through national governance bodies and courts. The new public management, with its emphasis on managerial techniques, quantitative indicators and goal-oriented administration has been one of the key drives of change. This new policy stream has been often coupled with the introduction of new methods for the evaluation of the quality of justice based on quantitative measures. At the same time, also other approaches have been explored and implemented to improve different aspects of judicial administration, such as access to justice, treatment of the parties, quality of judicial writing, and judicial consistency. Such approaches are based on various qualitative approaches rooted in legal, political and sociological disciplines.

The peculiar institutional setting of judiciaries makes the functioning of these quality evaluation and improvement mechanisms particularly challenging. Indeed, within the state organisation, the checks and balances concerning courts and judges are usually framed in the tension between judicial independence and judicial accountability. In organisational terms, it refers to the classic tensions between professionals and managers in professional organisations. For judiciaries, this tension is reinforced, because accountability works both towards the public, both towards the political domain, whereas according to the rule of law, judges must be independent from other state powers or external influence and impartial when conducting a case. This general description leaves many questions unanswered: who is responsible for what aspect of the judicial work? In how far may attempts to assess the functioning of judges and court organisations be followed up upon in terms of policies, management & organisation and professionals? In what ways, and by whom? How are the different approaches to measure and assess the quality of justice performing? How the tension between independence and accountability is working out?

Needs assessment and objectives of the problem - 20 years of experiences with quality management in judiciaries have not delivered a one size fits all methodology for assessing and improving the functioning of courts and judges. A general insight so far is, that it makes sense to distinguish between political, managerial and professional perspectives. Of course these perspectives usually are in line with specific actors: policy makers in the political domain; managers and chief judges in the managerial domain; judges in the professional domain. Adapting the courts and the prosecutions services to sometimes-rapid societal and technological changes while safeguarding the proper institutional setting is challenging and progress has been slow in many countries. There are indications that progress depends on balancing political, organisational and professional perspectives. There have been quite an interesting number of projects and they also have been analysed. But so far, a comprehensive methodology that combines assessment and organisation development capable of encompassing the variance of situations and balances of experiences in court administration has not been developed. **The development of such methodology is the final goal of the project.** To do this, we propose to describe and analyse the methods of evaluation of quality and quality development, at individual (judge) organisational (court) and judicial system (Ministries and councils) levels. This will provide the groundwork for combining and fine-tuning those methodologies in a judicial context. The outline and analysis of this new approach to evaluation and quality development in the judicial domain will be presented in such a fashion that it can be effectively wielded by policymakers, managers and professionals in the justice field.

We will do this, first, by an **inventory and analysis of evaluation methodologies for the functioning of courts, judges and judicial administrations.** Second, we will **describe and analyse policies, change strategies and implementation efforts in combination with the associated political, organisational and professional perspectives.** In the different contexts of judicial organisations the interactions between evaluation outcomes and efforts to improve the functioning of courts and judges often are marked by tensions between professional judges, court management, national court administration and national politics. **The key to success and failure of policies, organisation development and professionalization in judiciaries therefore is most likely to be found in the ways these tensions are mediated and balanced.**

Quantitative and qualitative evaluation strategies that do not take these tensions into account, therefore, are likely to fail. Such approaches need to be tuned with policymakers' wishes, to managerial perspectives and to the preferences from the professional judicial domain. Developing an improvement methodology for judiciaries is not a simple choice between quantitative and qualitative assessment, but an informed set of choices about what aspects of the functioning

of courts and judges can be successfully measured and for what purposes and how they can be measured; and about what aspects of the functioning of courts and judges are better assessed by qualitative methods, what these different methods entail and how the outcomes are used for policy and/or organisation development and/or professionalization. In any case, methodologies developed to evaluate and improve the quality of justice should be designed and implemented keeping the peculiarities of judicial institutions in stark focus. It's an area in which design and implementation of evaluation mechanisms – and actions to follow-up on outcomes - must be 'handled with care'. For this reasons, the project is called **“Handle with care”: assessing and designing methods for evaluation and development of the quality of justice**

This project follows an empirical approach. In order to design a realistic evaluation and organisation development methodology, it starts with the analyses of the ways in which the 5 judiciaries involved in the project design and implement mechanisms to evaluate and improve the quality of justice and work to reconcile the tension that may emerge in the process. A comparative analysis, and a report tailored on the issues that are more relevant for EU policy making will complete the assessment. Finally, the new methodology will be outlined taking advantage of the knowledge developed in the previous actions.

Based on the results of the proposed project our further purpose is to offer new, innovative solutions. Carrying out this task we heavily rely on the latest developments of political philosophy, managerial studies and legal sociology.

To stir up the dissemination of the results in the short timeframe of the project, each partner will attend one international conference to present interim and final research findings.

Furthermore, two workshops will be organised: one to discuss the project findings with national specialists in quality evaluation and development, a second to present and discuss with interested officials of the DG Justice and Consumers the findings that are more relevant for their institutional missions. All the reports will be published online on the website already developed by CFMnet, in which 3 project partners are involved. This reuse will save time and costs.

Given the length of the project specified by the call of maximum 12 month, and considering that the projects aims at conducting in-depth analyses, it's realistic to limit the project to the above-mentioned stages. As a consequence, a book with the project findings will be published after the termination of the project.

1.3. Relevance and justification (max. 4000 characters)

How does your project address the call priority under which you are applying? What is the project's contribution in this area?

What are the innovative aspects of the project?

...

In the last 10 years, the development of the European area of justice and the associated EU justice policy has become also a support for economic growth and structural reforms in line with Europe 2020 strategy.

The *Annual growth surveys* of the last three years, clearly state that the efficiency and the fairness of independent judicial systems is also an important prerequisite for economic growth (2015, p. 14). “There is a clear need to tackle issues such as the length of proceedings, the number of pending cases, the insufficient use of ICT, the promotion of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and the independence of judicial systems” (p. 14 2015). This should reduce costs for businesses and increase the attractiveness of the country to foreign investors. (2013, p. 13). In a few words “Growth and competitiveness is always associated to quality and efficiency of justice systems” {COM(2013) 800 final}. Even if the emphasis is on attractiveness and economic growth, the EU Justice Agenda for 2020 properly embrace a richer spectrum of desirable effects resulting from the good functioning of justice system, in particular protection of fundamental rights, mutual trust and mobility of European citizens. In this way, the Justice Agenda sees the richness of the values to be upheld by European justice systems.

The project team has a long research experience in this field, with a remarkable track of research projects, scientific publications, technical advice and collaboration with international organisations. Just to make some examples, of

contributions offered by project participants M. Velicogna has co-authored the CEPEJ study “*The functioning of judicial systems and the situation of the economy in the European Union Member States*” (2013) which was used as the bases for the first EU Justice Scoreboard, and F. Contini has authored the section of Judicial performance evaluation of the UNODC “*Resource Guide on Strengthening Judicial Integrity and Capacity*” (2011). More details about the works done by the project partners in this field are detailed in section 1.8.

From the researches we have conducted in the last 15 years, it emerges that the discussion about how to measure or evaluate the quality of justice is still open and disputed in policy making as well as in academic circles. It is therefore an area in which an empirical assessment of current practices and an analysis of their limits and potentialities are highly needed. The question of quality of justice evaluation and development is relevant not just because it matches the priority of the call, but because their better understanding is needed to assess the impact of reforms and innovation in this field. Indeed, without a clarification about the methods available, their range of functioning, and their reliability, the evaluation of policy impact will be imprecise, and possibly misleading. For such reasons, we surmise the question of quality assurance and quality evaluation is the topic with the highest priority when considering “court best practices in Member States to improve the functioning of the judiciary”.

1.4. Expected results (max. 4000 characters)

What are the expected results of the project? Who will benefit from these results and how?

How will the target groups of the project benefit concretely from the project results and what shall change for them?

How will these results contribute to achieving the objectives of the call priority under which you are applying?

Note:

Results are immediate changes that arise for the target groups after the completion of the project (e.g. improved knowledge, increased awareness).

Results must be distinguished from outputs, which are produced with the resources allocated to the project, e.g. training courses, conferences, leaflets.

The main objectives are to identify and share better methods to evaluate and develop the quality of justice at national and EU level.

Such objectives rise from the difficulties faced by the methods currently used to evaluate the quality of justice, and from the limited capacity of transforming the evaluation in real improvement (see section 1.2). The limits of the current situation and the ambition of the goal, suggest a careful and empirically based approach. This will be first of all pursued through and an unbiased, in-depth investigation of the methods currently used by 5 EU justice systems to evaluate and develop the quality of justice.

This first endeavour will provide a rich set of data, and facilitate the identification of the conditions that makes so difficult the evaluation of the quality of justice. Furthermore, it will provide the data needed to understand what conditions have to be fulfilled to conduct a meaningful and relevant judicial quality evaluation exercise. The comparative analysis between the 5 judicial systems will help reaching this objective.

A further objective is to link up these findings with the exercise of judicial quality evaluation and improvement currently conducted by the EC and the EU. Just to make an example, the data and the comparisons made by the EU justice scoreboard can be integrated by new data stream, or revised in the light of the finding of the national case studies. Furthermore, some work can be done to make these data more relevant and understandable at national level. We think the methodological triangulation between national case study, comparative analysis and EU/EC needs and practices in evaluating the quality of justice can be beneficial to both national and European level.

The final and more ambitious objective will be the development of a new methodological framework for quality evaluation and improvement. This will be developed through the identification of the conditions of failure and success of

the methods currently used, and built upon the robust empirical data set created by the research and the theoretical background already developed by the project partners in previous works. The method will make it possible to evaluate the quality of judicial activity in empirical terms, making judicial performance more visible and transparent for citizens and policy makers.

Reaching these objectives will be beneficial for all those engaged in judicial quality evaluation and development within national justice systems and at EU/EC level. Also, the improvement of such methods, supporting the delivery of better justice, will be beneficial for all the professionals involved in the delivery of justice and finally to the justice users. Last but not least, as noticed in the EU justice agenda for 2020, an improved quality of justice will help promoting economic growth, trust and mobility within the Union.

We think these objectives, their emphasis on court's and judicial practices, the exchange of practices enabled by the study, the focus on quality evaluation and development, the connection with EU/EC activities in the field and with the new EU Justice agenda, perfectly match the priorities of the call.

The project has been designed keeping in stark focus the 12 months duration established by the call, and its budget limited to 1 M Euro, presumably to be assigned to different projects. Considering such constraints, the project has been designed to deliver high value results in a short term and with a limited budget.

1.5. European added value (max. 2000 characters)

What is the project's added value at European level?

How will you ensure that the project methodology and/or outputs and/or results will be transferable at European level?

Note: *European added value of actions, including that of small-scale and national actions, shall be assessed in the light of criteria such as their contribution to the consistent and coherent implementation of Union law, and to wide public awareness about the rights deriving from it, their potential to develop mutual trust among Member States and to improve cross-border cooperation, their transnational impact, their contribution to the elaboration and dissemination of best practices or their potential to contribute to the creation of minimum standards, practical tools and solutions that address cross-border or Union-wide challenges.*

The European added value of the project is twofold.

At the EU member state level the project will provide the most updated assessment of the methodologies currently used to assess and improve the quality of justice in 5 EU judiciaries. Such judiciaries cover different geographical areas and European legal traditions. Also, they differ in terms of governance structure, a factor that largely affects the way in which the quality of justice is evaluated and promoted. The data collection and the analysis, therefore, will provide a robust empirical background relevant for European judiciaries interested in improving the quality of their justice system.

At the European level, the project will deliver a report in which the findings will be distilled and used to provide feedback that will be useful for the key evaluation exercises conducted by the EU: the justice scoreboard, Country specific recommendations (EUROPE 2020) and the periodical evaluation within the accession programme.

The **Justice scoreboard** is the key tool elaborated by the EC to compare the quality of European Justice systems. The Handle with care projects will allow to check the quality and comparability of the data used by the justice scoreboard; identify new data or common data definitions that can improve the scoreboard; suggest new approaches, data or indicators to improve or integrate the scoreboard.

The Commission regularly publishes **country-specific recommendations for each Member State** (EUROPE 2020). Quite often, such recommendations deal with issues related to the quality of justice. Suggestions are provided to member states in order to improve the specific weaknesses. In a different context, the EU conducts **periodical evaluation of the justice systems of the states included in the accession programme**. In both cases, the availability of additional information about statistical data and evaluation methods will help to provide more accurate assessments.

Furthermore the “policy menu” resulting from the comparative assessment will help the Commission to suggest to member states measures to evaluate and improve the quality of justice

1.6. Methodology

Outline the approach and methodology. Explain why this is the best approach to attain the objectives and the proposed results.

Explain the structure and complementarity of the workstreams (see part 2 of this document).

Workstream 0 Management

The applicant and the partners condensed in this workstream the activities that are exclusively dedicated to the general management and the coordination of the project. It includes the kick-off meeting organised by the Commission, its preparation and follow up, project planning, administration and monitoring, control of the quality and of the milestones, contractual and financial issues including reporting to the Commission, the final reports, risk management and ethical issues and sustainability.

As requested by the call for proposal, in the final report particular attention will be placed in documenting the number of subject reached by the project, and provide relevant data (anonymised and disaggregated) about the persons reached. This will be done through surveys distributed in the workshops and through the monitoring of the access to the website.

Workstream 1 - National analysis - The research starts with an **assessment of quantitative and qualitative methods** used by 5 European judiciaries to evaluate the quality of justice as well as with the discussion of how the evaluation is followed up by measures to improve the quality of justice. These national findings will be integrated with the results of previous researches in order to provide a richer data set. The goal of this first workstream is to provide, an inventory of current evaluation systems and of their goal in each of the five justice systems considered. A special focus will be dedicated to explore the linkage between the evaluation system in place and gender issues. Indeed, there are signals that despite the equal opportunity policies implemented by various member states, the gender distribution at the various court level is unbalanced (see section 1.15).

The ambition is to consider their actual use and operations, if the data assembled are valid and reliable, if they are followed up by concrete measures and improvements. Key to this approach is that in each case the description of the methodologies will be coupled with policy, management and organisation, and professional perspectives on the assessments and measures to follow up on outcomes.

Workstream 2 – Comparative and European Issues - The data collected in the first workstream, will be further analysed to produce two different reports. The first will be a **comparative assessment** aimed at mapping out common and divergent approaches, problems, and solutions in terms of methodologies and the ways in which efforts have been made to balance the different perspectives (policy, management/organisation, professional) in the contexts of judicial organisations. This will result in a second level, or meta-evaluation, of the systems currently used by the five judicial systems. The second report will deal with **EU policy-making** issues. It will distil the findings of the research, looking at activity of quality of justice evaluation carried out by the EC such as the justice scoreboard and the periodic evaluations of member states and candidate countries and following up on outcomes. The methodology is designed to keep in stark focus the institutional and constitutional features of the systems that affect the quality of justice and its evaluation: judicial independence, and services delivered by autonomous professionals. It considers the aims, the validity of concepts and methods and the reliability of assessments. In so far the evaluation proposed can be called a ‘meta-evaluation’.

Workstream 3 Methodology development - The analysis of the 5 case studies will result in insights of the conditions by which reliable assessments can be effectively used by policymakers, managers and professionals to enhance judicial and service qualities in court organisations. It should be noted that this is more than a state-internal exercise in the justice domain. Evaluations and follow-ups on outcomes are strongly related to societal developments. Usually these developments are external to the courts, and the methodology should help to balance the tensions between policymakers, managers and professionals in order to keep (ongoing) change processes flexible.

Workstream 4 -Dissemination - The fourth workstream will be dedicated to dissemination. Considering the strict timeline of the project, this will be based on two workshops one addressed to discuss the findings with national specialists in quality evaluation, the second addressed to all those that, within European institutions and particularly within the Commission, are interested in the issues of the evaluation and development of the quality of justice.

The following subsections provides a detailed outline of the working method, including the activities, and the research questions guiding the indepth study we propose to carry out.

Workstream 1 – National analysis

Quantitative methods - Judicial systems collect multipurpose statistical data that are also used for the evaluation of the quality of justice. In this area, the project wants to investigate which **data and quantitative methods** are used to evaluate the quality of justice. The complexity of this first area is often underestimated. However our previous works demonstrate that reliability, validity and transnational comparability of such data cannot be taken for granted. Just to make an example, the operative definitions of “professional” and “non professional” judge established by the CEPEJis implemented in different ways by the various member states, influencing (increasing or decreasing) affecting key indicators such as number of cases per judge. To deal with this issue at transnational level, it is necessary to start with the way in which key data are counted or calculated in each justice system.

More in detail the following topics will be addressed:

- 1) Which statistical data are collected and used for these purposes;
- 2) How data are collected and elaborated;
- 3) How the different legal backgrounds of the evaluated judicial systems affect the meaning of a given indicator?
- 4) To what extent such data are reliable and comparable at national level (previous researches proved that the reliability of some statistical data cannot be taken for granted);
- 5) Which quality dimension are measured (timelines, efficiency, judicial consistency...) with such statistical data;
- 6) To what extent the statistical data collected provide valid indicators for measuring the above mentioned quality dimensions;
- 7) Are there innovative methods to use quantitative data for measuring quality dimensions such as big data or semantic-analysis? Is this done on an ad hoc base (specific research), or as regular programme?

Qualitative methods - Justice systems have a long-standing tradition in using qualitative methods to evaluate and improve the quality of justice through a broad range of tools ranging from the motivation of the decision to the judgements to appeal, from open court to judicial records. These methods work as quality evaluation and assurance mechanisms in various ways.

It's bottom line that this basic set of mechanisms are in place in all the jurisdictions considered. However there can be important differences. Just to make an example the length and structure of sentences, or the detail of the motivations to be used in each justice system can be different, and also the right to appeal can be limited to specific cases. We think that such components are relevant for any discourse on quality of justice.

Furthermore, there are various methodological issues related with qualitative evaluation. The work of inspectorates is a good example: indeed, the work carried out by such bodies can be based on methodologies that are not always clear and well understood, and that can be challenged in terms of methodology, consistency, validity of the work they do.

Last but not least, there are innovations also in qualitative methods: various European judiciaries are elaborating sentencing guidelines to improve the consistency of judicial decision making, while other are using external or internal observers to evaluate the behaviour of the judge in open hearing. No doubt, the identification and analysis of such new mechanisms is relevant for the study, and for the promotion of the quality of justice in Europe. Some of the questions to be answered by the research are:

- 1) Which process/functions are evaluated through qualitative data?

- 2) How such data are collected and elaborated?
- 3) To what extent such data are reliable?
- 4) Which quality dimensions are evaluated (judicial consistency, quality of legal writing, behaviour in court hearing...)?
- 5) Are there innovative evaluation methods based on qualitative methods?

Follow up - With quality evaluation, there is always the risk of having ritualistic exercises. Such as the collection of statistical data not followed by any consequences, or the publication of court (or justice systems reports not followed by any consequences, or judgements of appeal that are not communicated to the first instance judge who has taken the decision. We think that evaluation exercises should be followed by some consequences. This is a pre-requisite to transform evaluation into improvement and organisational learning. At the same time European judicial systems have implemented innovative methods to evaluate and improve the quality of justice. The Rovaniemi Court of Appeal, the Swedish approach to the quality of justice based on dialogue, the Dutch RechtspraakQ, the Italian work of the “Civil Justice Observatories” have identified peculiar methods that, through joint inquiries often based on a mix of qualitative and quantitative data, try to join up quality evaluation and improvements. Some of the relevant questions to be addressed are:

- 1) Is there any consequence in the evaluation mechanisms?
- 2) Are there automatic consequences (such as increase or decrease of court financing), or does some process mediate them?
- 3) Are there mechanisms to improve the quality of justice using joining up evaluation and improvement such as salary based performance, resource allocation based on case load or workload, etc.

Workstream 2 - Comparative and European Issues

Comparative assessment

In this second workstream, the research will conduct a comparative assessment between the evaluation mechanisms developed and adopted in the various jurisdiction considered in the study. Apart from identifying common or divergent trends, recurrent problems, evaluation dynamics and smart solutions, the assessment will distil a menu of data and methods used to evaluate and improve the quality of justice systems. Such menu is designed to become a relevant tool to support policy making in the field of evaluation of the quality of justice. Furthermore, comparative analysis will provide the proper setting to conduct a meta-evaluation – i.e. an evaluation of the evaluation mechanisms in place in the different MS through a common framework. On its turn, this step is needed to distil the factors for success or failure of quality evaluation.

European level

The European Union is playing an active role in promoting the quality of judicial system. The Justice for growth agenda emphasises the linkage between the quality of justice and economic growth. More generally, the EU is engaged in various ways in evaluating the quality of justice of old and new member states, as well as of the states involved in the accession process. The research conducted at national level (previous stage) is designed to provide relevant pieces of information / knowledge to support such European policies in these areas. The findings will be encapsulated in a dedicated report and discussed in a seminar organised to discuss with EC and EU policy makers the findings of the project. The relevance of this workstream is better detailed in section 1.5 (European Relevance)

Workstream 3 - Methodology framework development

In this workstream the outcomes of workstream 1 and 2 will be combined with an up to date review of performance evaluation literature, quality management literature and change management literature, and of publications focussed on professional judicial values. The outcomes of those literature reviews will be systematically confronted with the outcomes of workstreams 1 and 2. The outcomes of this ‘confrontational’ analysis will be presented as explanations for successes or failures. Furthermore, from these outcomes, the researchers will develop choices for evaluation and organisation development strategies to be made that take into account policy perspectives, organisation and management perspectives and judicial professional perspectives. These possible choices will be presented as a reflection on research outcome, as a part of the report. The results will be presented in workshops 1 and 2, and reactions will be taken into account in the final report.

Workstream 4– Dissemination

The third workstream will be dedicated to dissemination. For reasons of space and to avoid redundancy and duplication this workstream has been discussed in section 1.12 (Dissemination strategy and communication tools).

1.7. Timeline by workstream (max. 2000 characters)

Provide in a structured manner the timing of the activities per Workstream by using, for instance, a Gantt chart.

Activities	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M9	M10	M11	M12
Project inception (+ 4 months after the signature of the contract)												
WS 0 – Project management												
Project kick-off meeting (EC)												
Project research meeting												
Establishing project plan												
Project monitoring & admin												
Contract. & budget reporting												
WS 1 – National analysis												
Methodology Draft												
Methodology definition												
Website preparation												
Desk study and data collection												
Fieldworks												
Reports drafting												
Internal (peer) review												
Final draft (nat. reports)												
WS 2 – Comparative and European Issues												
Comparative assessment report drafting												
EU report drafting												
Internal (peer) review												
Final draft Comp. assessment												
Final draft EU report												
WS 3 – Methodology development												
Methodology framework drafting												
Internal (peer) review												
Final draft, methodology framework												
WS 4 - Dissemination												
Publication of the reports on the website												
Workshop with experts												
EU/EC workshop												
Project findings presentation at international conferences												
End of the project												X

1.8. The partnership and the core project team (max. 4000 characters)

Describe the partnership of organisations implementing the project (applicant, partners, associate partners). Explain how the partners and associate partners were selected, and why this partnership is suited to attain the objectives of the

project. Describe the value of the partnership, its strengths/weaknesses, the organisational arrangements within the partnership and how you will ensure coordination within the partnership.

List and introduce the persons forming the core project team . The CVs of the key project staff members (e.g. project manager, financial manager and the key experts) must be annexed to the application.

Applicant

The Research Institute on Judicial System of the National Research Council of Italy (IRSIG-CNR)

Partners:

University of Debrecen (DU)

University of Limoges (UL)

Utrecht University (UL)

Lappeenranta University of Technology (LUT)

History, reasons and strength of the partnership - In 2003 Pauliat, (UL) Fabri (IRSIG-CNR) and Langbroek (UU) published *“The administration of Justice in Europe: towards the development of quality standard”*. The book is one of the results of a EU founded comparative research that introduced the concept of quality of justice in judicial administration. As detailed in the partnership declarations and in the attached CVs, an interrupted stream of collaborative research has followed that pioneering and seminal work. In other world, the members of this partnership are the founders of the European studies on quality of justice. If this concept is now the headline of this call for projects, is also thanks to this endeavour.

In 2014 UU and IRSIG-CNR joined the LUT in the project *“Towards European Caseflow Management development network”*, (T. Pirttilä) addressed to identifying, developing and sharing best practices in case management. This research is delivering relevant insights on how analytical information, operational management, and data driven monitoring can improve the functioning and the quality of justice. In the same year, the UD (M. Bencze) organised a research conference on *“How to Measure the Quality of Judicial Reasoning”* focusing on the essence of judicial administration, and on the associated methodological and practical questions. Various researchers involved in the *“Handle with care”* project proposal have attended at this successful conference.

The partnership of our project stems from this long and successful collaboration, from common research interests, and from the complementarity of the know-hows.

IRSIG-CNR provides the politological bases, UU the focus court dynamics and organisation development, LUT the quantitative approach to the study of judicial administration, UL and DU make available a rich spectrum of juridical know-how.

All these different academic backgrounds are needed to study a phenomenon, as the quality of justice, with deep entanglements with the democratic framework in which judicial institutions operate, with the rule of law upheld by courts, and with the financial constraints that affect judicial systems. We guess, it is difficult to find other research institutions within the EU with comparable research experiences, academic and practical results and dissemination capacity (see 1.12).

Organisational arrangement and coordination - Coordination will be granted through a clear division of labour, an experienced project management, and well established protocols to grant the scientific quality of the reports, assure the validity and reliability and comparability of the data. Each team will be composed of experienced researchers (CVs attached) and by juniors researchers specifically recruited for the project. In this way, the project will support the growth of the community of scholars with relevant experience in measure and development of the quality of justice will be promoted.

More in detail:

IRSIG-CNR (applicant) will supervise the entire project, providing scientific, administrative, and financial advices to the partner, monitoring the timely delivery of the report, and assuring the scientific quality of the findings. As detailed in part 2 of this Technical Annex, the applicant and the four partners will have the responsibility of one of the workstream.

Key roles

Francesco Contini: project coordinator

Marco Fabri, Helen Pauliat, Matyas Bencze, Timo Pirttilä, Philip Langbroek: Scientific quality assurance

Reports coordination:

Report	Partner	Coordinators
Italy	IRSIG	Davide Carnevali
Finland	LUT	Petra Pekkanen
Hungary	DU	Matyas Bencze
The Netherlands	UU	Philip Langbroek
France	UL	Caroline Foulquier
Comparative analysis	UL	Helen Pauliat
	LUT	Timo Pirttilä
EU report	DU	Matyas Bencze
	IRSIG	Marco Velicogna
Methodological framework	UU	Philip Langbroek

The quality of the above mentioned reports will be assured by internal reviews, carried out by the research team in charge of conducting the study, and by an external reviews, conducted by the research partners not directly involved in the writing. The working cycle will be as follow:

- 1) First draft
- 2) Internal review
- 3) Second draft
- 4) Project review
- 5) Final draft

1.9. Subcontracting (max. 2000 characters)

If applicable, explain the reasons for any subcontracting in your project.

Note: On the definition of subcontracting please read carefully section V.1.5.3 of the Guide for Action Grants.

We do not envisage the need of subcontracting for the implementation of the project.

The technical support to the implementation of the project specified in the budget will be limited to administrative activities related to the proper administration of the projects (timesheets, proof of payments, etc.). We don't think therefore it can be qualified as subcontracting as specified in the guide for action grant 2015. Rather it is an implementation contract (1.5.2).

1.10. Monitoring of the project implementation; risks and measures to mitigate them (max 2000 characters)

How will you ensure that the project is implemented as planned and what methods will you use to monitor its progress? What are the potential risks and what action do you plan to undertake to mitigate them?

On the basis of the project plan and milestones provided in the project proposal, the applicant, in strict coordination with the partners will proceed with the continuous monitoring of the project progress, assess the timely achievement of milestones and support corrective actions if implementation issues arise.

The exact timeline for project actions and milestones are indicated in the description of the workstreams of the project and will be also agreed upon by the participants during at the inception of the project in order to take into account the contingencies that should emerge between the project submission and its kick off.

Given the strict timeline of the project, two activities require a strict monitoring.

The first is the comprehensiveness and the delivery of national reports, since they provide the pieces of information needed to draft the comparative and the EC report, and the methodology framework that are the final and utmost goal of the Handle with care project.

The second is the organisation of the workshops. Indeed, to be sure to hold such meetings in due time, they have to be organised before the termination of the project. Therefore the project coordinator will take all the reasonable measures needed to assure that the dates of the workshop will be booked at least two month before the termination of the project. Last but not least at the inception stage, we will contact DG Justice to check their availability to attend at the workshop planned in Brussels.

1.11. Evaluation of the project activities, outputs and results (max. 2000 characters)

How will the project activities, the outputs and the results be evaluated, and by whom?

Explain which quantitative and qualitative indicators you propose to use for the evaluation of the reach and coverage of project activities and of project results.

Explain what data will be collected, according to what method and at what moments, including feedback from project participants (satisfaction surveys, evaluation forms, etc.).

How will findings be analysed and reported and how will they be used.

Note: For the evaluation of the activities you will be requested to use a participation evaluation questionnaire provided by the Commission.

You must identify which indicators you will use from the list provided in section 5 of the Application Form for Action Grant and include them in the indicators of your project. You will be asked to report on those indicators as part of the project's Final Report.

Where relevant, data must be disaggregated by gender and by age.

The project will deliver **8 reports**:

- **5 national reports**
- **1 Comparative report**
- **1 EU report**
- **1 methodology framework report.**

The dissemination will be conducted in a streamlined way, with online publication of the reports, and dedicated workshops. More in detail:

- **Publication** of the project reports, also structured as e-book in a specific **website**
- **1 Workshop** to discuss the project findings with national specialists
- **1 EU workshop** to present the findings at EU/EC officials
- Participation at **5 international conferences**

The evaluation will take place as follows

- **The workstream 1**, partners will work on national evaluation and improvement mechanisms delivering **1** report describing the **research methodology** for the national studies and **5 National reports**). The analysis will be conducted following the methodology agreed. Possible problems in national analysis will be reported and addressed in order to keep comparable the national reports. Furthermore, the reports will be evaluated within the projects through peer review. National experts will also validate the findings. The overall quality of the research will also benefit of the reviews received when submitting the papers at international conferences.
- **The Workstream 2** will deliver one **Comparative report and one EU report**. In addition to internal evaluation (peer review), they will benefit of an external evaluation based on the feedback received in the dissemination phase, particularly in the meeting with national experts and with EU officials.
- **The workstream 3** will deliver an outline of a **methodology framework** for future evaluation and development of quality of justice. It will be evaluated following the schema described above. However, the utmost evaluation will be the one provided by those who will attend at the workshop.
- **The workstream 4** will deliver workshops and the attendance at international conferences. The workshops will be evaluated through questionnaire submitted to the participants. The acceptance of papers presenting the project findings at international conferences will be another instance of evaluation

1.12. Dissemination strategy and communication tools

How do you plan to disseminate (actively spread) information about the project, its activities and its results? Please specify in particular:

- **Communication needs and objectives:** What are the communication needs and objectives of the project?
- **Target groups and multipliers:** What are the target groups? Which stakeholders or other organisations could possibly be supporters and multipliers of the communication activities?
- **Key messages:** Which messages will the activities convey in order to meet the communication objectives?
- **Distribution channels/tools:** Which communication channels/tools will be used to convey the messages to your target groups and multipliers?
- How will your dissemination strategy facilitate further use and transferability of the project results?

Key messages - Being a genuine research project, the key messages will be identified thanks to the research process itself. However, the title of the project “Handle with care” already identifies a key message. Judicial institutions are peculiar organisations: they are pillar of the democratic states and enabler of the rule of law, but at the same time they delivering public services. Their peculiar institutional setting, and the complexity affecting court organisation and adjudication make the quality evaluation exercise, and the measures taken to improve the quality something to be handled with care. Evaluation may trigger unexpected and inappropriate consequences, affecting not just the service delivery but the proper institutional settings in which judges and courts must operate. For these reasons, we will analyse and assess the methods currently used in a representative group of national judiciaries, compare national methods, and use these findings to build a new methodological framework for evaluation and development of the quality of justice that will be proposed to experts, policy makers and to the academic community. Since we think that such finding will be relevant for those that, within EC and EU are engaged in evaluation and development of the quality of justice, we have planned the development of a specific report and of specific workshop.

Target groups and multipliers - The main target group are all those who are involved in the evaluation and promotion of quality of justice, being evaluated, evaluator or quality developers. If their function is relevant, as recognized by the call for proposal, an improvement of their working methods will result in an improvement of the quality of justice, therefore in the everyday life of European citizens.

The experts of judicial quality evaluation and quality development in courts and justice administration, being engaged at national or at European level are the multiplier within their respective communities of practices.

Other academics will act as multipliers within the academic community.

The dissemination will be also amplified by network externalities: some of the researchers hold key position within leading European Academic Networks such as the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA), other are networked with international organisation such as COE (CEPEJ and Legal cooperation) and UNODC. All the partners collaborate with courts, ministries and judicial councils.

Distribution channels – tools - The short timeframe and the effort dedicated to the research require a streamlined dissemination strategy. This is based in 3 components:

- The dissemination of the reports through the web also in the form of an ebook
- The organisation of two different workshops to present and discuss the project findings with experts and with EU/EC
- The participation at 5 international conferences.

More in detail, all the reports produced by the project will be made available through the web. This option is more cost effective than the publishing of a book. Furthermore, to guarantee their availability they will be indexed with ISBN so to be available in the list of books and published on the research platforms with the largest users base (researchgate.com; academia.edu). Also, this option provides the best way to reach the main target group, i.e. all those who are engaged in evaluation and improvement of the quality of justice, being evaluated, evaluators or quality developer.

The two workshops are addressed to present the results to the key stakeholders of the projects: the experts of quality evaluation and quality development of national justice systems and those that, within the EU and the EC are engaged in evaluating and promoting the quality of justice. These two constituencies represent at the same time the key target groups and the key evaluators of the project. They are those who can act as multipliers of the findings. We are confident the project findings will be relevant for their institutional missions.

The participation of at 5 international conferences will provide the opportunity to present and discuss the findings with the academic community and the practitioners (judges, policy makers, court managers) engaged in the quality evaluation and quality development exercise. These groups will act as multipliers of the project findings.

1.13. Sustainability and long-term impact of the project results (max. 2000 characters)

What is planned as follow-up of the project after the financial support of the European Union has ended? How will the sustainability of the project's results be assured? Are the project results likely to have a long-term impact? How?

Note: *In this part you should not list activities or outputs of your project, but you should focus on the expected long-term impact of your project. The long-term impact refers to long-term socio-economic consequences that can be observed after a certain period following the completion of the project and may affect either the target groups of the project or other groups falling outside the boundary of the project, who may be winners or losers.*

The partnership is composed of by 5 research institutions, and the publication of the results is part of our institutional mission. Therefore, the first concrete action in terms of sustainability of the project result will be the publication of the results with a high reputation international publisher. Given the timeframe of the project of just 12 months, this is something the project partners will do once the project is terminated.

All the researchers and research institutions involved in the project have a long and enduring interest in the field of quality of justice. This interest will be translated in various other actions ranging from new research projects, technical

advice and participation to international conferences. In all these events, the findings of “Handle with care” will find a proper visibility.

Various researchers engaged in the project are regularly involved in technical advice addressed to improve the quality (or the performance) of justice systems. This will be another channel to provide long-term impact of the project.

1.14. Ethical issues related to the project (max. 2000 characters)

Describe any ethical issues which you could come across during the implementation of your project, including with regard to interactions with target groups or persons benefiting from the project, and present your strategy to address them.

The project foresees data collection, and interviews to experts. Such interviews do not involve vulnerable individuals and evaluation activities do not represent a risk for participants. Data gathered with these activities will be only utilized in anonymized form for the purposes of the project. Partners will make available copies of relevant ethic documentation if requested.

Furthermore, the institutional profile of the institutional partners (Research Institutions with many years of experience in training and research in the justice domain) will ensure that if any unexpected ethical issue may rise, it will be dealt with the maximum attention and care.

1.15. Mainstreaming (max. 2000 characters)

How do you plan to ensure mainstreaming of aspects mentioned in section 2.3 of the call in the activities of your project?.

The project team is perfectly balanced in terms of gender. The staff to be recruited for the project will be selected following national procedures that already promote equal employment opportunities, and merit based recruitment. Furthermore, the same topic of evaluation and promotion of the quality of justice have direct implications in terms of gender equality.

Just to make an example, in a recently published research on judicial performance evaluation promoted by one of the research partners, various authors signalled bias against woman and minority judges (A. Melville, *Evaluating Judicial Performance and addressing gender bias*, OSLS, 2014). On the same topic, the justice scoreboard observe a positive trend in in the share of female professional judges for both first and second instance as well as Supreme Courts. However, most Member States still have some way to go to reach the gender balance of 40-60% for Supreme Court judges. While data are not provided, the problem may exist also with leading positions in courts and prosecutors’ offices. Such managerial positions are extremely relevant in contemporary judicial administration and gender bias may exist also at in this case. The research, and particularly the national case studies (workstream 1), will explore this issue, with particular emphasis on the existence of a relationships between the quality evaluation systems currently used by MS and gender bias in the appointment of judges and prosecutors in leading position or at the highest national courts.

1.16. IF APPLICABLE: Description of child protection policy (max. 2000 characters)

If the applicant and/or any of the partners work directly with/have contact with children, provide a description of the child protection policy of these organisations, covering the following topics:

- purpose of the child protection policy;

- application of the policy (applicable to which staff, in which situations);
- responsibility: who is responsible for ensuring that the policy is adhered to;
- description of recruitment and screening processes with regard to child protection policy (details of training on child protection policy and rights of the child, screening, vetting (criminal background check). Preventing harm to children: processes exist to help minimise the possibility of children being abused by those in positions of trust.

The project does not need any child protection policy

PART 2 – DESCRIPTION OF WORKSTREAMS AND ACTIVITIES

In Part 2, please detail the activities that you will undertake to achieve the objectives and results described in Part 1 of this document. This section is divided into several Workstreams (WS), i.e.: sets of activities leading to a specific output that you wish to produce.

Any project will have a minimum of two and maximum of five WS: Workstream 0 including the management and coordination activities and outputs and Workstreams 1 to 4 including activities and outputs related to the objective(s) of your project.

Each Workstream should include activities and the expected outputs. Except for Workstream 0, you should provide a title and an objective to each Workstream.

► Workstream 0 - Management and Coordination of the Project

Workstream 0 is intended for the general management and coordination activities of the project (project meetings, project monitoring and evaluation, financial management, reporting, etc.) and all the activities which are cross cutting and therefore difficult to assign just to one specific workstream. In such case, instead of splitting them across many workstreams, please enter and describe them in workstream 0. For this reason this workstream has a different layout, where you do not have to enter objectives and duration. Nevertheless, it will have its own outputs and corresponding budget.

I. Description of the work (activities)

Be specific, give a short name for each activity, number them and describe them briefly. Indicate for each activity the partner who will be responsible for its implementation.

No.	Name and description of the activity	Partner
L 1	Project kick-off meeting (EC)	Applicant
2	Project research meeting	
3	Establishing project plan	
4	Project monitoring and administration	
5	Contractual and budget reporting to EU and partners	

II. Output(s) of this workstream

List the outputs to be produced by this workstream.

Outputs of your planned activities can be **intangible** (conferences, seminars, training sessions, meetings, interviews, etc.) or **tangible** (manuals, reports, leaflets, website, training material packages, books, etc.).

Give factual and quantitative data: e.g.:

- X regional seminars; X participants, in X country.

- title of publication, type of publication (brochure, manual, flyer, book, training material, etc.) language, format (electronic/printed), number of pages, number of copies.

No.	Output	Factual and quantitative data	Target group
1	Update from the EC on the project	1 All project partners are informed of the expectations of the EC about the project management	Applicant
2/3	Project research meeting and project implementation plan	2/3 All participants to the project are involved in the project and agree the details of the project implementation, including timeline, case study structure and research method, comparative approach etc. It will put the basis for successive work and management of activities.	
4	Project	4 Applicant organization will deal with management and work plan	

5	management Budget management	and will keep partners informed on these aspects through conference calls and other IT based tools. 5 Applicant organization will keep tracks of budget consumptions and progress in the activities of the project in specific reports addressed to EU and partners	
6	Final report	6 A final report written by the Applicant organization in cooperation with the other partners will deal with project sustainability	

► Workstream 1: Title: National analysis

Duration in months: **9**

Leading partner: **University of Debrecen**

I. Objective(s) of this workstream

The objective of this workstream is an in depth analysis and an assessment of quantitative and qualitative methods used by 5 European judiciaries to evaluate and develop the quality of justice.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Be specific, give a short name for each activity, number them and describe them briefly. Indicate for each activity the partner who will be responsible for its implementation.

No.	Name and description of the activity	Partner
1	Research Methodology Paper: study & Writing	All
2	National reports on judicial quality evaluation and development: each partner will do the following activities to prepare the report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk study • Field work • Report drafting (first, second & final draft) • Internal review 	
3	Peer reviews: it will be conducted by each partner on the works prepared by the others partners, guarantee an optimal scientific quality and consistency in the data collected	

III. Output(s) of this workstream

List the outputs to be produced by this workstream.

Outputs of your planned activities can be **intangible** (conferences, seminars, training sessions, meetings, interviews, etc.) or **tangible** (manuals, reports, leaflets, website, training material packages, books, etc.).

Give factual and quantitative data: e.g.:

- *X regional seminars; X participants, in X country.*

- *title of publication, type of publication (brochure, manual, flyer, book, training material, etc.) language, format (electronic/printed), number of pages, number of copies.*

No.	Output	Factual and quantitative data	Target group
1	Report	Handle with care: the research methodology,	Researchers
2	Report	The evaluation and development of quality of justice in Italy, 50 pp	Practitioners, experts and academics involved in judicial quality evaluation and quality development, policy
3	Report	The evaluation and development of quality of justice in France, 50 pp	
4	Report	The evaluation and development of quality of justice in Finland, 50 pp	
5	Report	The evaluation and development of quality of justice in Hungary, 50 pp	
6	Report	The evaluation and development of quality of justice in the	

	Web publishing	Netherlands, 50 pp All the reports will be in english and published on the web (see dissemination)	makers
--	----------------	---	--------

➤ **Workstream 2:** Title: **Comparative and European Issues**

Duration in months: **5**

Leading partner: **University of Limoges**

I. Objective(s) of this workstream

The WS has 2 objectives. The first is a **comparative assessment** aimed at mapping out common and divergent approaches, problems, and solutions in the field of the methodologies for the evaluation of the quality of justice. The second is a report dealing with quality evaluation and development at **EU level**. It will distil the findings of the research, looking at activity of quality of justice evaluation carried out by the EC such as the justice scoreboard and the periodic evaluations of member states and candidate countries and following up on outcomes.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Be specific, give a short name for each activity, number them and describe them briefly. Indicate for each activity the partner who will be responsible for its implementation.

No.	Name and description of the activity	Partner
1	For the "Comparative report" Report preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment and comparisons of the data collected in the national studies Report drafting (first, second & final draft) Internal review 	UL and LUT
2	Peer reviews by the partners who have not worked on the report	IRSIG-CNR, UU and DU
3	For the "EU report" Report preparation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment of the current evaluation of the quality of justice made by the EC (ex. Justice scoreboard), and use the data collected in the previous activity to identify inputs relevant for the EC Report drafting (first, second & final draft) Internal review 	IRSIG-CNR and DU
4	Peer reviews by the partners who have not worked on the report	UU, LUT and UL

III. Output(s) of this workstream

List the outputs to be produced by this workstream.

Outputs of your planned activities can be **intangible** (conferences, seminars, training sessions, meetings, interviews, etc.) or **tangible** (manuals, reports, leaflets, website, training material packages, books, etc.).

Give factual and quantitative data: e.g.:

- X regional seminars; X participants, in X country.

- title of publication, type of publication (brochure, manual, flyer, book, training material, etc.) language, format (electronic/printed), number of pages, number of copies.

No.	Output	Factual and quantitative data	Target group
1	Report	Comparing the evaluation and development of the quality of justice in 5 European countries, 30 pp	Practitioners, experts and academics

2	Report	The evaluation and development of the quality of justice at EU level, 30 pp	involved in judicial quality evaluation and quality development As above, but particularly all those that within EU institutions are engaged in evaluation and development of the quality of justice
	Web publishing	All the reports will be in english and published on the web (see dissemination)	

► Workstream 3: Title: Methodology framework

Duration in months: **5**

Leading partner: **Utrecht University**

I. Objective(s) of this workstream

The analysis of the 5 case studies will also result in insights of the conditions by which reliable assessments can be effectively used by policymakers, managers and professionals to enhance judicial and service qualities in court organisations. This WS will explore such conditions and, building on the findings of the project, make a proposal for the development of new innovative methodological framework for the evaluation and development of the quality of justice.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Be specific, give a short name for each activity, number them and describe them briefly. Indicate for each activity the partner who will be responsible for its implementation.

No.	Name and description of the activity	Partner
1	Report preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessment of the reasons of failure and success of the evaluation methodologies previously analysed assessment of quality evaluation failures and success in other domains outline of a quality evaluation and developments method based on success factors Report drafting (first, second & final draft) Internal review 	UU
2	Peer reviews by the partners who have not worked on the report	IRSIG-CNR, UL, DU, LUT

III. Output(s) of this workstream

List the outputs to be produced by this workstream.

Outputs of your planned activities can be **intangible** (conferences, seminars, training sessions, meetings, interviews, etc.) or **tangible** (manuals, reports, leaflets, website, training material packages, books, etc.).

Give factual and quantitative data: e.g.:

- *X regional seminars; X participants, in X country.*

- *title of publication, type of publication (brochure, manual, flyer, book, training material, etc.) language, format (electronic/printed), number of pages, number of copies.*

No.	Output	Factual and quantitative data	Target group
-----	--------	-------------------------------	--------------

1	Report	Towards new methods for evaluation and development of the quality of justice, 30 pp	Researchers
...	Web publishing	All the reports will be in english and published on the web (see dissemination)	Practitioners, experts and academics involved in judicial quality evaluation and quality development, policy makers

► Workstream 4: Title: Dissemination

Duration in months: **12**

Leading partner: **Lappeenranta University of Technology**

I. Objective(s) of this workstream

The workstream will be dedicated to dissemination. Considering the strict timeline of the project, this will be based on 2 workshops one at UU and one addressed to all those within European institutions and particularly at the Commission, are interested in the issues of the measurement and development of the quality of justice. Furthermore the dissemination will be done through the participation at international conference. Also a website will be developed to make freely available reports and relevant project materials.

II. Description of the work (activities)

Be specific, give a short name for each activity, number them and describe them briefly. Indicate for each activity the partner who will be responsible for its implementation.

No.	Name and description of the activity	Partner
1	Dissemination strategy development	LUT
2	Final research workshop: organisation participation follow up	All
3	EU/EC meeting: organisation participation follow up	All
4	Dissemination to international conference participation and follow up	All
5	E-book preparation	LUT
6	CFMnet website adaptations, and contents upload	LUT
...		

III. Output(s) of this workstream

List the outputs to be produced by this workstream.

Outputs of your planned activities can be **intangible** (conferences, seminars, training sessions, meetings, interviews, etc.) or **tangible** (manuals, reports, leaflets, website, training material packages, books, etc.).

Give factual and quantitative data: e.g.:

- *X regional seminars; X participants, in X country.*

- *title of publication, type of publication (brochure, manual, flyer, book, training material, etc.) language, format (electronic/printed), number of pages, number of copies.*

No.	Output	Factual and quantitative data	Target group
1	Final research meeting	25 participants	Practitioners, experts and academics involved in judicial quality evaluation and quality development, policy makers.
2	EU/EC workshop	18 participants	As above, but particularly all those that within EU institutions are engaged in evaluation and development of the quality of justice
3	Dissemination at 5 international conference	About 50 persons directly reached in each conference (total 200)	Practitioners, experts and academics involved in judicial quality evaluation and quality development
4	Website	An estimate of 10 contacts per day	Practitioners, experts and academics involved in judicial quality evaluation and quality development