



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Expert Group Meeting on the Use of Social Media by Judges

Vienna, Austria, 5-7 November 2018



Summary Report

This report has been prepared by the United Nations Office on Drug and Crime (UNODC) as a summary of the discussions during the international expert group meeting as part of the Judicial Integrity initiative focusing on the ethical use of social media by judges, held in Vienna from 5 to 7 November 2018.



Contents

INTRODUCTION..... 3

**BACKGROUND AND PREVIOUS WORK OF THE GLOBAL JUDICIAL INTEGRITY NETWORK
ON JUDGES’ USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA 3**

OBJECTIVES OF THE EXPERT GROUP MEETING 4

SUMMARY..... 6

(i) WELCOME REMARKS, INTRODUCTION, AND OVERVIEW OF THE WORK OF UNODC AND THE GLOBAL
JUDICIAL INTEGRITY NETWORK ON THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA BY JUDGES 6

(ii) SESSION 1 AND 2: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES IN THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA BY JUDGES..... 7

(iii) SESSION 3: SOCIAL MEDIA PRESENCE AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF JUDGES ON SOCIAL MEDIA 8

(iv) SESSION 4: WHAT CONTENT COULD (OR SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT) BE SHARED ON SOCIAL MEDIA? . 9

(v) SESSION 5: JUDGES AND ONLINE FRIENDSHIPS: FULLY MAPPING OUT THE VIRTUAL MINEFIELD 10

(vi) SESSION 6: SOCIAL MEDIA AND JUDICIAL TRAINING 11

(vii) SESSION 7: OTHER USERS OF SOCIAL MEDIA..... 12

(viii) SESSIONS 8 AND 9: DEVELOPING AND ESTABLISHING UNIVERSALLY APPLICABLE NON-BINDING
GUIDELINES ON THE USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA BY JUDGES..... 13

FINAL SESSION: KEY OUTCOMES AND SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS. CONCLUSIONS AND THE WAY FORWARD
..... 14

ANNEX I - AGENDA 15

ANNEX II - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 18



Introduction

This report represents a summary of the discussions and the key outcomes of the Expert Group Meeting on the Use of Social Media by Judges which took place from 5 to 7 November 2018 in Vienna, Austria, and that was organized under the umbrella of the Global Judicial Integrity Network.

The Global Judicial Integrity Network is a platform which provides assistance to judiciaries in strengthening judicial integrity and preventing corruption in the justice system. The Network promotes peer learning and support activities among judges and other justice sector stakeholders; facilitates access to relevant tools and resources on various issues relating to judicial integrity; and supports the further development and effective implementation of principles of judicial conduct and the prevention of corruption within the justice system.

During the launch event of the Global Judicial Integrity Network, and through an online survey disseminated in 2017, judiciaries and judges from around the world expressed their concerns regarding the use of social media by members of the judiciary. As a result of these concerns, participants adopted a [Declaration on Judicial Integrity](#)¹ and agreed that one of the priorities of the Network would be to develop guidance materials and other knowledge products to help judiciaries address challenges to judicial integrity and independence, including those created by the emergence of new information technology tools and social media.

Background and previous work of the Global Judicial Integrity Network on judges' use of social media

The efforts of the Network are intended to provide guidance to judges on how to communicate using each social media platforms in a way that does not breach any principle of judicial conduct and to afford the judiciary a framework for regulating judges' conduct when using social media platforms that is consistent with international and regional standards of judicial conduct and ethics, as well as existing codes of conduct.

Subsequently, the Global Judicial Integrity Network, with the support of UNODC, started to identify the challenges posed to judicial integrity by social media and existing good practices and effective standards implemented regarding the use of social media by judges. The following activities have taken place or are planned to take place on the topic of the use of social media by judges:

¹ Declaration on Judicial Integrity (paragraph 8) adopted at the launch of the Global Judicial Integrity Network in April 2018, available at <https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/restricted/network-launch.html>; Work plan of the Global Judicial Integrity Network developed by the Advisory Board of the Network.

1. Desk review of existing regulations, guidelines, materials, cases, and opinions on the issue.
2. Reference to the issue included in the first module of the e-Learning course on Judicial Ethics and Conduct developed as part of the Judicial Ethics Training Tools.
3. Dissemination of existing good practices and resources on the use of social media through the Network and its website (www.unodc.org/ji), including [podcasts](#), the “[Views](#)” series, and the [online library of resources](#).
4. An online global survey to collect the input of judges and other relevant stakeholders worldwide on the use of social media, with a view to collecting data and opinions on the various aspects of the use of social media by judges and gathering additional resources.
5. The preparation of a detailed discussion guide for the Expert Group Meeting on the Use of Social Media by judges. It compiles various existing relevant guidelines, materials, cases and opinions from across the world with a view to providing useful background information to sparkle discussions during the meeting. It also raises various questions related to the use of social media by judges that the participants could consider and share their views on.
6. The Expert Group Meeting held in Vienna, Austria on November 5 to 7, which aimed to bring together judicial and legal experts from different regions to identify key issues, discuss existing practices, collect new information, consider the usefulness of non-binding guidelines on the topic, and gather input on the possible content of such guidelines.
7. Finally, as an eventual outcome from the meeting, a set of non-binding guidelines on the use of social media by judges.

Objectives of the Expert Group Meeting

Social media platforms are increasingly a vital part of social life, communication, and dissemination of information. The use of social media has a particular impact on judges since it can potentially lead to situations, for example, in which judges may be seen as biased or subject to outside influences. At the same time, judges should not be isolated from society and should strive to create an environment of open justice and to understand the communities that they serve.

The Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct identify six core values of the judiciary – independence, impartiality, integrity, propriety, equality, competence and diligence – which are the highest standards of ethical conduct for judges.² Nevertheless, when these Principles or the Commentary on the Principles were first drafted, social media did not exist and neither document makes reference to their use.

² Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct can be accessed in multiple languages at: https://www.unodc.org/ji/resdb/data/2006/220/the_bangalore_principles_of_judicial_conduct_ecosoc_resolution_200623.html?lng=en. In addition, the Commentary on the Bangalore Principles can be accessed in multiple languages at: https://www.unodc.org/ji/resdb/data/2007/220/commentary_on_the_bangalore_principles_of_judicial_conduct.html?lng=en.

The primary objective of the meeting was, thus, to garner judges' advice and insight in order to understand the main challenges and practical issues around the use of social media by judges, as well as discuss concerns associated with the potential implementation of guidelines or standards of conduct on the topic. With this in mind, the meeting aimed to facilitate the work of the participants of the EGM, and later the work of the participants of the Network, in developing a set of non-binding guidelines that could serve as a source of inspiration for judiciaries that are beginning to address the topic and inform judges of the various risks and opportunities in using social media.

The EGM also sought to collect input for the work of the Judicial Integrity Group in reviewing and updating the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and/or its Commentary, in order to address emerging challenges to judicial integrity.

In order to support the work of the participants, UNODC drafted a discussion guide which compiled the existing relevant guidelines, materials, cases, and opinions from across the world with a view to providing useful background information to spark discussions during the EGM. It also raised various questions related to the use of social media by judges that the participants considered while sharing their views on the topic. Care was taken to ensure the participation of judges and legal professionals from every region and with different backgrounds. The meeting brought together around 25 experts from judiciaries, as well as national, regional, and international organizations and associations of judges.

More information about the meeting and the discussion guide are available at: <https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/restricted/social-media-EGM.html>.



Summary

Welcome remarks, introduction, and overview of the work on the use of social media by judges by the Global Judicial Integrity Network and UNODC

The welcome remarks were provided by **Mr. John Brandolino, Director of the Division of Treaty Affairs at UNODC**. He welcomed the participants and explained the background of the initiative and the Global Judicial Integrity Network. He thanked the participants for their work and the State of Qatar for its generous contribution, which funds the Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration. He explained how the topic of the use of social media by judges was identified as an emerging issue during the preparatory phase of the establishment of the Network, as well as during the launch event itself, and thus in the 2018-2019 work plan of the Network developed by its Advisory Board³. He underlined that one of the priorities of the Network is to develop guidance materials and knowledge-products to help judiciaries address existing challenges, in this case, the use of social media by judges.

Hon. Ms. Lynne Leitch, Justice of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice in Canada and Member of the Advisory Board of the Global Judicial Integrity Network also provided opening remarks. She noted the profound impact of social media platforms on communication and, thus, in judicial processes. She stressed that judges must understand and become comfortable with social media to fulfill their judicial duties. She further highlighted how judges must be mindful that because of social media, all of their decisions reach a new, much wider, and often anonymous audience. She concluded that judges require more training and guidance to be aware of current trends and innovations in the world and understand how to navigate these innovations while meeting appropriate standards of judicial conduct. She then praised the initiative of the Global Judicial Integrity Network in prioritizing the topic of the use of social media by judges.

Ms. Roberta Solis, Judicial Integrity Team Leader, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC Global Programme for the Implementation of the Doha Declaration provided a background presentation on UNODC's work in judicial integrity and introduced in more concrete terms the Global Judicial Integrity Network's objectives, services, and planned activities. Additionally, she explained the Network's work on judges' use of social media, including the organization of a substantive breakout session at the launch event, in partnership with the CEELI Institute, on "The risks and benefits of the use of social media by judges"⁴. She further informed participants that the topic had also been a part of the discussions at the breakout session organized by the Judicial Integrity Group on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct after 18 years and the potential need to revise and update the principles to meet contemporary challenges. She finally explained that the Advisory Board of the Network had

³ For more information, please visit: <https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/about.html>.

⁴For more information about it, please visit the following website:
https://www.unodc.org/documents/ji/session_reports/launch_report_ceeli.pdf.

developed the first work plan for 2018-2019, which included work on the issue of the use of social media by judges among its priorities⁵.

Sessions 1 and 2: Challenges and opportunities in the use of social media by judges

The purpose of these two sessions was to identify the resources available at the international, regional, and domestic levels on judges' use of social media. Furthermore, this session aimed to identify the most relevant issues to be explored during the following sessions.

Ms. Cristina San Juan, UNODC Consultant, provided an overview of the work carried out by UNODC on the use of social media by judges following the launch event of the Global Judicial Integrity Network. She presented the overall results of the desk review carried out on existing regulations, guidelines, materials, cases, and legal opinions related to the use of social media by judges from different jurisdictions. The results of this desk review formed the basis for the discussion paper distributed to participants of the meeting, in order to guide the discussions during each of the sessions of the EGM. Additionally, she presented the preliminary results of an online survey launched in September 2018 on the topic.

In the ensuing discussion, participants shared general experiences and practices from their jurisdictions and/or regions.

Participants debated a series of **challenges and opportunities** that social media posed to judges and judiciaries. As a general concern, participants agreed that the use of social media and new technologies is increasing and constantly evolving. It will change the way in which justice is made, as social media platforms are posing risks to security and challenges to ethics which may have potential implications to the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct. At the same time, the use of social media provides opportunities for judges and judiciaries, since it can be used as a platform to promote the transparency of judicial activity, as well as to engage society. Participants highlighted that judges should be conscious of the need to adapt themselves to this new scenario and to find a balance between the challenges posed and the opportunities offered by social media in the dispensation of their duties. For instance, as useful as new technologies could be for evidence gathering, judges should be careful if carrying out non-legal research of the parties of a case, as this might affect their impartiality.

Participants raised questions related to **regulation and guidance** and contemplated whether the use of social media was already regulated by the Bangalore Principles and its Commentary, or if additional guidance was necessary. In this discussion, some participants thought that no further norms were needed to regulate the matter. Others argued that because social media changes the way judges communicate (for example, the impact, reach, and audience of statements), specific provisions should be added to the Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct. In conclusion, participants noted that while the ethical standards already exist, these should be "digitalized", in order

⁵<https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/about.html>.

to more clearly address modern challenges posed by the use of social media and new information technology tools.

Session 3: Social media presence and the identification of judges on social media

The session started with a presentation by *Mr. David Ordoñez Solis, Judge from Spain and representative of the Ibero-American Commission on Judicial Ethics*, on the main recommendations compiled by the Commission on the use of social media by judges.

During this session, participants discussed the fundamental question of whether judges should be **present on social media platforms**, and if so, whether they could be present on all of the social media platforms, or only on some of them. Participants agreed that judges should not be barred from using any social media platforms. Nonetheless, social media should be used only as long as the user could maintain the ethical standards already determined in the Bangalore Principles and in a way that would not damage the reputation of the institutions they serve.

The Iberoamerican opinion on Judges and social networks (2015)

Conclusions:

- Judges have the right to use social networks under restrictions in order to protect their judicial duties.
- Judges must use social networks properly and carefully.

Recommendations

- 1) Judges should perform a profound examination of the characteristics and scope of the network.
- 2) Judges should limit any communication with those who, as parties or as lawyers, litigate in a matter the judges are hearing.
- 3) Judges who identified themselves or who are identified should realize that this implied more responsibility.
- 4) Judges should ensure, to some extent, knowledge of those with whom the network is shared.
- 5) Judges should keep in mind that any brief communications can give rise to unintended misunderstandings.
- 6) Judges should avoid any content that cannot be expressed publicly.
- 7) Judges should make use of advanced-level computer security measures (passwords, antivirus, antimalware, identity theft protection –anti-phishing–, etc.).
- 8) Judges should take into account that any action, image or statement may be documented and made public knowledge by means of social networks.
- 9) Judiciaries should offer suitable instruction on the use of social networks.

Furthermore, participants raised the issue of **the use of different profiles on social media**. Participants noted a distinction between private social media accounts and official accounts. The latter are accounts regulated and managed by judicial institutions and should follow the courts' policies in this regard, while the former are managed individually by the judges. Within the category of private social media accounts, participants also differentiated between personal profiles and profiles for professional purposes. In this context, participants emphasized that ethical standards should be observed in both types of profiles, personal or professional, since it would be difficult to differentiate when the user was expressing opinions as an individual or as a judge. Additionally, several participants noted that judges should observe even higher standards of propriety when using professional accounts and/or accounts in which they identify themselves as judges.

Regarding **identification on social media**, i.e., using a professional title or a real name, or the use of a pseudonym to cover a judge's identity, several participants noted that the use of pseudonyms on social media could not guarantee the safety of judges, and that anonymity should never be used to shield unethical behaviour. In addition, several participants noted that the same principles should apply to cases of judges who participate in secret groups because the information shared in these groups or pages, as well as the judges' identities, could become public or be leaked at any time.

During the discussions, some participants also raised various points related to ensuring the ethical use of social media by judges and the safety of judges, such as: i) the need to understand the security and privacy policies, settings and rules of the social media platforms, periodically review them and exercise caution; ii) considering removing links between a personal account and a professional account; iii) minimizing the use of social media and the amount of genuine verifiable personal information available online (in particular, for safety purposes); iv) considering a reduced list of friends on social media and revising periodically one's social media records; and v) that judges could consider the benefits of creating personal accounts as a way to protect their personal data and secure their online identity by preventing the creation of fake accounts by third parties.

Session 4: What content could (or should or should not) be shared on social media?

Mr. Barry Clarke, Employment Judge of England and Wales, delivered a presentation in which he explained the changes that social media generates in society and the particular hazards its use posed to the safety of judges. Judge Clarke added that judges, while entitled to use social media, should be aware of the challenges that social media platforms pose to judicial integrity. Judge Clarke further cautioned that some companies collect all the personal information of social media users and that the internet "never forgets" once the information is online. Therefore, judges should carefully consider what personal information they are sharing on social media platforms and online applications and review their data available online. To assist judges in the use of social media, the speaker emphasized that some guidelines would be very important in fostering the ethical use of these platforms and that training was indispensable for the future of judges and their safety.

During this session, participants noted that social media interactions were different from offline interactions and, therefore, additional precautions should apply when using social media platforms. Based upon this, participants discussed the judges' right of freedom of expression, which content they could (or should) share on social media, as well as which precautions to adopt when expressing opinions online (in terms of linking/sharing/reacting/reposting information, etc.), as this behaviour could potentially erode public trust and confidence in the judiciary.

Furthermore, participants discussed which **subjects** would be inappropriate for judges to address in their social media activities, for instance: controversial issues; politics; issues related to the judiciary; the defence of judicial values; legal opinions; advertisement or promotion of goods or services; etc. In particular, participants emphasized that it would be inappropriate to share information related to sensitive court administrative matters, hearings, or cases on social media.

Participants highlighted, though, that **content** which should (or not) be shared publicly has already been determined in the Bangalore Principles for offline situations, and that this should also serve as a guide for judges and apply to content shared on social media platforms. Nevertheless, participants concluded that social media and new technologies have particularities that were not contemplated previously for offline media, and, thus, additional guidance for judges on the use of social media would be beneficial. For example, participants argued that if a judge is not sure about whether to post or share something on social media, they should not do it, since it is extremely difficult to remove content once online. Some participants noted that, as a general rule, judges should not share anything on social media that they would not share or speak about in public, because in the end social media platforms are another form of public spaces.

Additionally, participants noted that judges should be wary of the information that other users share on social media about them and review it periodically. The same would apply to the information shared by a judge in their online profile before being appointed to the judicial position.

Finally, participants concluded that the **appearance** of ethical conduct on social media is as important as the ethical conduct of the judge in itself. During the discussion, it was proposed that judges should objectively analyze each situation on a case-by-case basis to determine whether disqualification or recusal from a case would be needed due to their online activities.

Session 5: Judges and online friendships: Fully mapping out the virtual minefield

This session focused on social media and judges' relationships with different members of the judiciary, parties of ongoing cases, and persons that might appear before them in court.

The speaker of the session, **Mr. Anurag Bana, Senior Legal Advisor from the International Bar Association ('IBA')**, elaborated on the use of social media by judges from the lawyers' perspective.

Mr. Bana explained that the IBA launched a survey on lawyers' use of social media in February 2012, in which respondents were generally opposed to the idea that judges should discontinue their use of social media upon becoming a judge. However, concern was expressed by the respondents of the survey as to the way in which this social media presence was used. For example, 95% of the respondents considered it to be unacceptable for judges to post online comments or opinions about lawyers or parties appearing before them, and 90% of them considered it unacceptable for judges to post online updates about proceedings even when doing so strictly for informational purposes. As a follow-up initiative to the survey, the association drafted and adopted the IBA International Principles on Social Media Conduct for the Legal Profession in May 2014.⁶

⁶ 'The impact of online social networking on the legal profession and practice' survey. For additional information on the work conducted by the International Bar Association, please visit: https://www.ibanet.org/Committees/Divisions/Legal_Practice/Impact_of_OSN_on_LegalPractice/Impact_of_OSN_Home.aspx

In the ensuing discussion, participants raised the question of which **connections, friendships, or endorsements** on social media would be inappropriate and/or would create the perception that a judge was capable of being influenced. Participants noted that judges were not barred from being friends on social media with other members of the judiciary. However, judges should be cautious when being friends on social media with those who appear or might appear before them in court and, particularly, should understand the difference in interacting online with prosecutors, parties of a case, or lawyers. Participants underscored that establishing such connections might be particularly inappropriate if done during the proceeding of a case in which both of them are intervening.

Additionally, participants discussed whether online friendships and connections should be treated the same way as real-life friendships in relation to **disqualifications and recusals**. Participants reflected on which issues should be analyzed when considering the propriety of a relationship between judges and online friends or followers who (might) appear before them: i) the closeness of the connection (friend, follower, sharing friends in online groups, same virtual community, (dis)like activity on social media, etc.); ii) the actual online conduct of the judge; iii) the context of the relationship; and iv) the type of social media platform used (Facebook, LinkedIn, Instagram, etc). As underscored in the previous session, some participants highlighted that judges should apply the same analysis to online relationships they would use for disqualifying themselves due to an offline relationship. At the same time, other participants cautioned that online and offline relationships were not the same and very often friends in social media were mere acquaintances in real life. Particularly, several participants noted that the propriety of an online relationship did not depend on the connection in itself but on the special position that this particular relationship would have or might have to influence the judge.

Finally, participants addressed the issue of whether judges should **disclose the list of their relationships and friends** on social media – in particular in the case of private social media accounts not accessible to the public. In this regard, participants concluded that a friendship should be disclosed if, according to the perception of an external reasonable observer, the online relationship would have the appearance of potentially unethical behaviour.

Session 6: Social media and judicial training

Judge Virginia Kendall, from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois and representative of the United States Federal Judges Association, presented the training programme used to train judges and other judicial personnel on the ethical use of social media in her jurisdiction. Judge Kendall elaborated on how the programme assists judges in understanding and applying the judicial ethical canons (broad principles of conduct for judges), in the context of using social media and information technology tools. According to Judge Kendall, judges must understand the technology underlying each platform and its limitations, as well as be provided with access to a source of or channel for advice on this matter. Additionally, the speaker provided a series of concrete suggestions for effective training on the use of social media, including the use of concrete examples of (un)ethical behaviour on social media by judges and demonstrations about the actual platforms, in order to provide judges with concrete practice and training on how to use them properly.

In the ensuing discussion, participants agreed that judges should maintain a certain level of **understanding of the new technologies** and social media platforms, and therefore, that training on the use of social media should be compulsory and continuous for judges. Nonetheless, participants noted that, since judges should not be expected to be experts on social media, different mechanisms should be considered to assist judges on ethical issues related to the use of social media, such as the creation of confidential and independent ethics advisory mechanisms (advisor or committee), social media crisis management channels or the publication of a list of most frequently asked questions (“FAQs”) on how to use social media.

Participants further stressed the importance of **judiciaries and/or judicial schools** committing to providing training for judges in order to promote the ethical use of social media platforms (in accordance with principles of judicial conduct), providing guidance, disseminating good practices and assisting judges to understand the risks and benefits of using social media. Some participants emphasized the need to consider including modules on the different social media platforms and their ethical use in the training curricula of national judicial schools.

In this context, participants welcomed the judicial ethics training tools developed by UNODC, which include a section about the ethical use of social media by judges and the challenges associated with it.⁷

Additionally, participants underscored the importance of providing training not only to judges, but also of including information on how the use of social media by **relatives and close friends** of judges could impact their judicial functions. This could be addressed, for instance by organizing information sessions for relatives, distributing informational materials, or training judges on how to discuss the issue with relatives and close friends.

Regarding the **training format**, participants agreed that all formats of training should be explored by judicial training schools, in order to better adapt to national circumstances and to adult learning techniques, although in-classroom training might be the ideal format in terms of facilitating the exchange of experience and information about challenges faced by judges.

Participants finally noted the relevance of training judges on **security issues** related to the use of social media, such as privacy settings on social media platforms, the use of firewalls, disabling the locator of a mobile phone, the need to periodically update or review the security settings of the platform, cyber crimes, and how to protect their online data.

Session 7: Other users of social media

Ms. Andrea Chis, Judge from Romania and representative of the European Networks of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ), presented the ENCJ’s work on the use of social media by judicial institutions and judges as well as on the need to involve other actors in discussions about the ethical use of social

⁷ For more information about UNODC’s Judicial Ethics Training Tools, please visit: https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/judicial_ethics.html.

media, such as prosecutors and court personnel. Judge Chis also elaborated on the reasons for judicial institutions to use social media, such as to provide additional or specific information about ongoing cases, judgments, and summaries of judgments, as well as to foster transparency and accountability in the judicial system, as opposed to the reasons for judges and prosecutors to use such platforms, either for personal or professional purposes.

The speaker then presented some highlights of the research conducted by ENCJ on the use of social media by judiciaries, as well as the recommendations stemming from this work, namely: i) that judiciaries would benefit from communicating via social media, currently one of the most widely available and used media, in order to meet the public's expectations and preferences, ii) the positive aspects of this method which enables direct communications and interactions with the public, and iii) that judiciaries should have dedicated communication teams and communication policies to address the use of social media.

During this session, participants also made reference to the discussions held in **session 3** regarding the distinction between institutional accounts managed by judiciaries and private accounts owned by judges. Participants noted that these types of accounts were different and, thus, should be easily and clearly differentiated. The same would apply to the content shared on them.

While only some participants shared examples of the use of social media platforms by **judicial institutions** in their jurisdictions, all participants agreed on the potential for social media platforms as an effective communication tool for judicial institutions and to democratize judicial systems, by fostering accountability and transparency of judicial activity.

In addition, participants discussed the advantages and disadvantages of the use of social media by a **broader group of actors in the justice system**, for example by prosecutors, court administrators and associations of judges and judicial councils. In particular on the issue of the use of social media by **associations of judges**, several participants argued that this collective form of freedom of expression had already been acknowledged in the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct and its Commentary for offline situations, and that the same criteria should apply to online platforms. This would mean that associations of judges would have a greater ability to express opinions, including, for instance, on political issues or issues related to the administration of the judiciary, as this would be done collectively, even through social media platforms.

Sessions 8 and 9: Developing and establishing universally applicable non-binding guidelines on the use of social media by judges

During this session, participants addressed issues related to the need, feasibility, and possible content of international guidelines on the use of social media by judges as well as how to establish and disseminate such guidelines to judges and judiciaries.

Participants were divided into small groups to consider potential recommendations for the guidelines in accordance with each subtopic discussed during the EGM. Each small group proposed draft

recommendations for the guidelines, which were then reviewed by the whole group in the following session. It was agreed that the draft proposal for the text of the guidelines would be further refined by the participants of the EGM after the meeting, before the draft guidelines were circulated by UNODC with the wider group of participants of the Global Judicial Integrity Network.

Final session: Key outcomes and summary of the discussions. Conclusions and the way forward

- Participants decided to continue working remotely on the guidelines to further refine the draft before it could be shared by UNODC with participants of the Global Judicial Integrity Network for broader consultation.
- Participants recommended that UNODC should also make use of upcoming events of the Global Judicial Integrity Network, events organized by partner institutions, and the website of the Network to continue the consultation on the draft guidelines, once a final draft was finalized by the participants of the EGM.
- The final draft of the guidelines would be presented at the High-Level Meeting of the Global Judicial Integrity Network in November 2019 in Doha, Qatar.⁸

⁸ For more information about the next High-Level Meeting of the Global Judicial Integrity Network, please visit: <https://www.unodc.org/ji/en/restricted/high-level-event.html>.

Annex I. Agenda

| Day One – 5 November 2018 | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 08.00 – 09.00 | Registration |
| 09.00 – 09.15 | <p>Welcome remarks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Brandolino, Director, Division of Treaty Affairs, UNODC • Justice Lynne Leitch, Ontario Superior Court of Justice, Canada, Member of the Advisory Board, Global Judicial Integrity Network |
| 09.15 – 09.30 | <p>Introduction and overview of the Global Judicial Integrity Network and UNODC's work on the use of social media by judges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open discussion |
| 09.30 – 10.00 | <p>Session I: Challenges and opportunities in the use of social media by judges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker: Cristina San Juan, Consultant, UNODC • Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open discussion |
| 10.00 – 10.30 | <i>Coffee Break</i> |
| 10.30 – 12.00 | <p>Session II: Challenges and opportunities in the use of social media by judges (cont.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moderator: Tatiana Balisova, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open discussion |
| 12.00 – 14.00 | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 14.00 – 15.30 | <p>Session III: Social media presence and the identification of judges on social media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker – Judge David Ordoñez Solis, Spain, Ibero-American Commission on Judicial Ethics • Moderator: Tatiana Balisova, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open discussion |

| | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15.30 – 15.45 | <i>Coffee Break</i> |
| 15.45 – 17.00 | <p>Session IV: What content could (or should or should not) be shared on social media?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker – Judge Barry Clarke, England and Wales • Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open discussion |
| 17.00 – 17.30 | Summary of the day and outline of proposed programme for Day Two |

| Day Two – 6 November 2018 | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 09.30 – 11.00 | <p>Session V: Judges and online friendships. Fully mapping out the virtual minefield</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker – Anurag Bana, Senior Legal Advisor, International Bar Association • Moderator: Tatiana Balisova, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open Discussion |
| 11.00 – 11.15 | <i>Coffee Break</i> |
| 11.15 – 12.30 | <p>Session VI: Social media and judicial training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker – Judge Virginia Kendall, USA, US Federal Judges Association • Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open Discussion |
| 12.30 – 14.00 | <i>Lunch</i> |
| 14.00 – 16.00 | <p>Session VII: Other uses of social media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker – Judge Andrea Chis, Romania, European Networks of Councils for the Judiciary • Moderator: Tatiana Balisova, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC • Open Discussion |
| 16.00 – 16.15 | <i>Coffee Break</i> |
| 16.15 – 17.00 | Session VIII: Developing universally applicable non-binding guidelines on the use of social media by judges |



| | |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC• Open Discussion |
| | |
| 17.00 – 17.30 | Summary of the day and outline of proposed programme for Day Three |

| Day Three – 7 November 2018 | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 09.30 – 10.30 | Session IX: Establishing international guidelines on the use of social media by judges (cont.) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC• Open Discussion |
| | |
| 10.30 – 10.45 | Coffee Break |
| | |
| 10.45 – 12.00 | Final session: Key outcomes and summary of the discussions. Conclusions and the way forward. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Moderator: Roberta Solis, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC |



Annex II – List of Participants

Countries

Brazil

Maria Thereza Rocha de Assis Moura, Minister, Vice-President, Superior Court of Justice, Member of the Advisory Board, Global Judicial Integrity Network

Carl Olav Smith, Judge, National Judicial Council

Canada

Lynne Leitch, Justice, Superior Court of Justice, Ontario, Member of the Advisory Board, Global Judicial Integrity Network

Costa Rica

Luis Guillermo Rivas Loaiciga, Judge, Supreme Court

Nigeria

Kashim Zannah, Chief Judge, High Court, Borno State and Member of National Judicial Council, Member of the Advisory Board, Global Judicial Integrity Network

Philippines

Jose Midas P. Marquez, Court Administrator

Qatar

Rashid Albadr, Justice, Member of the Court of Cassation, Supreme Court

Omar Ganim Mohamed, Director of International Cooperation Unit, Office of the Chief Justice

Romania

Vasilica-Cristi Danilet, Judge, Appeals Court

Trinidad and Tobago

Peter Jamadar, Justice of Appeal, Court of Appeal

Charisa-Marie Alexis-Francois, Judicial Educator, Judicial Education Institute

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Barry Clarke, Leadership Judge, Employment Tribunal, England and Wales

United States of America

Virginia Kendall, Judge, United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Chair, International Committee, Federal Judges Association

Robert Deyling, Assistant General Counsel, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Committee on Codes of Conduct, Judicial Conference of the United States

International Organisations



The Doha Declaration:
PROMOTING A CULTURE
OF LAWFULNESS



GLOBAL
JUDICIAL
INTEGRITY
NETWORK

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)

Karine Simonsen, Rule of Law Office, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights

Judicial Associations and Non-Governmental Organizations

European Network of Councils for the Judiciary (ENCJ)

Andrea Chis, Member of the High Judicial Council, Romania, Coordinator of the Image of Justice & Public Confidence Group

Ibero-American Commission on Judicial Ethics (ICJE)

David Ordoñez Solis, Senior Judge, Spain, Secretary Executive of the ICJE

International Association of Judges (IAJ)

Cagney Musi, Justice, South Africa, Vice-President of the IAJ
Gerhard Reissner, Judge, Austria, Honorary President

International Bar Association (IBA)

Anurag Bana, Senior Legal Advisor, Legal Policy & Research Unit

Judicial Integrity Group (JIG)

Nihal Jayawickrama, Coordinator of the JIG
Lord Jonathan Hugh Mance, Baron Mance, PC, Deputy President of the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom, Member of the JIG

National Center for State Courts (NCSC)

Keith Fisher, Principal Consultant and Senior Counsel for Domestic and International Court Initiatives