

8 May 2025

English only

**Commission on Crime Prevention
and Criminal Justice****Thirty-fourth session**

Vienna, 19–23 May 2025

Item 7 of the provisional agenda**

**Use and application of United Nations standards
and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice****Conference room paper to report on the implementation of
General Assembly resolution [78/227](#) entitled “Equal Access
to Justice for All” of 19 December 2023*******Introduction**

1. In its resolution [78/227](#), entitled “Equal access to justice for all”,¹ adopted on 19 December 2023, the General Assembly noted “that challenges to access to justice in criminal justice systems undermine the rule of law” and emphasized the “right of equal access to justice for all, including people in vulnerable situations, and the importance of awareness-raising concerning legal rights”, and in this regard committed “to taking all necessary steps to provide fair, transparent, effective, non-discriminatory and accountable services that promote access to justice for all, including legal aid”.
2. The resolution encouraged Member States “in accordance with their domestic legislation and within their capacity, to ensure equal access to justice and application of the law to all, including by taking effective measures that are informed by relevant data, such as data on age and gender” as well as “to collect and use quantitative and qualitative data, disaggregated by relevant factors, to ensure that criminal justice policies and programmes are informed by all available and relevant evidence and data” and “to explore cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary, multi-stakeholder, holistic and integrated partnerships, strategies and approaches at the national level when developing measures to reduce inequities in the criminal justice system, and to advance equal access to justice and equal treatment before the law for all, including through restorative justice programmes”.
3. The General Assembly further encouraged Member States to “promote the use of technology that fosters inclusive and equitable access to justice, including by addressing the challenges that the use of such technologies may pose for people in vulnerable situations and “to, as appropriate, employ different models of legal aid,

* Reissued for technical reasons on 14 May 2025.

** [E/CN.15/2025/1](#).

*** This document has not been edited.

¹ [A/RES/78/227](#).



and to consider effective ways to provide access to legal aid to ensure access to justice for all, without discrimination of any kind". Members States were also encouraged, in accordance with their domestic law, "to promote and implement policies aimed at guaranteeing access to justice for people in vulnerable situations without sufficient means, through timely, effective, adequately resourced and affordable and, whenever possible, free legal aid promoted by the State with the appropriate support of relevant academic institutions.

4. In paragraph 14 of the resolution, the General Assembly requested UNODC to "convene a meeting of experts, nominated by Member States, during the intersessional period, with interpretation into all official languages of the United Nations, subject to the availability of extrabudgetary resources with a view to sharing information on challenges, lessons learned, best practices and enabling factors needed to enhance the functioning of criminal justice systems to ensure equal access to justice for all." In paragraph 16 of the resolution UNODC was requested to report to the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at its thirty-fourth session on the meeting of experts and on the implementation of the resolution.

A. Summary of contributions received

5. In preparation of the meeting of experts, the Secretariat invited, through Note Verbale CU 2024/225(A)/DTA/CPCJS of 24 July 2024, Member States, United Nations entities, inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, the institutes of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network and other relevant stakeholders to provide substantive structured information on the implementation of the resolution, along four questions, namely:

1. **What are the primary challenges your country faces in ensuring equal access to justice within your criminal justice system? How do these challenges impact groups in vulnerable situation in your society?**
2. **Can you provide examples of initiatives or policies that have been successful in addressing access to justice issues in your country? What key lessons have been learned from these initiatives or policies?**
3. **What are the best practices currently being implemented in your criminal justice system to enhance access to legal aid and fair trials? How do these best practices improve outcomes for individuals involved in the criminal justice system? and**
4. **What factors have been crucial in enabling successful reforms or improvements in your criminal justice system? How can these enabling factors be replicated or adapted in other contexts or regions to ensure equal access to justice for all?**

6. By the deadline of 13 September 2024, the Secretariat had received contributions from:²

- **29 Member States:** Algeria, Andorra, Belgium, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Japan, Latvia, Malta, Moldova, Morocco, the Netherlands, Niger, North Macedonia, Oman, Panama, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Togo, Türkiye, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, and Zimbabwe.
- **10 intergovernmental organizations, United Nations agencies and Programme Network Institutes and other stakeholders:** Council of Europe, International Anti-Corruption Academy, International Criminal Court, International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law, Office of the High

² Those contributions for which the authors agreed, have been made publicly available on the following website: [UNODC's work on Access to Justice](#).

Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Violence against Children (OSRSG VAC), Organization of American States, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat).

- **19 non-governmental organizations with ECOSOC consultative status:** Ágora, Alliance of NGOs on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS), Drug Free America Foundation, ELEM – Youth in distress, Fundación Luz María, Fundación para la Democracia, International Movement for Advancement of Education Culture Social & Economic Development, International Organization for Victim Assistance, Japan Federation of Bar Associations, Kathak Academy, Liberian United Youth for Community Safety and Development, Partners For Transparency, Public-Private Integrity, The International Legal Foundation, Tripla Difesa Onlus, Victim Support Europe, World Society of Victimology, and ZONTA International.

7. The following sections include a summary of the contributions received.

1. Challenges to equal access to justice for all in criminal justice systems

8. As noted by the Secretary General in his report *Our Common Agenda* ([A/75/982](#)), the challenges to access to justice in criminal justice systems undermine the rule of law, the achievement of safe and secure societies, and the right to equal treatment before the law.

(a) Economic, geographic and other inequalities and lack or insufficient trust in the criminal justice system

9. Several contributions referred to economic challenges which affect both the state and individuals, intrinsically linked to the functioning of the criminal justice system. While state institutions are responsible for enforcing the law and ensuring equal access to justice, individuals' willingness or capacity to engage with these institutions is often impacted by their economic circumstances. High costs associated with legal processes may serve as a deterrent to individuals from seeking legal remedies, particularly during periods of economic crisis.

10. In many countries, individuals residing in remote rural areas or densely populated urban centres face specific challenges in accessing justice. Geographical barriers, including distance, limited infrastructure, and insufficient justice services, particularly in rapidly expanding urban areas, may significantly hinder their ability to seek legal assistance and judicial recourse.

11. Several contributions also highlighted concerns regarding the decline in public trust in criminal justice institutions, which weakens the rule of law and access to justice. Lack of trust may be shaped by various factors, including limited transparency, insufficient accountability, and weak oversight mechanisms. Crimes, particularly those affecting marginalized communities, may often be dismissed as minor offences and may go unreported.³ Public perception of the criminal justice system may significantly influence individuals' willingness to engage with institutions.

12. Corruption within the criminal justice system remains a significant barrier to access to justice. Instances of bribery, favouritism, and undue influence by powerful individuals and groups may undermine the integrity of legal proceedings. Reports of

³ Consult: UNODC, UNDP, & OHCHR. (2024). [Global progress report on Sustainable Development Goal 16: At the crossroads – Breakdown or breakthrough for peace, justice, and strong institutions.](#)

corruption⁴ within the criminal justice system, encompassed the judiciary, law enforcement and prison systems.

13. One Member State contribution referred to systemic, structural, and historical challenges to access to justice, such as actions, practices, and legislation rooted in colonial systems, as well as the prevalence of racism, which is both systemic and structural, as well as personal in nature. The contribution mentions that the overrepresentation of Indigenous people in the criminal justice system is a serious and complex issue rooted in systemic discrimination and the history of colonialism. The contribution further includes that Indigenous Peoples identified systemic issues within justice systems, which often failed to reflect Indigenous knowledge and practices and, in some cases, resulted in secondary victimization of those who came into contact with them as accused persons, offenders, victims, witnesses, or support persons. The same submission also noted that Black communities continue to experience the effects of prejudice, discrimination, and hatred, which originate in the history of colonialism, slavery, and segregation; that challenges included hate crimes, disproportionate victimization in homicides, and overrepresentation among accused persons; and, additionally, that many Black individuals reported having little or no confidence in the police.

(b) Institutional and procedural challenges

14. Police often serve as the first point of contact for the accused, victims, and witnesses. However, several contributions also noted that in many countries, the police does not fully fulfil its role as a provider of access to justice, due to lack of capacity, training or institutional organization. Several challenges persist in police relations with the public, particularly with offenders, victims, and witnesses. These challenges can lead to secondary victimization and a lack of trust in the police, dissuading communities from seeking help or reporting crimes due to fears of further victimization by law enforcement.

15. Inefficiencies and bureaucratic delays within judicial and prosecutorial processes significantly impede the timely resolution of cases. A backlog of cases often leads to prolonged delays, straining judicial resources and denying individuals prompt access to justice. This issue is particularly prevalent in overburdened legal systems where there is a shortage of personnel and resources.

16. A number of contributions indicated that many justice systems still lack victim-centred procedures. These systems often fail to provide a supportive environment where victims are heard, protected, and empowered. This lack of support increases the risk of re- and secondary victimization and discourages individuals from seeking justice, especially in cases of domestic violence and sexual assault. Victims of crime frequently encounter significant barriers in receiving financial or in-kind compensation, as the legal procedures for obtaining such are often cumbersome and not designed to support victims effectively. Victims also face challenges in accessing referral systems and support mechanisms that would otherwise guide them through the justice process. The complexity of legal procedures further exacerbates these difficulties, making it hard for individuals to navigate the system.

17. Limited access to legal representation, advice, and assistance, particularly for individuals unable to afford private lawyers, including in the investigative phase, remains a significant challenge recognized by several contributions. Despite global recognition of the right to legal aid, including through the adoption of the United Nations Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems,⁵ for those without means or where the interest of justice so require, many

⁴ For more information see UNODC corruption and victimization surveys at [Surveys](#), World Justice Project Rule of Law Index project surveys on corruption such as [World Justice Project's Corruption in the Caribbean Report Shows Majority Believe Public Officials Corrupt | World Justice Project](#), and [About – Afrobarometer](#).

⁵ General Assembly resolution 67/187 “Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems”, adopted 20 December 2012.

countries lack laws or policies that ensure the provision of legal services for all accused persons, leaving many vulnerable individuals without the support necessary to defend themselves effectively.

18. Contributions noted that language barriers significantly hinder individuals' ability to participate fully in legal proceedings. For instance, the failure to implement national policies promoting Indigenous languages within the criminal justice system was cited as creating obstacles, undermining their rights and impeding access to justice. Additionally, a lack of measures to ensure the accessibility of police stations, legal aid services, or court facilities creates barriers for individuals with disabilities, limiting their ability to effectively engage with the justice system. Lack of access to justice often results in overreliance on pretrial detention and overcrowding in detention facilities. The inability to meet financial requirements for release, such as bail or house arrest with monitoring conditions, disproportionately impacts individuals from economically disadvantaged backgrounds, leading to prolonged detention or imprisonment for those who cannot afford to pay.

2. Lessons learned, enabling factors and promising practices

19. Many contributions provided valuable insights into improving equal access to justice for all, focusing on lessons learned, enabling factors, and promising practices, as well as their impact on improving outcomes for individuals in contact with the justice system. Examples of successful initiatives and policies at the national and regional levels, including experiences from international organizations, were shared, offering potential approaches that can be adapted or transferred to other contexts or regions.

20. Accountability, integrity, and oversight are essential to ensuring equal access to justice for all by preventing and responding to corruption and human rights violations, thus fostering trust in the criminal justice system. Some contributions noted that both internal and external institutions play an important role in ensuring justice for victims of miscarriages of justice and human rights abuses, while also promoting a culture of accountability within the criminal justice system. Disciplinary actions against corrupt or underperforming prosecutors or judges, with due attention to judicial independence, have helped restore public confidence. The implementation of comprehensive case management, monitoring, and evaluation systems, along with community oversight initiatives, further ensures that individuals and groups have access to redress and greater access to justice.

(a) Ensuring accountability, integrity and oversight of the criminal justice system

21. Several contributions identified inclusive consultation processes as a promising practice for ensuring that the perspectives of groups in vulnerable situations are incorporated during the drafting of laws, policies, and programs. These consultations are essential for designing responses that address the needs of all individuals equitably. By engaging marginalized communities – those affected by discrimination, poverty, or historical injustices – these processes ensure that their concerns and lived experiences are reflected in reforms and future initiatives.

22. As an enabling factor, some contributions emphasized the importance of implementing human resources policies that support the recruitment, retention, and professional development of personnel across the criminal justice system, including police, prosecutors, judges, public defenders, and other relevant actors. Strengthening training institutions, such as judicial schools and police academies, along with ensuring safe working conditions for staff, contributes to a more capable and efficient justice system, enhancing access to fair and timely legal processes. Policies that ensure judicial independence promote a fair and impartial justice system, thereby reinforcing credibility and public trust.

23. Several contributions highlighted the importance of strengthening institutional capacity by professionalizing police and other law enforcement, legal aid providers, prosecutors, the judiciary, restorative justice practitioners such as mediators and

facilitators, court clerks, victim support personnel, and other service providers. Examples provided indicated that this can be achieved through training that is realistic, scenario-based, human rights-compliant, and gender-sensitive. Such practices uphold the highest standards of integrity and service delivery, contributing to a more effective and equitable justice system.

24. Some contributions also noted the importance of retaining qualified personnel by recruiting and maintaining skilled staff at all levels. Ensuring that police stations, courts, legal aid offices, and other related institutions are equipped with the necessary infrastructure to operate efficiently is crucial. Investing in mental health support for criminal justice practitioners preserves the integrity and effectiveness of the justice system. By addressing trauma and promoting mental well-being among professionals such as police officers, public defenders, prosecutors, judges, and service providers, these practitioners are better equipped to make impartial and empathetic decisions, thereby reducing the risk of burnout and bias. A healthier workforce contributes to fairer treatment for all individuals interacting with the justice system.

(b) Access to legal aid⁶ including access to legal information

25. To ensure equal access to justice for all, Member States, intergovernmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations have successfully implemented a variety of outreach, awareness, legal education and legal empowerment programmes using different media tools, but also educational institutions to ensure knowledge amongst the population of their rights, procedures and institutions.

26. As a promising practice, several contributions referenced community justice practices through support centres, which represented an innovative approach to community-based awareness-raising and improving access to justice at the local level. In these programs, trained individuals or facilitators serve as information sources within their communities, providing information on criminal justice procedures, laws addressing violence against women, victim protection measures, and mechanisms for citizen participation in the judicial system.

27. Many contributions noted that comprehensive, needs-based and tailored provision of legal aid services is vital to ensuring nation-wide access to justice. To increase accessibility, these services have been expanded, for instance, through collaborations between bar associations, civil society organizations, university legal aid clinics, or, where possible, digital platforms, for example to raise awareness of rights and how to access services, providing legal services to underserved populations.

28. Lessons learned mentioned the importance of establishing mechanisms to ensure early access to legal aid. Promising practices identified in some countries included duty solicitor programmes where lawyers are assigned to police stations to provide free legal assistance to suspects during the critical early stages of detention and interrogation, ensuring that suspects have immediate access to counsel and promoting equitable access to justice.

29. Some contributions indicated that institutionalizing public defence through the establishment of Public Defenders' Offices enhances equal access to justice. It was noted that ensuring autonomy in the areas of recruitment, promotion, and remuneration constitutes a good practice, as it allows public defenders to carry out their functions independently and without undue influence, thereby strengthening the

⁶ The United Nations Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems provide that “the term “legal aid” includes legal advice, assistance and representation for persons detained, arrested or imprisoned, suspected or accused of, or charged with a criminal offence and for victims and witnesses in the criminal justice process that is provided at no cost for those without sufficient means or when the interests of justice so require. Furthermore, “legal aid” is intended to include the concepts of legal education, access to legal information and other services provided for persons through alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and restorative justice processes.”

provision of effective legal assistance to individuals who cannot afford private counsel or in cases involving the public interest.

30. Another common promising practice identified was the establishment of legal aid clinics, which had proven effective in reaching marginalized communities and ensuring access to justice for individuals who cannot afford private legal representation. These clinics often collaborate with social services, counselling centres, and other support networks, providing a holistic approach to addressing the legal needs of those involved in legal proceedings.

31. Guaranteeing the right to legal defence, particularly for those unable to hire private counsel, includes ensuring that individuals are made aware of their rights from the moment of arrest, with clear, easy-to-understand information on how to access legal aid. Many contributions indicated the importance that legal aid should be made available for all individuals without discrimination of any kind, including for non-nationals. Improving coordination among legal aid providers was also highlighted as a good practice.

32. Simplification of procedures for accessing legal aid, including by the introduction of digital platforms, may streamline access to legal information and accelerate case processing, reducing unnecessary formalities, cutting costs and delays for litigants and improving efficiency within the justice system. One contribution highlighted the introduction of pay parity between prosecutors and legal aid lawyers as having contributed to ensuring fair and equitable compensation for legal professionals, fostering a more balanced and just public defence system and addressing the challenge of retaining qualified personnel.

(c) The role of the police in facilitating access to justice

33. Recognizing the role of the police in advancing equal access to justice, several contributions emphasized the importance of building trust and legitimacy through a human rights-based approach. Policing approaches that encourage consultative and collaborative arrangements between the police and citizens are particularly important and effective, including through community-oriented policing approaches. Evidence suggests that when police engage with community members in a manner that is fair, humane, transparent, and respectful of human dignity, it fosters a sense of trust. The use of body cameras on police uniforms was mentioned as having proven effective in increasing transparency and accountability, reducing instances of abuse of power and rights violations. Establishing an appeal system, particularly a quasi-appeal mechanism for arrests, was also highlighted as minimizing the risk of wrongful detention. The use of video-recorded interviews (VRIs) was cited as an effective practice which can contribute to reduce the risk of secondary victimization, by avoiding repetitive interviews as well as ensured transparency and accountability.

(d) Prosecution, judiciary and the courts

34. A number of inputs received addressed the role of the prosecution, the judiciary and the courts in the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Criminal justice reform, including expanded compassionate release, allowing judges more discretion in sentencing, abolishing mandatory or minimum sentences, and developing rehabilitation programs, were referred to as having played a vital role in improving access to justice.

35. Efforts to reduce case backlogs and ensuring timely justice delivery were deemed critical to increase access to justice. Examples of successful practices included the introduction of electronic case management systems which had streamlined the filing and tracking of cases, making it easier for individuals and lawyers to access case information and reducing delays caused by administrative bottlenecks. Initiatives such as publishing judgments and creating mechanisms for public participation had also enhanced the accessibility and transparency of the judiciary.

36. Different contributions highlighted good practices in the organization of courts. Examples included: the creation of local courts, including in rural and underserved areas; the creation of community courts collaborating closely with social and other services to offer tailored interventions; the use of mobile courts and the creation of one-stop centres within court buildings to provide legal and other advice. The implementation of oral procedures in judicial processes had also streamlined legal proceedings and made them more transparent, accessible, and understandable to the public.

37. Effective procedures must accommodate individuals who do not speak or understand the language of legal proceedings, including those with speech or hearing impairments. Some contributions emphasized that ensuring access to an interpreter system is essential for ensuring that language barriers do not impede access to justice. Establishing a qualification and registration system for interpreters, alongside continuous training, ensured high standards of interpretation. Measure to ensure accessibility included: asking individuals to specify their preferred language or communication method, and allowing those with alternative communication methods, such as unique systems developed with close contacts, to be assisted by a person of their choice; presentation and translation of procedures and documents in easy-to-understand language, particularly for individuals with intellectual disabilities or limited literacy including by simplifying complex legal terminology, using visual aids where necessary, and providing additional explanations to ensure full comprehension.

(e) Restorative justice and alternatives to pre-trial detention

38. Several contributions included the relevance of implementing restorative justice programs and alternative measures to incarceration as steps toward equal access to justice. Reforms in fines, fees, and bail reduce reliance on these financial measures, promoting economic fairness within legal systems. Several countries have introduced reforms to limit cash bail for nonviolent offences. Instead of relying on defendants' financial resources to determine pretrial release, judges assess the risk of flight and potential danger to the community. This approach prevents unnecessary detention of low-income individuals who cannot afford bail, reducing inequality. Restorative justice programs may address the underlying causes of an individual's involvement in the justice system and ensure access to justice, by focusing on accountability, rehabilitation, and reconciliation, and offer a holistic approach that contributes to better long-term outcomes for both offenders and victims.

(f) Victim support, assistance and protection

39. Several contributions highlighted the importance of ensuring access to justice for victims of crime by for instance, assigning victim support officers to victims and providing special protection measures during court procedures, such as use of videoconferencing or other technological tools and the presence of support persons, aiming to minimize risk of secondary trauma and victimization. Participation of victims in criminal trials is also an important element of access to justice, by enabling them to express the harm they have suffered and being heard, while providing the necessary safeguards and allowing the victims to express their needs. Integrated multi-disciplinary approaches for victims are a best practice and should include access to voluntary filing of complaints with specialized officers.

(g) Promising practices in ensuring non-discrimination in access to justice

40. Promising practices in access to justice for victims of hate crime were highlighted in some contributions such as the recognition in legal frameworks that certain crimes arise from bias, intolerance, and discrimination, provision of specialized training to police and prosecutors, whereby they learn to conduct pretrial processes for bias-motivated crimes in accordance with international standards, and are trained to handle such cases with sensitivity and fairness, addressing the harmful effects of prejudice at every stage.

41. Other contributions mentioned the use of impact assessments, carried out by qualified personnel, to address systemic inequalities by providing judges with critical insights into the effects of poverty, marginalization, and systemic disparities that affect discriminated communities. Such assessment allowed to contextualize individuals' experiences within the justice system and recommend appropriate measures, focusing on (re)integration, improving sentencing fairness and helping to mitigate the influence of systemic biases, such as racism, on judicial outcomes.

42. Some contributions also highlighted culturally relevant support through specialized courtwork programs to foster trust and understanding between Indigenous communities and the justice system. Such programs offer services such as pre-sentencing reports, which provide culturally contextual information by courtworkers, who are familiar with the culture, language, and history of the communities they serve, to connect individuals to community resources, including restorative justice programs, healing ceremonies, and mental health services. Others mentioned that in situations of historic and structural legacies of bias and discrimination leading to lack of access to justice for entire communities, investing in peace and reconciliation, reparatory and transformative justice and accountability mechanisms was a good practice to achieve healing and justice for those affected.

43. Some contributions also highlighted that achieving equal access to justice for all individuals and communities requires comprehensive, cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary, and multi-stakeholder approaches, in order to ensure that the diverse needs of individuals, particularly those from marginalized groups, are met effectively and with sensitivity.

B. Expert group meeting on Equal Access to Justice for All, held in Brasilia, Brazil from 9 to 11 December 2024⁷

44. In accordance with paragraph 14 of resolution [78/227](#), experts were nominated by Member States, through the Chairs of the Regional Groups of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (see Annex for the list of experts). The meeting, hosted by the Ministry of Justice and Public Security of Brazil, was held as a closed in-person session, and featured seven thematic discussions. These covered a global overview of access to justice, including barriers, challenges, best practices, and factors that support its improvement; discrimination in access to justice; representative criminal justice institutions; the responsible use of technology in the criminal justice system; data collection and impact measurement; equal access to justice for all and the environment; and cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary, and multi-stakeholder approaches in advancing access to justice.

45. In order to ensure an inclusive approach, an online consultation session with civil society organizations was convened at the beginning of the expert meeting, supported by the Alliance of NGOs on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, the Governments of Brazil and Canada, and the UNODC Civil Society Unit, aiming to inform the expert discussions. A total of 122 organizations registered their interest in speaking at the event, while 397 expressed their interest in attending, bringing the total number of interested participants to 519. Twelve participating organizations were selected to speak in the consultation by the organizers, with the objective of ensuring geographical and thematic representation. The CSO consultation highlighted a number of challenges, barriers and good practices.⁸

46. Session 1 of the Expert Group Meeting provided an overview of access to justice, focusing on barriers, challenges, best practices, and factors that support its improvement. Contributions included international standards and best practices

⁷ See also Conference room paper submitted by Brazil and Canada: Recommendations of the Expert Group Meeting on Equal Access to Justice for All, held in Brasilia, Brazil from 9 to 11 December 2024 at [ACONF241_PM_CRP2.pdf](#)

⁸ More details are provided in Annex 1.

presented by the UNODC, lessons learned from large-scale consultations in France, an overview of the legal aid service in Zambia, and initiatives from Zimbabwe aimed at improving the functioning of the country's criminal justice system. In the ensuing discussion, people-centred justice was highlighted as a guiding principle, requiring policies and reforms that address the needs of different sections of society. Strategies such as digital justice platforms, mobile justice services, focused workshops, and large-scale consultations, along with investments in justice system personnel through increased budgets, job creation, and targeted support for groups in vulnerable situations, were presented as measures to address service gaps. Legal aid service provision was recognized as essential in expanding access to justice. The role of dedicated institutions, partnerships with civil society, and integrating paralegals into justice systems were emphasized as a means of providing accessible legal aid to women, children, persons with disabilities, and individuals in vulnerable situations. Regarding barriers such as delayed prosecutions and unlawful detentions, experts referred to pro bono initiatives and enhanced collaboration among stakeholders as key enablers to facilitate justice.

47. The discussions underscored the value of decentralized and community-based justice mechanisms in bridging accessibility gaps, especially in rural and underserved areas. Models such as judicial facilitators—trained community members who mediate conflicts and escalate complex cases to courts—were referred to by experts as promising approaches. Specialized facilities and trauma-sensitive practices for victims were considered essential for fostering trust and ensuring dignity, particularly in resource-limited regions. Flexible strategies, such as mobile justice units, remote courts, and central notification systems in detention centres, were recognized for their capacity to reduce costs and overcome logistical barriers, demonstrating the importance of adaptive solutions.

48. Session 2 of the Expert Group Meeting addressed how discriminatory practices within criminal legislation, policies, and justice processes disproportionately affect groups in vulnerable situations deepening existing inequalities. Experts from Brazil and Mexico shared insights into the obstacles faced by marginalized populations and initiatives to overcome them. One expert noted that legal frameworks often reflect historical legacies, including colonialism and systemic racism, which create barriers to justice for racialized groups. Neutral policy classifications were identified as mechanisms that obscure racialized impacts, while the lack of targeted reforms fails to address the needs of diverse groups, including Indigenous and people of African descent.

49. Experts highlighted the importance of using multilingual materials, community radio broadcasts, and culturally appropriate resources to improve access for hard-to-reach populations in rural and underserved areas. Closing the digital divide in rural areas was key to fair access to justice and needs culturally sensitive support to effectively use digital tools in justice systems. The session concluded by focusing on structural reforms and multi-stakeholder collaboration to build and strengthen justice systems that address the needs of women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, and other groups in vulnerable situations. Strategies such as early legal representation, pre-charge diversion programs, clear prosecutorial guidelines, holistic public defence models, and access to social services were identified as effective in improving case outcomes. Experts acknowledged the importance of empowering marginalized groups, valuing their lived experiences, and called for continued international cooperation to dismantle systemic discrimination and ensure criminal justice systems that uphold fairness, efficiency, and human rights for all.

50. Session 3 of the Expert Group Meeting focused on representativeness within the criminal justice workforce, emphasizing the importance of ensuring that its personnel reflects the diversity of the communities they serve across the legal profession, police, prosecution, and judiciary. Experts from Brazil, Canada, Mexico, and Nigeria presented. The presentations and discussions examined inequities within criminal justice systems, particularly those affecting women and underrepresented groups, including biased evaluation practices, limited workplace flexibility, and exclusionary

behaviours. Efforts to address these challenges, including adjustments to geographic deployment policies, expanded parental leave, cultural change initiatives such as unconscious bias training and inclusive leadership, as well as resources for working mothers and caregivers and the creation of welcoming environments for diverse staff, were identified as effective in advancing gender equity and workplace inclusivity. Lack of representation of certain ethnic or racial groups in the judiciary was also highlighted, with attention drawn to the significant underrepresentation of marginalized groups in positions of authority. Affirmative action policies, such as reserving positions for individuals of African descent and Indigenous candidates, along with transparent data collection and reporting, were presented as steps towards addressing these disparities. Enhancing the diversity of advisory committees, implementing racial literacy training for public defenders, and offering scholarships for descent lawyers were highlighted as necessary strategies for tackling structural barriers. Experts emphasized the importance of recognizing the intersection of race and socioeconomic disadvantage in addressing inequalities.

51. Session 4 of the Expert Group Meeting examined the responsible use of technology in criminal justice systems. Experts from UNODC, Brazil, Malaysia, and Slovenia shared perspectives on the transformative potential of technology to enhance justice processes. Presentations and ensuing discussions highlighted examples such as digital case management systems, AI-driven tools for sentencing and evidence analysis, speech-to-text systems for court transcription, and the use of body-worn cameras by police to improve accountability, transparency, and effectiveness. These technologies had the potential to address longstanding challenges, including case backlogs, staff shortages, and the need for transparent decision-making. Assistive technologies, such as real-time translation and transcription for persons with disabilities or foreign detainees, were noted as critical for making justice systems more inclusive and accessible. However, experts emphasized the importance of comprehensive reforms to guarantee privacy protections through encryption and secure data storage, as well as leadership and ethical oversight to align any use of technology with human rights standards. The discussions also addressed the risks associated with technology, including systemic biases in AI-driven tools, data privacy violations, and unlawful surveillance. Examples included predictive policing algorithms and live facial recognition technologies, which, if left unregulated, could deepen existing inequalities and disproportionately target marginalized groups. Experts recommended implementing strict regulatory frameworks, judicial oversight, and safeguards to protect data privacy and fundamental rights.

52. Attention was also given to the ethical challenges of private sector involvement in the design and delivery of essential services. Experts stressed the need to maintain state accountability in public service delivery and cautioned against focusing solely on technological efficiencies at the expense of addressing the root causes of crime and systemic issues in communities. The session concluded by reaffirming the importance of international cooperation and multi-sectoral dialogue to address the implications of emerging technologies in criminal justice. Responsible use of technology must uphold human rights, ensure fair outcomes, and promote inclusive and equitable justice systems for all.

53. Session 5 of the Expert Group Meeting explored the critical role of data collection and impact measurement in evaluating the effectiveness of justice initiatives and informing legislative and policy decisions. Experts from Canada, Mexico, and Nigeria shared insights on methodologies for gathering reliable data and assessing outcomes to improve justice delivery. Discussions stressed the importance of integrating robust methodologies to evaluate access to justice initiatives, focusing on identifying root causes, reducing inefficiencies, and ensuring equitable outcomes. Experts highlighted the use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches to address systemic inequalities such as racism and gender inequality, and specific types of crimes such as torture and enforced disappearances, as well as institutional inefficiencies, for instance prolonged pre-trial detention. Given the complexity of these issues, interdisciplinary collaboration was recognized as essential for

strengthening research efforts by incorporating diverse perspectives, improving data quality, and upholding ethical standards, ultimately enhancing the effectiveness of justice research and policy development. Integrating data-driven strategies into institutional frameworks was highlighted to enhance oversight and accountability and to achieve meaningful results. Examples included tools that map human rights obligations into measurable indicators and the use of digital systems to streamline justice processes. Reporting mechanisms, such as timely submission of case records and arrest data, were noted as effective in identifying delays, holding justice actors accountable, and guiding policy reforms. These measures were recognized to improve efficiency and address critical gaps in justice delivery.

54. Experts emphasized the need to incorporate diverse perspectives into data collection and interpretation to uncover systemic discrimination, address colonial legacies embedded in legal systems, and ensure inclusive policymaking. Collaborative efforts with impacted communities to co-create data frameworks were recognized as a best practice to prevent interpretations or conclusions that reflect biased perspectives, ensuring that data accurately represents and respects the realities of those most affected. The session concluded with a call for sustained investment in justice research, continued cooperation among institutions, proper resource allocation for capacity-building, and the creation of accessible knowledge-sharing platforms.

55. Panel 6 of the Expert Group Meeting examined the access to justice aspects of crimes that affect the environment and climate change. Experts from Brazil shared perspectives on the importance of adapting legal and policy frameworks to address the criminal justice needs of individuals and communities impacted by environmental challenges while respecting their cultural values and lived experiences. Indigenous, racialized individuals and communities (quilombola), and those experiencing social and economic marginalization (riverine) communities faced severe consequences from climate events such as floods and droughts, while also being affected by crimes like deforestation and illegal mining, which pose a risk to their territories. These threats not only restrict access to sacred rituals and medicinal plants but also cause profound emotional and cultural losses and weakens their social and economic well-being. In this context, access to justice challenges included the lack of recognition and protection of Indigenous peoples' territories and identities, which restricts access to public services and increases exposure to land conflicts and environmental crimes. Additionally, limited access to culturally appropriate justice services and the underfunding of relevant institutions weakened institutional responses.

56. Efforts to enhance access to justice had included measures such as the creation of modular and accessible community service structures and itinerant services to reach remote and underserved areas, ensuring continued support for communities affected by disasters. Additional initiatives focused on implementing intercultural dialogue between Indigenous peoples and the justice system to strengthen mutual understanding of justice concepts, empowering Indigenous leaders as rights advocates within their communities, and addressing the impact of crimes against the environment in traditional territories and communities through diagnostics and policy recommendations. The session concluded by emphasizing the importance of replicating and scaling successful practices across regions and fostering collaborative networks within communities and justice institutions to strengthen access to justice nationwide.

57. The panellists for Session 7 of the Expert Group Meeting were expert from Brazil, Canada and Colombia, who shared insights on improving access to justice through multi-stakeholder, cross-sectoral, and multidisciplinary collaboration. Interventions referred to the transformative potential of intersectoral cooperation and holistic models in addressing diverse justice needs. Experts acknowledged the value of partnerships among criminal justice institutions, law and bar associations, academia, legal aid providers, civil society, community justice helpers/facilitators, international organizations, and development cooperation agencies to integrate evidence-based practices in service delivery. Interdisciplinary approaches that draw on expertise from health, education, and social sectors were identified as key to

improving outcomes for those involved with the criminal justice system. In this context, strategic partnerships—such as health-justice collaborations and early intervention programs—are considered promising strategies for addressing the root causes of inequities and expanding access to justice both for victims and people in conflict the law.

58. A cultural shift in the approach to justice was advocated, with a focus on restorative justice principles and practices over punitive approaches. Restorative justice, based on prioritizing harm repair, truth, reconciliation, and reparation, was deemed a fundamental component of comprehensive criminal justice models. It was also recognized as a means to foster community cohesion, strengthen trust in the legal system, and promote fairness. Education, cooperation, and research among justice institutions, policymakers, legal professionals, and communities were considered essential for overcoming barriers such as prejudice and resistance, which arise from the perception that restorative justice prioritizes reconciliation over accountability.

59. Addressing inequalities involved fostering inclusive collaboration among all stakeholders. Experts stressed the need to continue advocating for the elimination of biases against women, particularly in leadership roles, while ensuring the continued mainstreaming of gender equality. Simultaneously, they recognized the importance of collaboration with Indigenous justice systems, which facilitates intercultural dialogue, enhances knowledge exchange, and promotes a more equitable and responsive justice system.

60. Experts concluded reiterating the importance of an independent and impartial judiciary operating within a clear legal framework. Equal access to justice relied on the independence and impartiality of the judiciary, and the effective collaboration across sectors. Upholding these principles was considered essential for establishing a justice system that is fair, inclusive, and respectful of all individuals.

61. In the final session of the expert group meeting experts agreed that:

States who have the primary responsibility to ensure equal access to justice for all, should be encouraged to:

1. Ensure equal access for all during all phases of the criminal justice process, and ensure that this includes equal access for all in their interactions with law enforcement, prosecution, independent and impartial tribunals and judiciary, and other criminal justice institutions, legal aid providers and victim support services;
2. Promote and support the implementation of people-centred⁹, equity-based, gender-responsive, and identity-inclusive criminal justice systems and reforms to eliminate structural and cultural barriers, ensuring fair and equal treatment for all individuals and strengthening knowledge of, and trust in the criminal justice system, its institutions and the administration of justice;
3. Ensure that efforts to advance equal access to justice for all are data-driven, evidence-based, inclusive and transparent, informed by qualitative and quantitative data and research and developed through wide engagement of groups and individuals with lived experience of structural inequalities and exclusion, and the participation of diverse voices in decision-making while guaranteeing the allocation of sufficient resources for the implementation, evaluation and further adjustments, as necessary;

⁹ During the course of the Expert Group Meeting, experts agreed on the importance of the engagement of various groups, including, inter alia, women, minorities, migrants, Indigenous Peoples, persons with disabilities, children, young people, LGBTIQ+ individuals, older persons, refugees, internally displaced persons, stateless persons, marginalized communities and others with specific needs, in implementing a people-centered approach. The experts however did not agree on a single definition of people-centred justice. For further illustration of a “people centred approach”, refer to the document entitled “New Vision of the Secretary General for the Rule of Law” issued by the Secretary General of the United Nations.

4. Address the legacies of colonialism and the transatlantic slave trade, such as systemic racism, discrimination and poverty, as these continue impacting the experience of Afrodescendants/Black populations, and Indigenous Peoples and traditional communities in their contact with the criminal justice system, adopting an intersectional approach;
5. Promote inclusive and intersectional approaches to access to justice by addressing the compounded vulnerabilities faced by individuals at the intersection of multiple identities and factors, including in integrated and holistic support services;
6. Review existing criminal laws, practices and policies to increase access to justice in line with international best practices, including by decriminalizing conduct and eliminating law enforcement and criminal justice practices that target and/or disproportionately impact poor and marginalized persons, such as persons who face institutional barriers and challenges deprived of liberty due to inability to pay fines or fees.
7. Consider the impact of crimes that affect the environment including for Indigenous Peoples and local communities and examine the challenges this poses for ensuring access to justice for all, including the threats posed to environmental and human rights defenders;
8. Encourage law enforcement agencies and criminal justice institutions to systematically collect, analyse, and disseminate data, disaggregated by factors such as, among others, race, gender, and age, ensuring its accessibility to promote transparency, and inform evidence-based policymaking, and include safeguards to ensure the protection and security of personal data that is collected and stored;
9. Strengthen and/or establish independent and internal oversight bodies to monitor law enforcement and criminal justice practices, ensuring transparency and accountability, including for over-policing, detention and criminalization of groups in vulnerable situations, in particular Afrodescendants/Black populations, Indigenous Peoples, migrants and other communities and the treatment of victims throughout criminal proceedings;
10. Adopt strategies to promote diversity, equality and equity within law enforcement and criminal justice institutions, legal aid services, victim support services, and among legal professionals and organizations supporting the criminal justice system, including by implementing legal and policy reforms to address structural barriers and encourage participation, eliminating bias in recruitment processes, promoting career development processes and addressing workplace discrimination. Such efforts should be accompanied by transparent data collection/collation and regular public reporting to measure progress;
11. Promote measures to increase efficiency and access to legal services that foster inclusive and equitable access to justice, including, where relevant, through the responsible use of technology, and only in line with the below safeguards;
12. Ensure that any responsible deployment of technology, including AI, includes its regulation and the evaluation of its impact on access to justice, in alignment with the international commitments made in the Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, The Global Digital Compact, and the first General Assembly Resolution on Artificial Intelligence ([A/78/L.49](#));
13. Ensure that any responsible deployment of technology, including AI is in accordance with the principles of legality, proportionality, necessity, accountability, and non-discrimination, and a requirement for safety, privacy, and human rights-by design, as well as formative and regular periodic evaluations that include consultations with diverse stakeholders to ensure effectiveness, accuracy, and the absence of harm, in particular mindful of the potential impact of such technology exacerbating existing biases and discrimination;
14. Removing barriers, in line with the United Nations Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems, to promote the

delivery of quality, fair, effective, inclusive, equitable legal aid¹⁰ services at all stages of the criminal justice process, for anyone detained, arrested, suspected of, or charged with a criminal offence, and for victims and survivors, and witnesses, if the person has no means or where the interests of justice so require. This can be achieved through employing a variety of models, including through partnerships with and between community organizations, civil society, universities, bar associations and grassroots organizations and the use of paralegals, community/popular defenders, public defenders, university legal clinics. The exchange of best practices on the efforts to implement the UN Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems is encouraged;

15. Promote the use of a variety of community based and restorative justice approaches to increase access to justice, in line with international human rights and other international standards;

16. Promote public awareness of the right to equal access to justice for all, in particular among those living in rural or remote areas and groups and communities that face discrimination and inequality, those facing other barriers to access, such as language, disabilities, and those in vulnerable situations, through legal information and education and awareness raising and take proactive measures to bring the justice system closer to the people;

17. Consider reporting on their implementation of resolution [78/227](#) and use and application of UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice related to access to justice in their inputs to the UN Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice and its regional preparatory meetings, as well as in the annual session of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice under the agenda item on UN standards and norms in crime prevention and criminal justice;

18. Create cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary, multistakeholder programmes that provide access to justice and develop referral mechanisms between these organizations, to address gaps in the delivery of access to justice. This includes promoting a whole of government approach and interministerial cooperation, for example, by bringing together justice, education and health concerns, to provide trauma-informed support services for victims of violence or rehabilitation programmes for prisoners.

¹⁰ As defined in the United Nations Principles and Guidelines on Access to Legal Aid in Criminal Justice Systems ([A/RES/67/187](#), annex).

Annex 1: Summary of CSO consultation

Civil society organizations noted that various barriers continue to hinder equal access to justice, including biases, procedural obstacles, and a limited understanding of victims' rights. It was emphasized that comprehensive reforms should prioritize inclusive national consultative processes, promote capacity-building and awareness initiatives, and strengthen accessible reporting mechanisms.

One intervention mentioned that certain colonial-era laws, established in specific historical contexts, remain embedded within legal and social systems, contributing to ongoing challenges related to inequalities and discrimination.

Another intervention reiterated the importance of ensuring that policing policies comply with international human rights standards. It was noted that law enforcement practices and policies should be based on objective, evidence-based criteria. Another intervention noted that hate crimes remain a significant concern and must be properly identified, documented, and prosecuted. Prosecutorial and judicial systems must be equipped to address these crimes effectively, ensuring that victims receive appropriate legal protections and support.

One civil society organization representative further noted that efforts to address structural discrimination must continue through the integration of human rights-based approaches in justice systems. It was suggested that justice policies should strengthen community-based support mechanisms, address discriminatory law enforcement practices, and review sentencing practices, particularly to reduce reliance on restrictive and disproportionate penalties for non-violent offences.

Efforts to promote equal access to justice should include strengthening legal aid services, reinforcing public defenders' offices, and supporting restorative justice measures. Training law enforcement and judicial officers on fair justice practices was noted as essential to reducing bias. It was also suggested that independent oversight bodies be established to monitor judicial processes and law enforcement conduct, contributing to greater accountability.

Another intervention referred to the importance of institutional changes, such as inclusive workplaces, to provide appropriate facilities for women staff and to create a more supportive environment. Building the capacity of justice professionals was noted as relevant to sustaining professional responses, with suggestions to develop continuous and career-oriented training programmes. The use of accredited e-learning platforms was also mentioned as a means to ensure accessible training for justice sector actors, particularly in remote areas.

An intervention highlighted that clear guidelines are needed to govern the use of technologies in the criminal justice system to ensure compliance with human rights standards. Establishing external oversight committees, composed of civil society organizations, legal experts, and community representatives, was suggested as a way to enhance transparency in the use of such technologies. The importance of robust data protection regulations was also highlighted.

Systematic data collection was referred to as a tool for enabling police and law enforcement agencies to identify crime patterns, allocate resources, and monitor the impact of interventions. An intervention recommended that standardized protocols be developed for the collection, maintenance, and use of data, supported by appropriate training, encryption of sensitive information, and independent audits to ensure compliance with privacy and human rights standards.

One intervention mentioned the importance of publishing disaggregated data on law enforcement actions, including arrests, complaints, and investigations, to better understand disparities and support policymaking aimed at addressing systemic discrimination. Community engagement was also considered essential to ensure that data collection practices serve the public interest, foster trust, and promote accountability in law enforcement.

It was noted that equitable access to justice requires sustainable, well-funded services and coordinated efforts among governments, civil society, academia, and the private sector to strengthen justice systems and respond to evolving societal needs.

Annex 2: List of experts who participated in the Expert Group Meeting

Experts Nominated by the Group of Eastern European States:

Poland: Maria Jolanta Grochulska, civil administrator, Department of Judicial Assistance and Human Rights, Ministry of Justice.

Romania: Cristina Lenuta Bostinaru Beclea, Department for Crime Prevention, Ministry of Justice.

Slovenia: Ciril Keršmanc, Judge in the Criminal Law Division of the District Court of Ljubljana.

Experts Nominated by the Group of Western European and Other States:

Canada: Dr. Michele Leering (PhD, CM), Visiting Scholar at Queen's University Faculty of Law in Ontario, Canada and former Executive Director/Lawyer of the Community Advocacy & Legal Centre.

France: Dr. Guillaume Vieillard, Head of Office of Institutional and Diplomatic Affairs, Delegation for European and International Affairs, General Secretariat, Ministry of Justice.

Portugal: Judge Júlio Gantes Gonçalves da Costa, member vowel of the Superior Council of the Judiciary.

Carla Maria Arrabaça Martins Falua, Senior Coordinator of Criminal Investigations.

Experts Nominated by the Group of Latin American and the Caribbean States:

Chile: Pablo Alberto Aranda Aliaga, Head of the Department of Studies and Projects, National Public Defender's Office.

Colombia: Jorge Enrique Vallejo Jaramillo, magistrate of the Superior Court of the Bogotá Judicial District.

Costa Rica: Judge Patricia Solano Castro, President of the Criminal Cassation Chamber of the Supreme Court.

Cuba: Yurais Álvarez Morales, Provincial Director of Justice of Havana.

Gladys María Padrón Canals, Registrar of Civil Status at the Office of the Special Registry and as Head of the Secretariat at the Ministry of Justice.

Dominican Republic: Judge Vanessa Acosta Peralta, Judge at the Supreme Court of Justice and Deputy Coordinator of the Judiciary's Commission for Gender Equality.

Mexico: Arturo Guerrero Zazueta, Director General of Human Rights, Gender Equality, and International Affairs of the Federal Judiciary Council.

Panama: Carlos Mario Martínez Zevallos, Deputy Prosecutor at the Subregional Prosecutor's Office of Bajo Chiquito, Office of the Attorney General.

Paraguay: Juan Jim Zaracho, Coordinator of Institutional Integrity for the Paraguayan Judiciary.

Experts Nominated by the Group of Asian and the Pacific States:

Malaysia: Justice Dato Mohd Radzi Bin Harun, High Court Judge in Kuantan, Pahang.

Philippines: Joan Carla V. Guevarra, Assistant State Prosecutor and Program Director at the Department of Justice.

Thailand: Dr. Kattiya Ratanadilok, Director of the Justice Research and Development Institute, Ministry of Justice.

Experts Nominated by the Group of African States:

Algeria: Mustapha Moudjadj, Director of Foresight and Organization, Ministry of Justice.

Rostom Mansouri, Public Prosecutor, Ministry of Justice.

Angola: Costa Antonio Sindula Chipepe, Judge and National Director of Justice Administration.

Burkina Faso: Bambara Bado Egnoma Pascale, Director of Access to Justice and Victim Support, Ministry of Justice and Human Rights.

Ouedraogo Jean, Police Commissioner, Director of Judicial Police.

Egypt: Amr Abou Hashima, Chief Prosecutor and Member of the Legislation Sector at the Ministry of Justice.

Kenya: Edwin Otieno Oduor, Senior Principal Prosecution Counsel, Advocate of the High Court of Kenya.

Nigeria: Evbu Igbiniedion, Executive Secretary of the Administration of Criminal Justice Monitoring Committee.

South Africa: Judge Nobolao Martha Mbhele, Judge of the High Court of South Africa.

Ntsumbedzeni Nemasisi, National Operations Executive of Legal Aid South Africa.

Tanzania: Janethreza Aloyce Kitaly, Prosecutor at the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and Acting Assistant Director for Case Management (AgADCM).

Fortunata Anastas Guvette, State Attorney, National Prosecution Services of Tanzania.

Uganda: Rachel A. Odoi-Musoke, Senior Technical Advisor and Head of the Governance and Security Programme Secretariat.

Zambia: Humphrey Mweemba, Director/CEO of the Legal Aid Board Zambia.

Mukelabai Ngenda, Access to Justice Analyst in the Governance, Policy, and Planning Department of the Ministry of Justice in Lusaka, Zambia.

Zimbabwe: Salome Chihuri. Principal Law Officer in the Ministry of Justice, Legal, and Parliamentary Affairs.

Fortunate Dzingai Maringe, principal legal officer at Ministry of Justice, Legal and Parliamentary Affairs Zimbabwe under department of Legal Aid directorate.
