

## MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

## "PARTNERSHIP FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT" 2020 - 2022 "

## FOURTH CONSULTATIVE MEETING

21.10.2020

Component No. 3. "Access to Justice" Drafting an Action Plan



CONSULTATION 4				
Consultation Details				
Policy Goal Focus	Build an open government that provides its citizens with access to justice, transparency and accountability.			
Lead Focal Point Institution	Directorate of Policies and Strategies in the Field of Justice.			
Date	21 October 2020			
Consultation Meeting Number	Fourth consultative meeting			
I. Objective of Consultation Meeting				
What was the aim of this consultation? Please answer for all that apply	Details			
(i) Introduce stakeholders to the proposed policy goal	In cooperation with stakeholders, consultative meetings were held in order to draft the Action Plan of Component no. 3 "Access to Justice" part of the Open Government Partnership 2020-2022. The concluding meeting was the fourth consultative meeting, part of which were the discussions on concrete proposals / comments / suggestions on which the stakeholders had conducted on the action plan. Also, Znj.Hoxha costrndofhow civil society involvement in drafting and revising measures / activities of this plan.			
(ii) Introduce stakeholders to the OGP process	Ms. Elona Hoxha conducted a brief summary of the entire process, starting from the preconsultation report to the fourth consultative meeting. Reflected on the participants the proposals / comments made by them in the framework of the review of the Draft Action Plan.			
(iii) Explain the feedback tools for stakeholders	At the last meeting, participants focused inproposals and concrete suggestions tomade be after meetingthe third consultative, which had been sent to the relevant address.			
(iv) Brainstorm ideas with stakeholders	N/A			
(v) Develop further details (milestones, etc.) for ideas	Ms. Petrina Broka (Lecturer and Representative of the Law Clinic) in the framework of the meetings held, has shown the willingness to be active in the process of drafting draft action plan expressing suggestions and comments. Specifically: Ms. Broka emphasizes the strengthening of interinstitutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and public institutions / national and international organizations as well as civil society actors. A very good contribution in the training of the target groups would be given by the Law Clinic at the Faculty of Law, UT, which has the necessary human and infrastructural capacities			

	for the realization of the trainings. For this reason it is stated that it should be included in the institutions that can contribute in this regard.  Mr. Erjon Capani representative, Protection of Persons with Disabilities, joined the discussion expressing consent regarding the comment of Ms. Broka and the proposal made by the Directorate of Free Legal Aid, reiterating that it supports all discussions and proposals of realized in previous meetings.  Also, Ms. Julia Mulla, in the framework of the priority measure and in accordance with the comments made by Ms. Broka continues with the presentation of the proposal of a new measure: Establishment of the Inter-Institutional Forum for legal aid guaranteed by the state with the technical secretariat in the Directorate of Free Legal Aid.
(vi) Gather feedback on Proposed policy goals	Psrepresentatives on issues ofh-chairsof tstakeholders early in the process have supported key policy that provides citizens access to justice, transparency and accountability, proposing in this way in accordance with the specific objectives of action / activity concrete, measurable and feasible.
(vii) Prioritize proposed policy goals	During the meetings held, the prioritization of specific objectives was given importance, consequently in the fourth consultative meeting the stakeholders had the clearest comments on new proposals or improvement of activities.
(viii)Other (provide details)	N/A
II. Methodology	
What was the format of the meeting? How were stakeholders able to participate?	Details
	Details  Due to the impossibility of conducting a physical meeting as a result of the pandemic, the meeting was conducted online through the Cisco Webex platform.  Participants were introduced to the main policy in the meetings held. The fourth meeting focused on discussing and presenting the proposals submitted by the participants.
How were stakeholders able to participate?	Due to the impossibility of conducting a physical meeting as a result of the pandemic, the meeting was conducted online through the Cisco Webex platform.  Participants were introduced to the main policy in the meetings held. The fourth meeting focused on discussing and presenting the proposals submitted

(iv)	Brainstorming	N/A
Stake	eholder Selection	Details
(i)	How were stakeholders selected?	Stakeholders were selected based on the list of civil societies / groups.  The participants who attended the third consultative meeting, were also present at the last consultative meeting whose purpose was to benefit from civil society concrete proposals which can be included in the draft OGP Action Plan.
(ii)	How were stakeholders contacted?	Participants were introduced after the first meeting with the process, he is sent to their emailphaddressrkatës of access to materials. For each consultation meeting stakeholders are kept in constant contact to share any information about the meetings and materials.
(iii)	How many stakeholders were contacted?	In total about 25 interest groups were contacted.
(iv)	Was the consultation announced publicly? (via websites, social media, etc.)	In official OGP website are published to all materials / pInformation rkatëset any consultative meeting beconducted, where interest groups Kan can have Sinfor access to and recognized by afër.
(v)	Were stakeholders reminded?	Attendees received reminder emails on the last consultative meeting.
III.	Results / Findings	
Stake	eholder Contributions	Details
(i)	How many stakeholders attended?	The participants of the third meeting were part of the continuity of the process which coincided with the fourth and last consultative meeting.
(ii)	Did stakeholders contribute?	The participants after the end of the third consultative meeting, had considered the submitted materials, expressing themselves with initiatives and comments regarding measures / activities which aim at their inclusion in the current or future action plan.
(iii)	Main issues identified by stakeholders	During the meeting, the representatives emphasized the inter-institutional cooperation between the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and civil society actors in the framework of access to justice; Involvement of the Law Clinic in the training of target groups etc.
(iv)	Main recommendations from stakeholders?	The discussion focused on the concrete proposals undertaken by the Directorate of Free Legal Aid and the comments made by Ms. Broka.
IV.	Short Borders Identified & Preparations for Next Consu	ltation
		Details
(i)	Limitations in stakeholder attendance	Participants who had confirmed their participation were present by joining the meeting to discuss the proposals and comments made by them.
(ii)	Limitations in stakeholder participation	Interested groups were requested to send additional suggestions / interventions / ideas to the relevant email addresses to be considered for inclusion in the action plan.
(iii)	What can be done to improve attendance?	Forfshirja of stakeholders nh khth process has had

				a positive impact as a result of their contribution with suggestions / concrete initiatives focusing on the main problems encountered during their activity.			
(iv) What can be done to improve participation in the next meeting?				N/A			
STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK							
Name:	Petrina I	Broka	Organization / Affiliation:	Faculty of	`Law	Position:	Lecturer and Representative of the Law Clinic at the Faculty of Law
Issues Raised		⊠No / □Yes					
Feedback		Ms. Broka expressed gratitude for the invitation and attention paid to stakeholders in this important process that concerns the drafting of the action plan regarding component no. 3, "Access to Justice" of the Open Government Partnership 2020-2022. Znj.Broka concrete ideas expressedduring consultation meetings be conducted.					
•Emphasized the strengthening of inter-institutional cooperation between the Director Free Legal Aid and public institutions / national and international organizations as well a society actors in the framework of strengthening access to justice says that it would be fruitful if the above mentioned cooperation it would not be just between the Free Legal Directorate and the actresses mentioned on the other side.  • A very good contribution in the training of the target groups would be given by the Clinic at the Faculty of Law, UT, which has the necessary human and infrastructural cap for the realization of the trainings.			nizations as well as civil s that it would be more een the Free Legal Aid d be given by the Law				
Other Com	nents						
Name:	Erjon (	Capani	Organization / Affiliation:	Protection with Disa	n of Persons bilities	Position:	Lawyer
Issues Raised							
Feedback M	Capani, joined the discussion expressing consent regarding the comment of Ms. Broka and proposal made by the Directorate of Free Legal Aid, reiterating that it provides support for discussions and proposals realized in previous meetings.						
Ideas Sugge	Ideas Suggested						
Other Comments							
Name:	Julia Mu	lla	Organization / Affiliation:	Directora Legal Aid Ministry (	, at the	Position:	Legal Specialist
Issues Raise	ed -	⊠No / □Yes					
Feedback	Ms. Mulla in the framework of the consultative meetings held supported all the initiatives undertaken by the representatives of the interest groups in the realized consultative meetings and considered their proposals.						

	• Establishment of the Inter-Institutional Forum for state-guaranteed legal aid with the technical secretariat in the Free Legal Aid Directorate.
Ideas Suggested	•Cooperation between institutions that provide access to justice should not be only through the institutions of the Ministry of Justice and the Directorate of Legal Aid but also within NGOs with each other.
Other Comments	

	STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE					
	Name	Organization / Affiliation (full name, not acronyms)	Position	Email		
1	Petrina Broka	Faculty of Law	Pedagogue and Representative of the Law Clinic	petrina.br@gmail.com		
2	Erjona Capani	Protection of Persons with Disabilities	Lawyer	erjoncapani @ gmail.com		
3	Julia Mulla	Legal Aid Directorate Free	Legal Specialist	Julia.mulla@mindication.gov. al		
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

26		
27		