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Sustainable Development Goals and the UNGCP

Sothi Rachagan
Focus of Presentation

1. Commonality of the objectives and guiding principles of the two documents.

2. Need for SDG 16 to focus on the civil justice system and legal empowerment.

3. Making the civil justice system serve consumer needs.

4. Quality control of consumer ADR mechanisms.

Source: MOHE website
SDG 16 and the Civil Justice System

**SDG 16:** “Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels.”

**Target 16.3:** “Promote the rule of law at the national and international levels and ensure equal access to justice for all.”

**Indicators for Target 16.3:**
“16.3.1 Proportion of victims of violence in the previous 12 months who reported their victimization to competent authorities or other officially recognized conflict resolution mechanisms
16.3.2 Unsentenced detainees as a proportion of overall prison population.”

Absence of targets for civil justice system and legal empowerment.
Civil Justice System & Consumer Needs

Area most people have a problem in justice system is with regards civil law, not criminal law.


Largest % of respondents in 35 of the 45 countries surveyed faced consumer disputes or problems.

In remaining 10 countries, consumer disputes and problems came second to housing.
## Regional Confidence in Judicial Systems and Courts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know / Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All results are based on 2013 survey data.*

*Survey results for Asia do not include China, Middle East and North Africa results do not include Jordan, Syria, Egypt, Libya, Algeria, or Gulf Cooperation Council countries.*

**GALLUP**
Perception of Corruption - Global Average

Key Public Sector Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% saying “most” or “all” are corrupt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected representatives</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business executives</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister / President</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax officials</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges and magistrates</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Leaders</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizen confidence in the judicial system (2014)

Source: Gallup world Poll from Government at a Glance 2015
## Judiciary - Percentage who had interacted and paid bribes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage who had contact in past year</th>
<th>Percentage who paid bribes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly Independent States</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Europe</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia-Pacific</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU / other Western European countries</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for Lack of Confidence

- Court rules that are not user friendly
- Court experience – delay, cost, formality, etc.
- Political and power group influence
- Bribery
Quality Control of ADR Mechanisms

*Accessibility
*Awareness
*Expertise
*Transparency
*Effectiveness
*Accountability

*Fairness
*Voluntariness
*Legality
*Coverage
*Special consideration for disadvantaged and vulnerable

Additional Considerations

• Publicly funded Tribunal for Consumer Complaints complemented by industry funded specialised tribunals/ombudsmen schemes.

• All tribunals/ombudsmen are statute based with regulations that ensure fairness, transparency and accountability.
  (Avoid ‘shall-may’ confusion malady)

• Free to consumers, with option for consumers to reject award and seek redress in courts.
Additional Considerations

• Provide individual and collective redress, identify systemic problems, suggest solutions and report on progress made.

• Provide user data.

• Provide for regular periodic independent reviews with suggestions for improvement.
Conclusion

• View civil justice system and legal empowerment as critical components of SDG 16 so that mandate in para 37 – 41 of UNGCP may be realised.

• Focus on making civil juice system meet consumer needs.

• Include in UNCTAD and IGE work programme the drafting of a Code of Good Practice on Consumer ADR (can be basis for national guidelines or statutes).
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