



---

**Twenty-first session**

The Hague, 5-10 December 2022

**Report of the Advisory Committee on Nominations of Judges  
on the work of its eighth session**

*Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction	2
A. Opening of the session	2
B. Adoption of the agenda	2
II. Considerations of issues on the agenda of the Committee	3
C. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee	3
D. Organization of work of the Advisory Committee in 2022	3
E. Other matters	5
 Annex I	 6
Annex II	7

## **I. Introduction**

### **A. Opening of the session**

1. The eighth session of the Advisory Committee on Nominations of Judges (“the Committee”) was opened on 5 September 2022 by the Interim Chair, Ms. Sanji Monageng, designated to this function at the informal 16 February 2022 meeting of the Committee. The eighth session was held on 5 and 6 September 2022, in The Hague.

2. The following members participated in-person in the session:

- (a) Mr. Julian Fernandez (France);
- (b) Ms. Lucy Muthoni Kambuni (Kenya);
- (c) Ms. Milica Kolaković-Bojović (Serbia);
- (d) Mr. Erkki Kourula (Finland);
- (e) Ms. Sanji Mmasenono Monageng (Botswana);
- (f) Mr. Eduardo Rodríguez Veltzé (Bolivia); and
- (g) Mr. Sang-Hyun Song (Republic of Korea).

The means for virtual participation were provided for the two members who could not be present.

### **B. Adoption of the agenda**

3. The Committee adopted the following agenda:

- 1. Opening of the session by the Interim Chair.
- 2. Adoption of the agenda.
- 3. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Advisory Committee.
- 4. Organization of work of the Advisory Committee in 2022:
  - (a) Work of the Advisory Committee in light of resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res.4 and the amendments to the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee (annex II):
    - (i) Preparation of a compendium of submissions from States Parties, and a reference document for States Parties for use when establishing or utilizing national nomination procedures (para. 7 of the resolution).
    - (ii) Development of a common questionnaire (ICC-ASP/18/Res.4, annex II, para. 5 *bis* (a)).
    - (iii) Reference checks of candidates (para. 5 *bis* (c)).
    - (iv) Drawing up of a standard declaration (para. 5 *bis* (d)).
    - (v) Review and documenting of national nomination processes para. 5 *bis* (f)).
    - (vi) Conduct of a confidential provisional assessment requested by a State Party, pursuant to paragraph 8 *bis*.
  - (b) Decisions on steps to be taken by the Advisory Committee in light of the recommendations of the Group of Independent Experts relating to the Advisory Committee (R371, R372, R373, R374, R375 and R376) and the June 2022 report of the facilitator in the New York Working Group.
  - (c) Consideration of questions to be posed to candidates in 2023.
  - (d) Consideration of a proposal by the Registry on candidates’ knowledge of English/French.
- 5. Other matters

## II. Considerations of issues on the agenda of the Committee

### C. Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Committee

4. On 5 September 2022, the Committee elected Ms. Sanji Monageng (Botswana) as the Chairperson of the Committee and Mr. Julian Fernandez (France) as the Vice-Chairperson.

### D. Organization of work of the Advisory Committee in 2022

#### (a) Work of the Advisory Committee in light of resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res.4 and the amendments to the terms of reference of the Advisory Committee (annex II)

5. The Committee considered how to proceed with its work, in light of its expanded mandate contained in resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res.4.<sup>1</sup> The Committee also took note of the recommendations of the Group of Independent Experts relating to its work<sup>2</sup> and of the on-going discussion thereof by the facilitation on the “Procedure for the nomination and election of judges”, (“the facilitation”), including preliminary conclusions of States Parties.

##### (i) *Preparation of a compendium of submissions from States Parties, and a reference document for States Parties for use when establishing or utilizing national nomination procedures (para. 7 of the resolution)*

6. The Committee considered the preparation of a compendium of submissions from States Parties as at 31 August 2020 regarding their national nomination procedures, as set out in the mandate contained in resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res.4<sup>3</sup> (see annex I). The Committee took note that, pursuant to notes verbales sent by the Secretariat in 2020, 2021 and 2022 requesting States Parties to submit information on their national nomination procedures, a total of 30 States Parties had submitted the information requested, and that 29 of the submissions<sup>4</sup> had been posted on the webpage of the Assembly of States Parties.<sup>5</sup> An addendum to this compendium could be issued as and when additional submissions are received.

7. As regards the preparation of a reference document for States Parties to use on an optional basis, which includes practices that could be taken into account when States Parties are establishing or utilizing national nomination procedures,<sup>6</sup> the Committee considered the submissions and was of the view that, in light of the limited number of submissions received, its ability to prepare a well-considered reference document was also limited. The Committee nevertheless, prepared, on the basis of the limited information available to it, a preliminary Matrix (annex II) that reflects the most salient elements of the nomination procedures submitted by States Parties, including the common elements. The Committee was of the view that it would be in a better position to prepare a more comprehensive reference document if a greater number of submissions were available to it. In this regard, the Committee called upon States Parties that had not yet submitted information on their national nomination procedures to do so as soon as possible.

8. Further, the Committee took note of the discussion held in the facilitation on recommendation R376, and noted that the recommendation had not been positively assessed

<sup>1</sup> [https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp\\_docs/ASP18/ICC-ASP-18-Res4-ENG.pdf](https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/ASP18/ICC-ASP-18-Res4-ENG.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Independent Expert Review of the International Criminal Court and the Rome Statute System Final Report - 30 September 2020 (ICC-ASP/19/16), Chapter XX, recommendations R373-R375:

[https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp\\_docs/ASP19/ICC-ASP-19-16-ENG-IER-Report-9nov20-1800.pdf](https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/ASP19/ICC-ASP-19-16-ENG-IER-Report-9nov20-1800.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> ICC-ASP/18/Res.4, para. 7.

<sup>4</sup> One State Party had requested that the Secretariat not publish the information submitted until it had completed the update thereof.

<sup>5</sup> <https://asp.icc-cpi.int/ACN/2020-National-Procedures>

<sup>6</sup> ICC-ASP/18/Res.4, para. 7.

by States Parties.<sup>7</sup> The Committee agreed that no action was therefore required of the Committee.

(ii) *Development of a common questionnaire (ICC-ASP/18/Res.4, annex II, para. 5 bis (a))*

9. The Committee took note of the common questionnaire that had been prepared by the previous Advisory Committee in 2020 which candidates for election at the nineteenth session had been required to complete,<sup>8</sup> pursuant to resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res.4.

10. The Committee decided that certain modifications to the common questionnaire might be needed. In order to continue pursuing its work during the intersessional period, the Committee decided to establish a working group on the development of a common questionnaire.

11. The Committee took note of the decision which States Parties had made on recommendation R373 regarding the certification of the common questionnaire by a senior member of the national level judiciary or of the nominations/appointment body which oversaw the nomination process. However, the Committee was of the view that although it would proceed to request that certification, it was important to bear in mind that it might not be feasible or appropriate for the judiciary or nomination/appointment body to provide such certification regarding certain personal replies from the candidates, both vis-à-vis the 2020 questionnaire<sup>9</sup> and the 2023 version which the Committee was still in the process of preparing.

(iii) *Reference checks of candidates (para. 5 bis (c))*

12. The Committee received a briefing from the Secretariat regarding the 2020 process conducted for candidates for judicial elections. It was informed that in 2020, it had not been possible for the Committee to itself conduct reference checks for candidates. The Security and Safety Section of the Registry had, however, carried out background checks on the candidates and there had been the opportunity for external stakeholders to submit information on candidates for the attention of the Committee. The Committee took note that, since that time, the Assembly had progressively developed a due diligence process for candidates for elections, which had been conducted with the assistance of the Independent Oversight Mechanism (IOM), a subsidiary body of the Assembly.<sup>10</sup> The Secretariat informed the Committee of the due diligence processes undertaken for the elections of the Prosecutor and the Deputy Prosecutors in 2020 and 2021.

13. The Committee recalled that in the case of candidates for judicial elections, the nomination is made by a State Party. Therefore, in the absence of any specific decision by the Assembly on a different due diligence process, the Committee was of the view that for the 2023 nominations, it should rely once more on the assistance which could be provided by the Security and Safety Section of the Registry, as in the case of the 2020 nominations.

(iv) *Drawing up of a standard declaration (para. 5 bis (d))*

14. The Committee considered the standard declaration which had been drawn up by the previous Advisory Committee which each candidate had been requested to complete in 2020, pursuant to resolution ICC-ASP/18/Res.4.<sup>11</sup>

15. The Committee was of the view that certain modifications could be made to the standard declaration, and would return to this issue in advance of its work in 2023.

(v) *Documenting of national nomination processes para. 5 bis (f))*

16. As regards the mandate contained in the amended Terms of Reference of the Committee regarding the review and documentation of national nomination processes, the Committee was of the view that this mandate was related to the mandate on the preparation

<sup>7</sup> Report of the Review Mechanism submitted pursuant to ICC-ASP/19/Res.7, paragraph 9 (ICC-ASP/20/36), annex II, titled "Matrix- Progress in the assessment of the IER recommendations":

[https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp\\_docs/ASP20/ICC-ASP-20-36-ENG.pdf](https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/ASP20/ICC-ASP-20-36-ENG.pdf)

<sup>8</sup> <https://asp.icc-cpi.int/elections/judges/2020/Questionnaire-Declaration>

<sup>9</sup> If the Committee was to replicate some of those 2020 questions in 2023.

<sup>10</sup> <https://asp.icc-cpi.int/IOM>

<sup>11</sup> <https://asp.icc-cpi.int/elections/judges/2020/Questionnaire-Declaration>

of a compendium and a reference document<sup>12</sup> and considered that these documents were relevant to this mandate.

(vi) *Conduct of a confidential, provisional assessment requested by a State Party, pursuant to paragraph 8 bis*

17. The Committee considered how it would treat a request for a confidential, provisional assessment of the suitability of a potential candidate of a State Party should such a request be made of it. It decided that if the need arose, it would proceed as requested, bearing in mind the risks related to confidentiality in what has traditionally been a transparent process, resources of the Committee, recusal of members and risk of potential misuse of the process.

(b) **Decisions on steps to be taken by the Advisory Committee in light of the recommendations of the Group of Independent Experts relating to the Advisory Committee (R371, R372, R373, R374, R375) and the June 2022 report of the facilitator in the New York Working Group**

18. The Committee considered the recommendations of the Group of Independent Experts related to its work and the improvement of the system for the nomination and election of judges,<sup>13</sup> as well as the work of the facilitation thereon. The Committee took note that recommendations R371 and R372 concerned the work of States Parties and thus required no consideration by members. Further, the Committee took note that recommendations R373, R374 and R375 had been positively assessed by States Parties and that States were considering the way forward on these recommendations. It noted further that recommendation R376 had not been positively assessed by States Parties.<sup>14</sup> In light of the assessment by States Parties of these recommendations, the Committee was of the view that it was therefore not necessary for it to take any decisions relating to the recommendations.

(c) **Consideration of questions to be posed to candidates in 2023**

19. The Committee began its consideration of the confidential list of questions that the previous Committee had posed to the candidates in 2020.

20. In order to continue pursuing its work during the intersessional period, the Committee decided to establish a working group to consider the questions to be posed to candidates in 2023.

(d) **Consideration of a proposal by the Registry on candidates' knowledge of English/French**

21. The Committee took note of the findings of the previous Committee on the actual level of knowledge of some candidates of the working languages of the Court, as well as its request that the language capability of candidates for future elections be assessed by means of a general test applicable to all candidates, to be administered by the Registry of the Court.<sup>15</sup> The Committee welcomed the offer of the Registry to assist, upon the request of the Committee. The Committee will continue its consideration as to whether it may seek such guidance and assistance, including the timing and modalities of the test.

22. The Committee requested that, where appropriate, a nominating State should submit a written and oral language proficiency certificate of a recognized/accredited language institution/university, along with the nomination of a candidate. This would expedite the Committee's consideration of the language skills of a candidate.

## **E. Other matters**

23. The Committee reiterated the importance of face-to-face interviews with the candidates for the effective discharge of its mandate. The Committee recalled that it had previously stressed the importance of face-to-face interviews with candidates and that it had

<sup>12</sup> See paras. 6 to 8 of the present report.

<sup>13</sup> Independent Expert Review of the International Criminal Court and the Rome Statute System Final Report - 30 September 2020 (ICC-ASP/19/16), Chapter XX: [https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp\\_docs/ASP19/ICC-ASP-19-16-ENG-IER-Report-9nov20-1800.pdf](https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/asp_docs/ASP19/ICC-ASP-19-16-ENG-IER-Report-9nov20-1800.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> See footnote 7.

<sup>15</sup> Report of the Advisory Committee on Nominations of Judges on the work of its seventh session (ICC-ASP/19/11), para. 34.

requested States Parties to ensure that their candidates are available for face-to-face interviews with the Committee. The Committee stressed that it was the responsibility of the nominating State to ensure that its candidate attended the face-to-face interview.

24. As regards the information which nominating States submit, the Committee recalled that it had suggested guidelines thereon, in its second, third, sixth and seventh reports.<sup>16</sup>

25. The Committee agreed tentatively to meet from 3 to 14 July 2023 to conduct in-person interviews at the International Criminal Court in The Hague.

## **Annex I**

### **National nomination and selection procedures**

Compendium of submissions by States Parties can be found at <https://asp.icc-cpi.int/sites/asp/files/2022-10/ACN-NominationProcedures-ENG-14Oct22-1350.pdf>.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> ICC-ASP/12/47, annex III, ICC-ASP/13/22, annex II, appendix III, ICC-ASP/16/7, annex II, appendix III; and ICC-ASP/19/11, Annex III, A.

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to ICC-ASP/18/Res.4, para. 6.

## Annex II

### Advisory Committee on Nominations of Judges

#### Compilation of national nomination procedures

Responses received from States Parties in 2020, 2021 and 2022<sup>1</sup>

#### Most salient elements

States	Elements	Comments
Argentina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Ireland, Mongolia, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, Uruguay	Procedure provided for the nomination of candidates for appointment to the highest judicial offices in the State in question (pursuant to article 36, paragraph 4 (a) (i), Rome Statute)	
Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Finland, France, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Tunisia	Procedure provided for the nomination of candidates for the International Court of Justice in the Statute of that Court (pursuant to article 36, paragraph 4 (a) (ii), Rome Statute)	
Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, United Kingdom	Publication in Official Journal (or other public document, including the internet) of vacancy and/or candidate	Argentina: The name and the curricular background of the person or persons considered for the position will be published in the Official Gazette and in at least 2 newspapers of national circulation, during 3 days. Simultaneously with such publication, that information will be disseminated on the official website of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights of the Nation.

<sup>1</sup> Responses were received from four members of the Group of African States, two members of the Group of Asia-Pacific States; four members of the Group of Eastern European States; ten members of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States; and nine members of the Group of Western European and other States.

States	Elements	Comments
		<p>Belgium: A vacancy for the post of judge at the International Criminal Court shall be published in the Belgian Official Journal when the Council of Ministers, on a proposal of the Minister of Justice, decides to put forward a candidate for such an election. The announcement published in the Belgian Official Journal shall set out the qualifications of candidates.</p> <p>Bolivia: Socialization of the vacancy to competent institutions.</p> <p>Burkina Faso: Ministry of Justice informing all judges within the ministry that a call for nominations for the election of judges at the ICC was open.</p> <p>Czech Republic: The call for applications for nomination as a candidate for the position of Judge of the Court shall be published by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (...) The Ministry shall take the appropriate measures to give the call for applications the widest possible publicity; in particular, it shall publish the call on its website and notify it, in an appropriate manner, to courts, Public Prosecutor's Offices and to Deans of the Faculties of Law of public higher education institutions in the Czech Republic.</p> <p>Finland: vacant offices for which Finland intends to nominate a candidate must be announced and published in an appropriate manner. In principle, only persons who have submitted their application for the office concerned can be nominated as candidates.</p> <p>France: the French authorities issued a public call for nominations on the websites of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Justice.</p> <p>Georgia: the Training Center of Justice shall officially submit the vacancy information to the Constitutional</p>



States	Elements	Comments
		<p>Court of Georgia, the High Council of Justice of Georgia, the Prosecutor's Office of Georgia, the Georgian Bar Association, higher educational institutions in Georgia, and non-governmental organisations operating in the relevant field.</p> <p>Mongolia: information about vacancies is disseminated through Administration Office of Supreme Court.</p> <p>Netherlands: selected on the basis of an open call for candidates.</p> <p>Norway: Ministry of Foreign affairs issues call for applications. The committee is to submit its short list, with the reasons for its recommendation, to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The short list will be public, but the committee's reasons will normally be exempted from public disclosure.</p> <p>Sierra Leone: Two tracks – open and general call for applications based on qualification requirements set out in the Constitution; and second track based on internal evaluations and promotions on the basis of meritorious service as determined by Judicial and Legal Service Commission (mainly used for the Court of Appeal and Supreme Court).</p> <p>Slovenia: call for applications published in Official Gazette.</p>
Czech Republic, Georgia, Finland, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Kingdom	Candidate has to apply	<p>Czech Republic: The individual applicants shall submit their applications to the Ministry within the deadline set in the call.</p> <p>Georgia: Persons interested in the vacancy shall submit documents within 10 calendar days after the vacancy has been published.</p>

States	Elements	Comments
		<p>Finland: In principle, only persons who have submitted their application for the office concerned can be nominated as candidates.</p> <p>Mongolia: interested and qualified candidates must express readiness to contest the position and make a direct approach to the Administration Office.</p>
Czech Republic, Georgia, Norway, Switzerland	Language requirement	<p>Czech Republic: e) Have an excellent knowledge of and be fluent in at least one of the working languages of the Court. Have an active knowledge of the other working language of the Court.</p> <p>Georgia: A candidate shall indicate in which working language of The Hague Court he/she wishes to complete the competition procedure provided for by Article 4 of this Procedure.</p> <p>Norway: proficiency in English and French shall be documented or tested.</p> <p>Switzerland: The panel shall conduct interviews and written tests to assess the expertise and language skills of the most promising applicants.</p>
Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Georgia, Finland, France, Mongolia, Norway, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom	Test / interview	<p>Czech Republic: The Board shall then interview the applicants whose applications have not been excluded pursuant to (2) above.</p> <p>Costa Rica: He was also interviewed for this purpose.</p> <p>Georgia: the Training Center of Justice shall conduct a test in the English or French language, and the assignments of the test shall be drawn up, and fulfilled assignments shall be assessed based on a 10-point system, by a consultant(s) invited by the Training Center of Justice.</p>

States	Elements	Comments
		<p>Finland: The Panel may interview eligible applicants and it may invite external experts, as well, to give their opinions on the applicants.</p> <p>France: It immediately rejected seven nominations and then held individual interviews with each of the seventeen short-listed candidates.</p> <p>Mongolia: candidates may undergo interviews or exams. Those already appointed as a Justice of the Supreme Court do not engage in assessments as they have already met the requirements.</p>
Argentina	Sworn statement with a list of all their own assets, those of their spouse and/or those of the live –in partner, which constitute the assets of the marital partnership and those of their minor children. List of civil associations and commercial companies of which they are or were part in the last 8 years, the law firms to which they belong or belonged, a list of clients or contractors of at least the last 8 years, within the framework of what is allowed by current professional ethics norms, and in general, any type of commitment that may affect the impartiality of their criteria for their own activities. Tax report.	
Belgium	Two lists	Intervention by the High Council of Justice (HCJ), responsible for drawing up the ranking of candidates in two lists of profiles as set up in Article 36, § 3, (b), i) and ii), of the Rome Statute.
Burkina Faso	Nomination has also been approved by the Economic Community of West African States	
Costa Rica	Double procedure: (i) In accordance with paragraph 4, a), ii), of article 36 (ICJ) (ii) Separate evaluation by President and MFA	
Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Switzerland	Screening	Czech Republic: The Board shall review the submitted applications and exclude any incomplete applications in cases where the applicant has not given any satisfactory

States	Elements	Comments
		<p>reason for his failure to include any of the particulars specified in the call for applications pursuant to Article 3 (2) above.</p> <p>Ecuador: Screening of candidates was carried out and the curriculum vitae of said candidates reviewed and qualified.</p> <p>France: scrutinised twenty-four applications to assess whether the profile of the candidates met the criteria stipulated in article 36(3) of the Rome Statute. It immediately rejected seven nominations and then held individual interviews with each of the seventeen short-listed candidates.</p> <p>Georgia: The Training Center of Justice shall carry out the initial screening of competition applications on the basis of the assessment of the documents and the information provided for by Article 3 of this Procedure.</p> <p>Switzerland: The panel may use additional evaluation methods to ensure that the applicants have 'high moral character' and the required skills. In assessing the applicants' 'high moral character', the panel checks the applicants' references and any other publicly available information, with due regard to the credibility of sources. The panel creates a standard declaration for all applicants to sign that clarifies whether they are aware of any allegations of misconduct, including sexual harassment. Where such allegations have been made, the panel should weigh the applicants' declaration against other available information and reports. The additional evaluation measures referred to in paragraph 94 may include where appropriate, subject to the applicants' consent: a. obtaining comments from outside bodies, including civil society; b. using an existing procedure or mechanism within the Swiss system; c. consulting a specialised company.</p>

States	Elements	Comments
Argentina, Georgia, Slovenia, Uruguay	Legislative Power approval	<p>Argentina: judges are appointed to the Supreme Court by the President of the Nation, with the agreement of the Senate. (...) (S)enators must formally approve the nomination by a two-thirds majority for the nomination to be confirmed.</p> <p>Georgia: The Parliament of Georgia shall be requested to select and approve one candidate through a hearing and voting procedure established for electing members to the Constitutional Court of Georgia.</p> <p>Slovenia: candidate elected by National Assembly through secret ballot.</p> <p>Uruguay: General Assembly decides on nominee by simple majority vote.</p>
Czech Republic, Finland, Latvia, Republic of Korea, Switzerland, United Kingdom	Creation of a Working Group/Panel of experts/other	<p>Czech Republic: The Selection Board shall consist of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, who shall be its Chairperson, the Minister of Justice, the Presidents of the Constitutional Court, Supreme Court and of the Supreme Administrative Court, the Supreme Public Prosecutor, the Public Defender of Rights, and members of the National Group in the Permanent Court of Arbitration.</p> <p>Finland: a special Panel of Experts that the Government appoints for the task of preparing such nominations, including the making of assessments.</p> <p>Latvia: A Working Group established by the Ministry of Justice decides on the applicable procedure – either addressing a specific candidate, or running a selection procedure. Working Group also decides on composition of selection committee, regulation and rules of procedure</p>

States	Elements	Comments
		<p>Republic of Korea: The Government of the Republic of Korea selects its candidates for election as judge of the ICC through the Committee for the Nomination of Candidates for Election to the ICC (the “Committee”). The Committee consists of the members of the Korean national group at the Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) and the Chief Justice (or his/her representative) of the Supreme Court of Korea.</p> <p>Switzerland: A formal panel with the requisite expertise shall be set up to ensure accountability and objectivity with regard to the internal selection of judicial candidates.</p> <p>United Kingdom: The United Kingdom used an open and transparent process for selection by inviting applications through a public advertisement issued by the Judicial Appointments Commission. The applications were reviewed by a panel of senior members and representatives of the judiciary of England and Wales, the Northern Ireland Department of Justice, the Scottish Government, the Ministry of Justice and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office. The best applicants were then invited to an interview by the same panel. The panel made recommendations to the Foreign Secretary, who made the final decision on the United Kingdom’s candidate.</p>
Norway	Based on the procedure for appointing judges to national courts and on the procedure for nomination of candidates for the office of judge at the European Court of Human Rights, with certain modifications	
Republic of Korea	Procedure allows for aspects of both article 36, paragraph 4 (a) (i) and article 36, paragraph 4 (a) (ii)	Republic of Korea: the Committee consists of members of the national group at the PCA as well as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who makes

---

States	Elements	Comments
		recommendations to the President for the appointment of judges of the Supreme Court.

*Note:* In some cases the procedure outlined in the response submitted by the State Party was the procedure actually adopted by the State Party, either in general terms or in respect of a recent nomination; in other cases, it was the proposed or likely procedure that would be followed.

---