CEPA

ԻՐԱՎՈՒՆՔՆԵՐԻ ՊԱՇՏՊԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԱՌԱՆՑ ՍԱՀՄԱՆՆԵՐԻ ՀԿ

ԻՐԱՎՈՒՆՔԻ ԵՎՐՈՊԱ
EUROPE IN LAW

REPORT

ON THE MONITORING RESULTS OF ACTIONS UNDER THE 2022–2026 ACTION PLAN FOR JUDICIAL AND LEGAL REFORMS STRATEGY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

(COVERING 2022 THROUGH TO THE FIRST HALF OF 2026)

ԶԵԿՈՒՅՑ

ՀԱՅԱՍՏԱՆԻ ՀԱՆՐԱՊԵՏՈՒԹՅԱՆ ԴԱՏԱԿԱՆ ԵՎ ԻՐԱՎԱԿԱՆ ԲԱՐԵՓՈԽՈՒՄՆԵՐԻ 2022-2026 ԹՎԱԿԱՆՆԵՐԻ ՌԱԶՄԱՎԱՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆԻՑ ԲԽՈՂ ԳՈՐԾՈՂՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ԻՐԱԿԱՆԱՑՄԱՆ ԾՐԱԳՐԻ 2022-2026 (2026 ԹՎԱԿԱՆԻ ԱՌԱՋԻՆ ԿԻՍԱՄՅԱԿ) ԹՎԱԿԱՆՆԵՐԻ ԻՐԱԿԱՆԱՑՄԱՆ ԵՆԹԱԿԱ ԳՈՐԾՈՂՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ ՄՇՏԱԴԻՏԱՐԿՄԱՆ ԱՐԴՅՈՒՆՔՆԵՐԻ

YEREVAN
2026
ԵՐԵՎԱՆ







ԻՐԱՎԱՀԱՆՁՆԵՐԻ ՊԱՇՏՊԱՆՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ
ԱՌԱՆՑ ՍԱՀՄԱՆՆԵՐԻ ՀԿ



ԻՐԱՎՈՒՆՔԻ
ԵՎՐՈՊԱ
EUROPE IN
LAW

REPORT

ON THE MONITORING RESULTS OF ACTIONS UNDER THE 2022–2026 ACTION PLAN FOR JUDICIAL AND LEGAL REFORMS STRATEGY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

(COVERING 2022 THROUGH TO THE FIRST HALF OF 2026)

YEREVAN

November, 2026 ©

This report was prepared by EU-Armenia Civil Society Platform with the financial support of the Council of Europe. The assessments presented in this report must not, under any circumstances, be construed as representing the official views of the Council of Europe.

The assessment of the implementation of Strategic Goals 1, 2, 4 (Actions 2, 3, 4, 7, and 10), 5, 8, and 11 of the Report is the responsibility of Syuzanna Soghomonyan, Senior Expert and Coordinator of Programmes at the Armenian Lawyers' Association NGO, while the assessments of the implementation of Strategic Goals 3, 4 (Actions 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9), 6, 7, 9, 10, and 12 is the responsibility of Hasmik Harutyunyan, Expert at the Protection of Rights without Borders NGO.

The English version of the report was edited by Lousineh Hakobyan, President and Senior Lawyer with the Europe in Law Association NGO.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....5
MONITORING METHODOLOGY.....8
GOAL 1. Establishment of a unified "Electronic Justice" management system and modernization of and access to electronic databases.....10
Electronic management of court cases..... 10
Digitization of mediation and public notifications..... 11
Digitization of probation, compulsory enforcement, and penitentiary systems 12
Digitization of archival materials of the State Register of Legal Entities 12
Digitization of notarial services..... 12

GOAL 2. Application of transitional justice mechanisms through the identification of systemic human rights violations through fact-finding activities.....13

GOAL 3. Development of democratic institutions.....14
Supporting the activities of the Constitutional Reforms Council and the Professional Commission..... 14
Developing the concept and draft of constitutional amendments 15
Amendments to electoral legislation and their assessment..... 15

GOAL 4. Ensuring the continuity of judicial system reforms 15
Conditions in courts, selection and training of judges..... 17
Provision of the necessary premises and material and technical resources for the effective functioning of anti-corruption courts (including the panel reviewing appeals against their decisions). 18
Provision for the legal possibility of appealing decisions rendered by the Supreme Judicial Council in disciplinary cases..... 18
Review of the voting weight of non-judge members in the Ethics and Disciplinary Affairs Commission of the General Assembly of Judges.... 19

GOAL 5. Reforms in the Criminal Law Sphere 20
GOAL 6. Reforms to Civil and Civil Procedure Legislation.....21
Civil Procedure Regulations and Securing Obligations 21
Electronic Justice and Limitations of Assessment..... 21
GOAL 7. Reforms to Administrative and Administrative Procedure Legislation 22
Inventory of sector-specific issues and preparation of a package of amendments..... 23
Electronic litigation and legislation on administrative offenses..... 23
GOAL 8. Reforms in the Bankruptcy Sector 23
GOAL 9. Development of Alternative Dispute Resolution Methods 24
Establishment of an arbitration center..... 24
Legislative instruments for arbitration and mediation..... 25
GOAL 10. Reforms in Legal Aid 26
Regulations concerning the Chamber of Advocates and the scope of free legal aid..... 26
Tax changes and uncompleted actions 26
GOAL 11. Reforms to the Compulsory Enforcement System 27
GOAL 12. Other Strategic Directions.....28
Regulations in the Notarial Sector 28
Academy of Justice and Expert Activities..... 29

RECOMMENDATIONS.....30
A. Methodological Recommendations.....30
Assessment of action implementation 30
Assessment of performance against action indicators..... 31
Periodic updating and public disclosure of reports..... 31
General recommendations 31

B. Recommendations on specific strategic objectives.....32

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Monitoring of Armenia's 2022–2026 Judicial and Legal Reforms Action Plan

Scope and methodology

The report monitored implementation of the Action Plan under the Republic of Armenia's 2022–2026 Strategy for Judicial and Legal Reforms. The review combined a procedural assessment of planned actions with a selective qualitative assessment of whether implementation contributed to strategic objectives. It drew on official reports, legal acts and draft legislation, information requests, stakeholder interviews, and a focus group discussion. As an interim review, it did not assess the Strategy's final outcome indicators.

Overall results

Of the 87 actions assessed, 56 were completed, 12 partially completed, and 19 not completed. The procedural completion rate was 64.37%. A separate qualitative assessment of 16 selected actions—covering transitional justice, democratic institutions and constitutional reform, and continued judicial reform—found five implemented, five partially implemented, and six not implemented. Its implementation rate was 31.25%. These results show a substantial gap between completing planned activities and achieving the intended strategic results.

Main findings across the 12 strategic goals

Goal 1. Electronic justice and digital systems. Electronic tools were introduced for civil, administrative, bankruptcy, and pretrial criminal proceedings, as well as probation, compulsory enforcement, and legal-entity archives. However, interoperability, reliability, access to evidence, electronic notifications, and end-to-end digitization remain problematic. Several planned digital notarial functions have not been delivered, and published judicial statistics are insufficient to verify all intended results.

Goal 2. Transitional justice. Legal amendments adopted in December 2024 created a basis for a Fact-Finding Commission, but the commission had not been established or begun work at the time of monitoring. The report identifies shortcomings in the proposed institutional model, including safeguards for independence, autonomy, member selection, resources, access to information, and external oversight. The planned fact-finding outcomes therefore remain unachieved or unassessable.

Goal 3. Democratic institutions and constitutional reform. The constitutional reform process remains incomplete: the full Professional Commission was not sustained, participation in public discussions fell below target, and neither a comprehensive reform concept nor a finalized

constitutional amendment draft was available. The roles of the Constitutional Reforms Council and Professional Commission also lacked clarity. In contrast, amendments to the Electoral Code adopted in December 2024 were assessed as a completed result.

Goal 4. Judicial system reform. Separate civil and criminal courts of first instance were established in Yerevan; higher-court judicial remuneration was revised; and a framework for periodic judicial integrity assessments was introduced. However, planned judicial sub-specialization was not achieved, the disciplinary appeal mechanism for Supreme Judicial Council decisions was not yet operational, and evidence on the practical effects of judicial training, integrity reviews, and court restructuring remained insufficient.

Goal 5. Criminal justice. Investigation bodies received audio and video recording equipment, probation monitoring infrastructure was improved, staffing increased, and guidance on new criminal legislation was prepared. Legal mechanisms for assessing prosecutors' and investigators' integrity were also introduced. Nevertheless, information was insufficient to assess some practical outcomes, and planned electronic tools for criminal court proceedings remained dependent on the UNICOURT system.

Goal 6. Civil law and civil procedure. Legislative amendments addressed cassation appeals and introduced a legal framework for electronic civil justice. Issues arising from the Civil Procedure Code were identified, and draft amendments progressed. However, proposed reforms concerning secured obligations and corporate law remained incomplete or unresolved, while the introduction of electronic tools encountered practical difficulties, including limited advance notice and testing.

Goal 7. Administrative law and procedure. Authorities identified implementation problems and developed draft amendments, while legislation supporting electronic justice advanced. Nevertheless, several intended regulatory outcomes were not verified, and the new Code on Administrative Offenses had not been adopted at the time of monitoring. Two of the four actions were completed and two partially completed, without demonstrating that all intended results had been achieved.

Goal 8. Bankruptcy and insolvency. The new Insolvency Code was adopted on June 18, 2026, and electronic procedures received a legislative basis. The Code had not yet entered into force, however, and its intended effects—including at least a 20% reduction in case-processing time and approximately 10% growth in financial rehabilitation cases—could not be evaluated within the monitoring period.

Goal 9. Alternative dispute resolution. All nine planned actions were assessed as completed. The Armenian Center for Arbitration and Mediation was established, relevant legal instruments were adopted, and an electronic mediation platform was launched. The reported expansion in mediation activity is significant, although further assessment is needed to establish the mechanisms' accessibility, use, enforcement of outcomes, and practical effectiveness.

Goal 10. Legal aid. Eligibility for free legal aid was expanded and the framework for pro bono services developed. Five of seven actions were completed, but the net increase in public defender positions was only four after subsequent reductions. The report also identifies risks to affordability and access arising from tax changes, limited use of the pro bono VAT exemption, and insufficient evidence on service quality and impact.

Goal 11. Compulsory enforcement. New legislation, infrastructure, and automation tools modernized the Compulsory Enforcement Service. Yet the reported 41.5% increase in average remuneration fell short of the 50% target, and available evidence did not demonstrate the intended reduction of at least 40% in the duration of enforcement actions. Training effectiveness and other staffing indicators also remain insufficiently documented.

Goal 12. Other strategic reforms. Changes to notarial disciplinary procedures and professional liability insurance were implemented. By contrast, the planned expansion of notarial enforcement endorsements and legal reforms concerning the Academy of Justice and expert activities remained incomplete. The report highlights weaknesses in the initial diagnosis of problems and in treating the preparation of draft laws as a final result.

Conclusions and recommendations

The central finding is that procedural progress often exceeded demonstrated institutional or public-facing results. The report therefore calls for a more rigorous, evidence-based approach to assessing reform implementation, distinguishing the drafting or submission of legal acts from their adoption, entry into force, and practical application.

Methodological priorities. Use a consistent rating scale and assess every component of multi-part actions against its indicators and supporting evidence. Introduce measurable outcome indicators, baseline and comparable data, and periodic public updates on datairav.am. Where outcomes cannot yet be evaluated, identify the missing evidence and specify how and when they will be assessed.

Sector-specific priorities. Improve the reliability, usability, interoperability, and measurable results of electronic justice systems; strengthen the independence and operational safeguards of the proposed Fact-Finding Commission; ensure that judicial disciplinary appeals work in practice; assess training and integrity measures through outcomes, not participation alone; and examine the accessibility and effectiveness of administrative justice, alternative dispute resolution, and legal aid. Continue monitoring bankruptcy reform after the new Code enters into force and publish comparable evidence on the performance of compulsory enforcement reforms.

MONITORING METHODOLOGY

The Armenian Lawyers' Association NGO, a member of the EU–Armenia Civil Society Platform, monitored the Action Plan under the Republic of Armenia's 2022–2026 Strategy for Judicial and Legal Reforms, covering 2022 through the first half of 2026. The monitoring drew on a methodology the organization has developed and used over the years to assess similar strategies.

The purpose of the monitoring was to assess the implementation of the Strategy's Action Plan during the period from 2022 through the first half of 2026, determine the extent to which the planned actions were carried out, and evaluate their contribution to achieving the strategic goals. The monitoring encompassed both a procedural (quantitative) assessment of the actions and, a selective qualitative assessment of the impact of certain actions.

The assessment examined the actions to be implemented during the period under review, the anticipated results, and the verification measures defined in the Action Plan. As this was an interim monitoring process, the indicators for the Strategy's final outcomes were not included in the scope of the assessment. Instead, the assessment focused on progress in addressing specific issues, alignment between planned actions and expected outcomes, the effectiveness of the actions in tackling problems, and the potential for continued implementation of the strategic directions.

The assessment was carried out using two main groups of indicators.

The procedural (quantitative) assessment examined the extent to which the planned actions were implemented, based on available evidence of their execution. The actions were evaluated in three categories.

- Completed: when implementation of 91–100% of the action was verified.
- Partially completed: when implementation of 31–90% of the action was verified.
- Not completed: when no more than 30% of the planned work was carried out, no work was carried out, or no information about the action was provided to the monitoring group.

For each sector, the monitoring group calculated a performance indicator representing the ratio of "completed" actions to all actions planned for that sector during the reporting period.

The qualitative impact assessment examined the extent to which implemented actions

contributed to the expected results at the level of strategic directions or specific objectives. This selective assessment covered the following areas of the Strategy: transitional justice, the development of democratic institutions and constitutional reforms, and continued judicial system reform. The actions were evaluated in three categories.

- Implemented: when available evidence showed that implementing the action had achieved the expected result at the strategic objective level.
- Partially implemented: when the action contributed to only a partial result or insufficient evidence was provided to confirm its full implementation.
- Not implemented: when no significant measures were taken, the measures taken did not contribute to the expected result, or no evidence was provided to confirm implementation.

For each area, the expert team calculated a performance indicator reflecting the achievement of an intermediate or final result at the level of a given strategic objective through the implementation of specific actions.

Thus, the procedural assessment determined the extent to which the planned actions were carried out, while the qualitative assessment assessed the degree to which their implementation contributed to addressing the relevant strategic objectives.

Data collection and analysis combined quantitative and qualitative information. The monitoring relied on primary and secondary sources, including responses to information requests sent to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia and other competent authorities; reports and other documents issued by state bodies; legal acts and draft legislation; and discussions and interviews with stakeholders.

A focus group discussion brought together representatives of state bodies responsible for implementing the actions and other relevant stakeholders. Individual interviews were also conducted with key stakeholders in the field.

The monitoring findings informed a report on the implementation of actions under the Strategy's Action Plan for 2022–2026 (covering the period up to and including the first half of 2026). The draft report was discussed with interested parties. The draft was also submitted to state bodies responsible for implementing the actions and other relevant entities for their views and recommendations. Some of the observations and recommendations received were accepted and incorporated into the final report.

GOAL 1. Establishment of a unified "Electronic Justice" management system and ensuring access to and modernization of electronic databases

This objective focuses primarily on digitizing processes in the justice sector—ranging from the adjudication of court cases and the submission of procedural documents to the publication of information regarding court operations—as well as improving electronic systems used by law enforcement and related state bodies and digitizing archival materials and notarial services. The planned changes aim not only to establish electronic systems but also to ensure that they are interconnected, efficient, and publicly accessible.

Electronic Management of Court Cases: For civil and administrative cases, relevant modules of the "Electronic Court" system have been implemented, allowing users to submit procedural documents electronically, track case progress, and access case materials. For civil cases, the system facilitates an end-to-end electronic process—from the filing of a claim to the issuance of a final judicial act and a writ of execution. The electronic module for administrative cases was launched on August 25, 2025; according to the data provided, more than 70% of applications in administrative cases are submitted electronically.

At the same time, an examination of the practical application of the system for civil cases has shown that the system's existence alone does not mean that it fully meets users' needs. Monitoring has revealed delays in resolving technical issues, difficulties in searching for and accessing necessary documents and evidence, and instances where evidence uploaded to the system was not visible to the court—and became apparent only after an attorney specifically drew attention to it. These circumstances underscore the importance of ensuring not only that the system is launched but also that it is reliable, easy to use, and provides full access to procedural materials.

An electronic module for bankruptcy cases has been launched on the e-bankruptcy.am platform. The relevant legal provisions governing the system entered into force on April 27, 2026. The system provides for the electronic submission of documents, access to case materials, the issuance of notifications, and the electronic conduct of certain bankruptcy proceedings, including auctions. For new cases, judicial acts and public information regarding the progress of the proceedings are also published on the cases.court.am platform. In practice, however, challenges persist: notifying individuals not registered in the system may still require the use of non-electronic methods, and the digitization of all processes related to the disposal of assets remains incomplete. Consequently, the system has not yet eliminated the need to carry out certain actions in parallel, both electronically and on paper. Issues remain unresolved concerning the introduction of an electronic module for

criminal court proceedings and its integration with existing systems used by the bodies involved in the legal process. Specifically, the interoperability of electronic systems used in criminal cases is not yet fully established. According to the justification provided by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia, resolving this issue depends on the implementation of the unified judicial management system, UNICOURT. Meanwhile, the "e-criminal case" system—designed for the electronic management of pre-trial criminal proceedings—is already in use; as of September 1, 2023, in accordance with the Criminal Procedure Code of the Republic of Armenia, pretrial proceedings have been managed electronically.

P**ublication of information regarding court activities and electronic access:** The Strategy envisages publishing reports and statistics summarizing court activities via an online system accessible to the public, as well as enhancing the systems for the electronic assignment and distribution of judicial cases and the official publication of judicial acts. Monitoring found that the published judicial statistics are insufficient to fully verify whether the quantitative outcomes envisaged by the Strategy have been achieved. Beyond publishing electronic data, it is therefore essential to ensure that the data are complete and that sufficient information is available to evaluate the results.

To make various electronic systems within the justice sector accessible from a single platform and to ensure their interoperability, a unified "Electronic Justice" platform has been planned. Related efforts have included the modernization of systems for the allocation of judicial cases and the publication of judicial acts, the implementation of information security tools, and simplifying user access. Nevertheless, establishing full connectivity between these systems remains a significant challenge for the overall digitalization process.

Digitization of Mediation and Public Notices: Electronic tools in the field of mediation are intended to facilitate mediation and their integration with judicial proceedings. However, monitoring has revealed interoperability issues between the electronic mediation platform and the civil litigation system. Specifically, mediators are unable to independently access civil case files within the relevant system or submit settlement agreements; furthermore, the system lacks the functionality needed to leave certain proceedings without examination. Representatives from the mediation sector have raised these concerns, and the Ministry of Justice has expressed its intention to improve the system.

The official website for public notifications has been upgraded, and the updated site was launched on April 1, 2025—later than originally scheduled. However, a unified system for

individual and public notifications has not yet been established, and processes related to individual notifications have not been fully integrated. This limits the development of a unified electronic mechanism for notifications.

Digitization of the Probation, Compulsory Enforcement, and Penitentiary Systems: The "e-probation" electronic management system has been introduced in the field of probation. To improve the Compulsory Enforcement Service's systems, tools have been developed and introduced for automatically distributing cases; the consolidation, transfer, allocation, and closure of enforcement proceedings; as well as personal user dashboards and electronic services. These include platforms for searching, making payments, and closing proceedings, as well as interdepartmental electronic communication channels. According to the data provided, the number of users of the system reached approximately 20,000 in 2024.

Work has been undertaken to modernize of the "e-penitentiary" electronic management system within the penitentiary sector, including the development of technical specifications. However, the need to analyze existing processes has raised the possibility of developing a new system. Thus, alongside the introduction of digital tools across various sectors, existing systems still need modernization and comprehensive functionality.

Digitization of Archival Materials of the State Register of Legal Entities: Digitizing archival materials at the State Register of Legal Entities has resulted in the establishment of a digital archive; according to monitoring results, all archival materials have been fully scanned and digitized. Furthermore, the registration process for new entities at the State Register is conducted exclusively electronically, ensuring that the files for newly registered entities are created digitally.

Digitization of Notarial Services: The strategy envisaged the creation of an electronic system that would enable notaries to certify installment sale agreements for goods electronically and facilitate the digital exchange of documents—including the electronic issuance of enforcement writs (notarial writs of execution) in cases involving the compulsory enforcement of related obligations. The Strategy also envisaged a system for certifying certain unilateral transactions and transmit documents via electronic communication channels. According to monitoring data, these systems have not been developed or launched; consequently, the intended digitalization capabilities for these aspects of notarial services have not been realized.

Monitoring results indicate that, under the Strategy, electronic systems have been introduced and launched for a number of functions in the justice sector. These include specific modules for judicial case management, an electronic system for pre-trial criminal

proceedings, systems for probation and compulsory enforcement services, as well as a digital archive for the State Register of Legal Entities. At the same time, the implementation of all planned functions and the full interoperability of these electronic systems have not yet been achieved. The monitoring also identified challenges related to the practical application of certain systems, the complete digitization of procedures, and the refinement of electronic tools. Consequently, introducing these systems alone does not guarantee that all outcomes envisaged by the Strategy will be achieved.

GOAL 2. Application of transitional justice mechanisms through the identification of systemic human rights violations through fact-finding activities

Strategic Objective 2 aims to identify systemic human rights violations through a fact-finding body, examine the causes and mechanisms underlying those violations, and propose measures to restore the rights violated.

The fact-finding body was not established within the timeframe set by the Strategy. Subsequently, in December 2024, amendments to the Law "On the Public Council" were adopted, establishing the legal basis for the formation of a Fact-Finding Commission. Thus, while the procedural outcome—the establishment of a legislative framework—was achieved, it occurred after the deadline set by the Strategy.

In 2025, a competition to select the Commission's members was announced; however, it was declared unsuccessful because too few candidates met the established minimum threshold. At the time of monitoring, no new competition had been announced; the commission had not been formed, and no fact-finding activities had taken place. Consequently, it was not possible to ensure or evaluate the outcomes stipulated by the Strategy—namely, identifying at least 50% of instances of rights violations, proposing remedies to restore rights in at least 30% of detected cases, and the submission of interim and final reports.

The study further revealed that the mere existence of a legal basis for establishing the commission is insufficient to ensure its effective operation. The current institutional model has limitations concerning the commission's independence, financial and administrative autonomy, the professional selection of its members, the preliminary assessment of their integrity, direct access to information, external oversight, and its operational capacity. Specifically, the commission is envisaged as a temporary body operating within the framework of the Public Council, with its organizational processes and some of its functions linked to

the Public Council. At the same time, there are no clear, comprehensive safeguards to ensure the provision of the professional, research, technical, and material resources necessary for the commission to fulfill its broad mandate.

Thus, while the legislative framework provides for the establishment of a fact-finding body, such a body has not been formed or begun operating. Furthermore, the limitations identified through a qualitative assessment of the existing legal model do not establish that all institutional safeguards needed to achieve the objective are in place.

GOAL 3. Development of democratic institutions

Supporting the activities of the Constitutional Reforms Council and the Professional Commission

One of the strategic objective's main components was constitutional reform through a professionally organized process, the development of a conceptual framework, and the subsequent drafting of constitutional amendments based on that framework. To this end, measures were envisaged to support the work of the Constitutional Reforms Council and the Professional Commission.

The Constitutional Reforms Council continues to operate under the rules of procedure approved by Prime Minister's Decision No. 111-A of January 27, 2022. This framework meets the requirement that the Council remain operational for at least 1.5 years. The Professional Commission was intended to consist of at least five members; for a period, however, the Commission had only active three members. The terms of office of five members of the Commission's initial composition expired on December 31, 2022; subsequently, competitive selection processes failed to result in the formation of a full Commission of at least five members. More than 30 public discussions were organized in Yerevan and in the Shirak, Lori, and Vayots Dzor provinces. However, only approximately 300 people participated, falling short of the target of at least 500 participants. Furthermore, the Professional Commission's composition did not fully meet the established criteria; for a period, it had only three members, and competitive processes failed to secure the intended full membership. Interviews conducted during the study revealed that the boundaries between the functions and responsibilities of the Council and the Commission were not sufficiently clear. In practice, attempts to separate political roles from professional ones did not always ensure effective cooperation. The Council was also tasked with objectives that fell outside its core mission, while professional support and human resources remained limited. At the same time, the report cautions that interruptions in the Commission's operations cannot be automatically attributed solely to the institutional model; a shortage of candidates and other organizational factors must also be taken into account.

Development of the Concept and Draft of Constitutional Amendments

The draft concept for constitutional reforms was scheduled to be developed during the fourth quarter of 2022; however, it was not published and remained unavailable throughout the monitoring period. Subsequent reports from the Ministry did not confirm the completion of this action. According to interviewees, while certain ideas or chapters may have been drafted, no unified, comprehensive document was ever produced.

The same issue applies to the draft constitutional amendments, which were due in the second quarter of 2023. As of September 2026, no complete, finalized draft was available. Interviewees noted that while individual provisions or working drafts may have existed, the process of developing the draft, its content, and the allocation of responsibilities lacked sufficient transparency.

The monitoring results indicate that the challenges stem not only from missing documentation but also from process management, an inadequate separation of roles, limited professional support, and the organization of public participation. Interviewees also noted that there is sufficient professional capacity to develop a high-quality constitutional text, provided that the organizational issues surrounding the process are resolved.

Amendments to Electoral Legislation and Assessment

Monitoring indicates that, unlike constitutional reform, electoral legislation has produced a clear outcome. Following the development of a package of amendments based on the Venice Commission's positions and issues identified during the 2021 elections, the National Assembly adopted a constitutional law amending and supplementing the Electoral Code on December 5, 2024. This action has been assessed as completed, and, based on an impact assessment, the strategic objective has been realized.

In terms of procedural assessment, one of the four actions was completed, one was partially completed, and two were not completed. Thus, the primary unresolved issue regarding Goal 3 is the relaunch of the full constitutional reform process—encompassing the preparation of a concept paper and a draft, the clarification of the respective roles of the Council and the Commission, the provision of professional support, and the organization of substantive public discussions.

GOAL 4. Ensuring the continuity of judicial system reforms

Goal 4 aimed to continue institutional and operational reforms in the judicial system by refining the structure and specialization of courts, improving judicial remuneration,

developing professional capacities, and introducing integrity mechanisms. The expected outcomes were greater judicial efficiency, stronger professional and integrity standards for judges, and more effective adjudication of cases.

The measures implemented under this goal yielded varied results. Legislative amendments provided for the separate establishment of civil and criminal courts of first instance in Yerevan, revised remuneration for judges in higher courts, and a mechanism for the periodic assessment of judges' integrity. At the same time, the intended outcome regarding the sub-specialization of judges or the establishment of new specialized courts has not been achieved, and the available data are insufficient to fully assess the qualitative outcomes of the training provided to judges of the Anti-Corruption Court.

Civil and criminal courts of first instance of general jurisdiction were established separately in Yerevan under amendments introduced by Constitutional Law HO-575-N of December 23, 2022. Establishing these separate courts fulfilled the planned judicial restructuring. However, the available data are insufficient to evaluate the long-term impact of this change on case processing times, the workload of judges, and the quality of justice. The draft legal acts envisaged by the action—aimed at establishing sub-specializations for judges or creating specialized courts—have not been developed, and the target of an increase by at least one such unit has not been met. While other measures presented in the Ministry of Justice's report—such as delegating the adjudication of certain small-claim cases to notaries and amending regulations on administrative proceedings—may contribute to the efficiency of the judicial system, they do not constitute the implementation of the planned action, as they have not resulted in the creation of a new specialized court or the establishment of sub-specializations for judges. Law HO-264-N of June 9, 2022, revised the remuneration of judges in higher courts, establishing an additional payment equal to 80% of the base salary for the President, Vice-President, and judges of the Constitutional Court. For judges of the Court of Cassation, an additional payment equal to 50% of the base salary was established; these payments are in addition to existing seniority-based supplements. Thus, the legislative objective regarding the revision of remuneration has been achieved. At the same time, available data do not allow for an assessment of the long-term impact of this change on the attractiveness of the judicial profession, the retention of personnel, or the efficiency of the judicial system. Under the 2023 training programs for Anti-Corruption Court judges, eight judges received specialized training on investigating corruption-related crimes, while four received specialized training on anti-corruption civil cases. According to the data provided, 80% of the judges underwent training, thereby meeting the quantitative target. However, the results of surveys regarding the effectiveness of the training and the satisfaction of the participants were neither submitted to the monitoring group nor made public. The absence

of such data from subsequent reports also limits assessment of the professional outcomes of the training and its impact on judicial activity.

A mechanism for the periodic assessment of judges' integrity was introduced through legislative amendments adopted on April 11, 2024. The timeframes for conducting the assessment, the questionnaire's electronic format, and the procedure for completing it have been established. Responsibility for conducting the assessment rests with the Corruption Prevention Commission, which provides an advisory opinion. Such opinions are not subject to publication. Consequently, while the legal framework and procedures have been established, the practical effectiveness of this mechanism depends on the availability of sufficient information regarding the outcomes of its application and the measures taken on that basis.

Conditions in courts, selection and training of judges

Regarding the provision of premises and material and technical resources for anti-corruption courts, the Ministry's report indicates that the relevant construction and technical work was completed in December 2024. This action is assessed as completed; however, the report notes that detailed data concerning the scope of the work and specific outcomes were not provided.

A review of the procedure for appointing judges led to a mechanism for adding candidates to the list through a specialized qualification assessment without requiring mandatory training at the Academy of Justice. From a procedural standpoint, the action is considered completed. However, the qualitative assessment raised concerns because the new procedure was introduced without proper public consultation; the relevant provision was not included in the version of the draft law submitted for public discussion but was instead added during the parliamentary stage. The study also indicates that the available data are insufficient to establish whether examinations conducted under the "special procedure" ensure the required professional standard for candidates who do not undergo training at the Academy of Justice. In 2023, seven qualification assessments were conducted via the special procedure, compared to two under the general procedure. Consequently, while the implementation of this mechanism is confirmed, its justification and its impact on the quality of candidates have not been fully established.

Regarding professional development for judges of the Anti-Corruption Court, a substantial proportion of the target group—approximately 80%, according to data cited in the report—participated in the relevant courses in 2023. However, results concerning the effectiveness of these training courses or participant satisfaction have not been presented. For this reason,

while the level of participation is confirmed, the impact on professional competencies or the quality of judicial activity cannot be assessed.

Provision of the necessary premises and material and technical resources for the effective functioning of anti-corruption courts (including the panel reviewing appeals against their decisions).

According to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia's report on the implementation of the 2022–2026 Judicial and Legal Reform Strategy for the second half of 2024, this action is considered completed. According to the report, the Anti-Corruption Court operates at 3/9 Tbilisi Highway, Yerevan, while the Anti-Corruption Court of Appeal operates at 5/1 Ara Sargsyan Street. The report also states that since its establishment, the court has operated out of an administrative building located at 3/9 Tbilisyan Highway. Construction and logistical support work undertaken between 2022 and 2024 to improve the building's facilities and surrounding grounds was fully completed in December 2024.

Revision of the legislative procedure for the appointment of judges, aimed at improving the objectivity of recording results of written qualification examinations and oral interviews for judicial candidates, and at establishing new procedures for the recruitment of judges. Although this action has been deemed completed—based on the adoption of Constitutional Law HO-575-N on December 23, 2022, which entered into force on June 15, 2023—its implementation has revealed several issues. Specifically, a special procedure for assessing the qualifications of judicial candidates was introduced without public consultation; furthermore, individuals included in the list through this process were exempted from the requirement to undergo training at the Academy of Justice—despite insufficient data on the complexity of the examinations or the justification for this exemption. At the same time, monitoring revealed that this special procedure was applied more frequently than the general procedure: in 2023, seven qualification assessments were conducted via the special procedure, compared to only two via the general procedure.

Provision for the legal possibility of appealing decisions rendered by the Supreme Judicial Council in disciplinary cases

Relevant amendments have been made to the Judicial Code of the Republic of Armenia. Article 156.1 of the Code provides for the right to appeal a decision of the Supreme Judicial Council imposing disciplinary liability on a judge or rejecting a motion to impose disciplinary liability on a judge.[1]

1 Judicial Code of the Republic of Armenia, Article 156.1

However, the final and transitional provisions of the article stipulate that the regulations will enter into force, in accordance with the established procedure, when the Supreme Judicial Council's relevant subordinate normative legal act enters into force.[2]

Under these amendments, a panel of four Council members will examine whether a judge should be held disciplinarily liable. The panel's composition will vary for each disciplinary proceeding and will consist of two candidates elected by the General Assembly of Judges and two candidates elected by the National Assembly. Any appeal filed against a decision to impose disciplinary liability on a judge will be reviewed by the Council, composed of members who were not part of the panel that originally examined the disciplinary case.
Nevertheless, the Supreme Judicial Council has not yet adopted the relevant regulatory act, and the appeals mechanism has not been established.

Review of the voting weight of non-judge members in the Ethics and Disciplinary Affairs Commission of the General Assembly of Judges

Following the amendments of March 4, 2026, the Ethics and Disciplinary Affairs Commission was established with 11 members: six judges and five non-judge members. On July 3, 2026, three new members were elected to the Commission. Despite the legislative amendment, the report highlights concerns regarding effective civil society representation. There are insufficient safeguards to ensure that the non-judge members represent civil society interests, and external oversight and accountability in the selection process are limited.

A mechanism for the periodic assessment of judges' integrity was introduced through legislative amendments on April 11, 2024. This assessment is scheduled to take place in the sixth year following a judge's initial appointment and is conducted by the Commission for the Prevention of Corruption. Although a legal mechanism has been established, the advisory opinions are not subject to publication, which further complicates the assessment of its impact.
The report recommends the periodic publication of aggregated and anonymized data on the number of reviews conducted, their overall outcomes, and the measures taken.
The key finding is that judicial reforms cannot be measured solely by the adoption of laws or the provision of material and technical resources. It is essential to evaluate the practical applicability of new procedures, their transparency and independence, the accessibility of appeal mechanisms in practice, and the outcomes of training initiatives.

2 Constitutional Law of the Republic of Armenia, adopted on October 25, 2023, "On Making Additions and Amendments to the Constitutional Law 'Judicial Code of the Republic of Armenia'" https://www.arlis.am/hy/acts/185501

Overall, Goal 4 has seen improvements in the organizational structure of the judicial system, the remuneration of judges, and mechanisms for overseeing judicial integrity. At the same time, the intended outcome concerning specialization has not been achieved, while a lack of sufficient outcome data limits the assessment of the practical impact of training programs and integrity reviews.

GOAL 5. Reforms in the Criminal Law Sphere

Goal 5 aimed to improve the efficiency and institutional capacity of the criminal justice system by improving the conditions for conducting investigative actions, upgrading technical equipment, and strengthening human resources. This included providing methodological support and continuous training for the implementation of new criminal legislation, as well as introducing mechanisms to assess the integrity of prosecutors and investigators. The expected outcomes were more efficient criminal proceedings, properly conducted investigative actions, and stronger professional and integrity standards within the criminal justice system.

Most measures envisaged under criminal justice reforms produced positive results in quantitative terms. Pre-trial investigation bodies have been equipped with the necessary equipment for video and audio recording of investigative actions; the Probation Service has been provided with electronic monitoring equipment and relevant infrastructure; and the staffing levels of pre-trial investigation bodies and the Prosecutor's Office have been increased. Guidelines for the new Criminal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code have been developed and made available to law enforcement and judicial authorities. Ongoing monitoring identified issues arising during implementation of the new codes, leading to working discussions and proposals for legislative amendments.

At the same time, some measures did not fully achieve their intended outcomes. While the quantitative targets for training staff of the Penitentiary and Probation Services have largely been met, complete information has not been provided on whether all trained personnel have also undergone the prescribed integrity assessment.

A draft legal act amending the Criminal Procedure Code to facilitate the introduction of e-justice tools has not been developed in connection with the rollout of the UNICOURT unified judicial management system.

Legislative amendments adopted on April 11, 2024, established mechanisms for periodically assessing the integrity of prosecutors and investigators. Specifically, relevant amendments

were made to the laws "On the Prosecutor's Office," "On the Investigative Committee," and "On the Anti-Corruption Committee." Thus, the legal grounds for conducting integrity assessments have been established; however, the available information does not allow a comprehensive assessment of how these mechanisms operate in practice or their outcomes.

GOAL 6. Reforms to Civil and Civil Procedure Legislation

Civil Procedure Regulations and Securing Obligations

As outlined in the Strategy, Goal 6 covers revising the mechanism for returning cassation appeals, examining legal regulations governing the enforcement of obligations, modernizing corporate law, assessing issues arising from the application of the Civil Procedure Code, developing relevant amendments, and introducing electronic justice tools.

Legislative amendments aimed at revising the mechanism for returning cassation appeals were adopted on February 7, 2024, although the deadline for this action was 2023. The action is considered completed, as the intended legal outcome has been achieved. Regarding legal regulations for securing the performance of obligations, the study indicates that draft amendments to the Civil Code and to the legislation governing the registration of secured rights over movable property have been developed and submitted to the Office of the Prime Minister. However, insufficient information has been provided on subsequent developments or any government decision. Furthermore, there is no information on whether at least 70% of instances involving the pledging of movable property comply with the specific legal regulations. Consequently, this action has been assessed as partially implemented.

As part of efforts to modernize corporate law, a preliminary version of a concept paper for corporate legislation reform was developed and submitted to the Office of the Prime Minister on June 30, 2025. However, the corresponding government decision has not yet been adopted. This illustrates the distinction between preparatory work and a final legal outcome.

The action to identify issues related to implementing the Civil Procedure Code has been deemed completed. The report indicates that approximately 60% of the challenges encountered during the implementation of the 2018 Code were identified and incorporated into the relevant report. Based on this assessment, a draft of amendments was submitted for public consultation and shared with the relevant authorities; it subsequently received government approval and was adopted by the National Assembly at first reading on December 22, 2023.

Electronic Justice and Limitations of Assessment

Monitoring found that a draft law—aimed at introducing electronic justice tools into the

Civil Procedure Code—was developed and submitted to the Prime Minister's Office. Although it was initially returned for revision, the Government subsequently approved it, and the National Assembly adopted it. At the procedural level, this action is considered completed.

At the same time, the assessment notes that practical difficulties arose during the introduction and implementation of these electronic tools. Stakeholders were not adequately notified in advance, nor were adequate conditions provided for testing the system before its launch. Consequently, the establishment of a legal framework does not in itself demonstrate the system's full applicability, effectiveness, or user satisfaction.

Progress under this objective has been achieved primarily through legislative amendments to civil procedure, the identification of existing issues, and the establishment of the legal framework for electronic justice. At the same time, the next steps concerning certain components of secured transactions and corporate law has not yet been determined.

GOAL 7. Reforms to Administrative and Administrative Procedure Legislation

Inventory of sector-specific issues and preparation of a package of amendments

Goal 7 envisaged identifying the challenges and gaps in the implementation of the Code of Administrative Procedure, developing a package of legislative amendments, introducing regulations to facilitate electronic justice, and improving legislation concerning administrative offenses.

The identification of challenges in implementing the Code of Administrative Procedure is considered complete. According to available data, proposals were collected from courts and administrative authorities; these were consolidated into a report made available to the Ministry of Justice and the Office of the Prime Minister.

Based on the identified challenges, draft amendments to the Code of Administrative Procedure and the Code on Administrative Offenses were developed and submitted for public consultation and review by relevant stakeholders. However, monitoring did not confirm full implementation of this action. A provision of the Penitentiary Code—which had been adopted and entered into force prior to the approval of the 2022–2026 Strategy—was cited as an achieved result. Consequently, this provision cannot, in itself, be considered a new result achieved under the Strategy.

Furthermore, for several of the action's nine outcome indicators, the report referred to the drafting and submission of proposals; however, the necessary regulations had not yet been

incorporated into those drafts, and their adoption had not been confirmed. Therefore, the action has been assessed as partially implemented.

Electronic Litigation and Legislation on Administrative Offenses

Monitoring indicates that amendments aimed at introducing e-justice tools have been adopted, establishing the necessary legal framework. However, practical implementation still depended on the law entering into force and the system being launched.

Drafts for a new Code on Administrative Offenses and related legislation were developed, submitted for public consultation, and subsequently revised. Nevertheless, at the time of monitoring, the new Code had not yet been adopted, and insufficient information was available on the draft's subsequent progress. According to information obtained during a focus group discussion, the legislative package was still under discussion with stakeholders. Consequently, this action has been assessed as partially implemented.

Thus, according to the procedural assessment, two of the four actions have been completed, two have been partially completed, and no actions were assessed as not completed. However, these quantitative results does not imply that all intended results have been achieved.

GOAL 8. Reforms in the Insolvency Sector

Goal 8 envisaged reforming bankruptcy regulations to address identified problems and current needs comprehensively, improve the efficiency of bankruptcy proceedings, and introduce e-justice tools. Specifically, the plan included developing a reform concept for the sector, adopting a unified legislative act based on that concept, shortening the time needed to examine bankruptcy cases, and increasing the number of financial rehabilitations.

According to monitoring results, a concept was developed to comprehensively address problems and current needs in the bankruptcy sector. Based on this concept, drafts of a Bankruptcy Code and related laws were prepared and discussed with relevant stakeholders. The legislative package was submitted to the Office of the Prime Minister on June 30, 2025, and the new Insolvency Code was adopted by the National Assembly on June 18, 2026. The Code is set to enter into force one year after its official publication, at which point the 2006 Law "On Insolvency" will be repealed.

The new Code introduces provisions aimed at addressing issues identified in legal practice, as well as specific procedures concerning certain types of entities and cross-border insolvency. Thus, the legal foundations for a comprehensive regulatory framework and the application

of specialized procedures in this field have been established at the legislative level. At the same time, it is necessary to distinguish between the enactment of legislative provisions and their practical implementation. Available data do not yet establish the extent to which these regulations will resolve the identified problems.

The anticipated outcomes within two years of implementing the new Code were a reduction of at least 20% in bankruptcy case processing times and an increase of approximately 10% in financial rehabilitation cases. Meanwhile, pursuant to Government Decision No. 1974-L of November 17, 2023, the implementation deadline was moved from the second half of 2024 to the first half of 2025; furthermore, the new Bankruptcy Code was adopted only on June 18, 2026, and is set to enter into force one year after its official publication. Consequently, the two-year period required to evaluate the outcomes following the implementation of the Code does not align with the timeframe for the implementation of the Strategy and the comprehensive assessment of its performance. At the time of monitoring, therefore, it was not possible to objectively assess the extent to which these indicators had been met. This limits not only the evaluation of expected practical outcomes but also the ability to draw a definitive conclusion on their achievement by the end of the Strategy period.

Legislative amendments have also been introduced to facilitate the integration of electronic justice tools into bankruptcy proceedings. Specifically, Law HO-27-N, adopted on January 16, 2024, establishes procedures for carrying out actions and activities related to bankruptcy proceedings electronically.
Thus, the legal foundations for comprehensive legislative regulations and the application of electronic justice tools in the field of insolvency have been established. At the same time, the new Insolvency Code has not yet entered into force, and the period for assessing the expected outcomes following its implementation extends beyond the implementation period of the Strategy's Action Plan. Consequently, the practical effectiveness of reforms in this sector, including their impact on the duration of insolvency proceedings and financial recovery, remains to be evaluated.

GOAL 9. Development of alternative dispute resolution methods

Establishment of an Arbitration Center

One of Goal 9's main components is establishing a new arbitration center in Armenia. This involves developing a vision, a governance structure, and a financing model; engaging international and local partners; and securing the necessary legal framework and material

and technical infrastructure. Monitoring results in this area indicate significant procedural progress.

The "Center for Legislation Development" Foundation under the Ministry of Justice has established an advisory committee comprising 27 international and national experts. Links have been established with 14 Armenian entities and associations, as well as seven international donor organizations. International cooperation has also established connections with international arbitration institutions.

A needs assessment survey targeted more than 200 organizations, of which 88 participated. The Center's vision, draft charter, arbitration and expedited arbitration rules, mediation rules, procedures for the Arbitration Council, a code of conduct for arbitrators, and fee regulations have been developed. The Center's charter has been registered with the State Register of Legal Entities.

The "Armenian Center for Arbitration and Mediation" Foundation was registered on May 19, 2023. Premises have been leased, funding has been allocated to the Center from EU budget support resources, and its website has been developed. These developments confirm the establishment of the necessary legal and organizational foundations.

Legislative Instruments for Arbitration and Mediation

Amendments to the Law "On Commercial Arbitration" and related laws were adopted on May 3, 2023. These amendments clarified the grounds for challenging an arbitrator and the regulations concerning conflicts of interest. Changes to the Civil Procedure Code shortened certain timeframes for proceedings related to the setting aside and enforcement of arbitral awards—including a reduction from one month to 15 days in the time allowed to review an application for the issuance of a writ of execution.

In the field of mediation, legislative amendments have been adopted, and the e-mediation.am platform has been developed and launched. The platform is designed to maintain a registry of mediators, automate their selection and appointment, and facilitate online mediation. Furthermore, subordinate legislation has been adopted to regulate the qualification, training, and professional development of mediators, the maintenance of the registry, and the electronic appointment process. As of July 1, 2025, regulations requiring mediation before filing lawsuits in certain family disputes entered into force. Available data indicate that approximately 2,010 cases have been entered into the electronic platform; of these, 1,742 have been concluded, of which 518 resulted in settlements. The number of mediators, estimated at approximately 5–10 during the Strategy's initial phase, reached 79 by the end of 2024 and 125 in 2025.

Based on the procedural assessment, all nine actions envisaged under the objective are considered completed. This represents one of the clearest examples of tangible progress among the selected objectives.

GOAL 10. Reforms in the field of legal aid

Regulations Governing the Chamber of Advocates and the Scope of Free Legal Aid

Goal 10 encompasses improving the governance and accountability of the Chamber of Advocates, reviewing eligibility for free legal aid, increasing the number of public defenders, introducing and promoting mechanisms for pro bono services, amending qualification procedures for advocates, enabling judicial appeals against disciplinary decisions, and establishing an electronic pro bono platform.

Amendments to the Law "On the Advocacy," adopted on October 5, 2022, introduced provisions concerning the formation of the Chamber of Advocates' Disciplinary Commission, the operation of its governing bodies, rules on incompatibility, election procedures, and the termination of terms of office. The composition of the Disciplinary Commission was approved in December 2022, while the rules of procedure for the Chamber's Council were established in January 2023. The scope of beneficiaries eligible for free legal aid has been expanded to include foreign nationals (for the purpose of appealing a deportation decision); individuals involved in proceedings to determine or review their legal capacity (i.e., cases concerning the declaration of a person as legally incapacitated or having limited legal capacity); and victims serving as conscripts in the armed forces. These changes are currently in effect and have been assessed as completed.

To increase the number of public defenders, 15 positions were added over a period; however, due to a reduction in budgetary resources in 2025, 11 positions were subsequently eliminated. This resulted in a net increase of four positions. The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia has assessed this action as completed, because the number of positions increased within the designated timeframe. Monitoring, however, indicates that the sustainability of this increase is not guaranteed. The legislative framework for pro bono legal aid has been established; however, reports published by the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia provide insufficient data on the number of citizens using this service or whether it has reduced public defenders' workloads by the targeted 30%. Although the legal framework is in place, its actual implementation and impact remain unassessed.

Tax Changes and Uncompleted Actions

The study examines tax amendments that entered into force on January 1, 2025, shifting

legal services to the general taxation regime. The professional community, the Chamber of Advocates, the Human Rights Defender, and civil society organizations have raised concerns about several risks: an increase in the cost of legal services, greater operational difficulties for individual attorneys, a potential decline in pro bono services, and an increased burden on the Public Defender's Office. Consequently, the monitoring indicates that these changes were not preceded by a comprehensive assessment of their impact on human rights and access to justice. On March 26, 2025, a limited tax exemption was established, under which free legal services are exempt from VAT, provided their value does not exceed 5% of the total value of the taxable transactions of the respective lawyer or organization on a monthly basis. According to data from the State Revenue Committee (SRC), only 0.46% of VAT-paying entities utilized this exemption in 2025, while the figure was zero in the regions. The report indicates that the exemption was not widely used and failed to effectively encourage the provision of pro bono services.

Amendments to lawyers' qualification procedures were adopted in 2022, allowing individuals who meet specific professional requirements and possess the necessary work experience to take the qualifying examination without undergoing mandatory training at the School of Advocates. However, a draft special procedure for judicial appeals of disciplinary decisions made by the Chamber of Advocates was submitted to the Prime Minister's Office only on December 30, 2025, and no further progress has been confirmed. The action concerning the creation of new incentives for pro bono work and the development of an electronic platform has also been assessed as unfulfilled.

According to the monitoring results, five of seven actions were assessed as completed and two as not completed. Key unresolved issues include the actual accessibility of free legal aid, the sustainability of pro bono services, long-term resourcing for public defenders, and the absence of an effective mechanism for the judicial appeal of disciplinary decisions. In this area, it is particularly important to evaluate the links among the various actions; for instance, tax policy can directly undermine the effectiveness of tools designed to encourage pro bono assistance.

GOAL 11. Reforms to the Compulsory Enforcement System

Goal 11 envisaged reforming the legal and institutional foundations of the compulsory enforcement system, introducing a new model for the Compulsory Enforcement Service (CES), strengthening the Service's human resources and technical capacity, and reducing the duration of enforcement proceedings and individual enforcement actions by automating them to the greatest possible extent.

To this end, a concept for a new CES model was developed, the Law "On Enforcement Proceedings" was adopted, and amendments and additions were made to the Law "On the Compulsory Enforcement Service." The Service's technical infrastructure was modernized, and automated tools were introduced for processing payments within enforcement proceedings, distributing collected funds, lifting attachments (seizures), and terminating proceedings. Staff also received training to develop their professional capacities. At the same time, the achievement of projected results has not been confirmed in all areas. Specifically, the increase in the average salary at the Compulsory Enforcement Service (CES) was 41.5%, falling short of the projected minimum of 50%. Insufficient data were provided to assess the increase in employees with higher legal education and at least two years of work experience. Similarly, available data were insufficient to evaluate the proportion of trained staff, the effectiveness of training courses, and the level of participant satisfaction. Although systemic changes were implemented to automate enforcement proceedings, there is no comparable evidence showing that these changes reduced the average duration of enforcement actions by at least 40%.

Thus, legislative, technical, and organizational changes have been implemented within the compulsory enforcement system; however, the practical impact of some changes and the achievement of established performance indicators cannot yet be adequately assessed.

GOAL 12. Other Strategic Directions

Regulations in the Notarial Sector

Goal 12 covers improving and expanding the institution of the "enforcement endorsement" (writ of execution issued by a notary), reviewing disciplinary liability procedures for notaries, revising their professional liability insurance system, developing a unified legal act regulating the Academy of Justice, and drafting a law on expert activities.

The action concerning the improvement and expansion of the institution of the enforcement endorsement has been assessed as not implemented. Monitoring revealed that, during the Strategy's development, insufficient preliminary analysis was conducted to identify the problems with the existing regulatory framework, their underlying causes, and the potential effectiveness of proposed solutions. Discussions with notaries took place only after the Strategy had been approved. Subsequent analysis indicated that the digitalization of the justice system—rather than legislative amendments—would have been the primary prerequisite for addressing the issue. This action and the related study reveal a shortcoming in strategic planning: if the diagnosis of a problem and the comparative assessment of potential solutions are carried out only during the implementation phase, the action itself, or the instrument chosen, may prove poorly founded.

On July 12, 2023, amendments to the Law "On the Notariat" were adopted to revise the procedures for holding a notary disciplinarily liable; subsequently, on September 22, a ministerial order established templates for decisions arising from disciplinary proceedings. This action has been assessed as completed. Changes to the professional liability insurance system now allow notaries to obtain additional coverage beyond mandatory insurance for risks associated with specific transactions. This action has also been assessed as completed.

Academy of Justice and Expert Activities

A draft Law "On the Academy of Justice" and a package of related legal acts were developed to establish a unified legal framework governing the Academy of Justice. These documents address the Academy's governance, the status, rights, and obligations of trainees, disciplinary proceedings, the powers of governing bodies, and the procedures for organizing examinations and challenging their results.

However, the package was returned by the Prime Minister's Office for further revision, and no final legal acts were adopted during the period under review. Consequently, this action is assessed as not completed.

A draft Law "On Expert Activity" was also developed and submitted to the Prime Minister's Office; however, the six performance indicators associated with this action were contingent upon the final adoption of the draft laws. As the Government has not granted approval or completed adoption, the action is assessed as not implemented. While preparatory work shows progress, it has not yielded the intended final outcome.

Of the five actions, two were assessed as implemented and three as not implemented. The actions concerning the review of the disciplinary liability system for notaries and the system for insuring their professional liability have been implemented. The actions regarding the expansion of the institution of the "writ of execution" (enforcement endorsement), the unified legal regulation of the Academy of Justice, and the draft law on expert activities remain unimplemented.

The key conclusion regarding this objective is that developing drafts should not be considered the final stage when indicators require a government decision, the adoption of a law, or the practical implementation of a regulation.

FINAL CONCLUSION

Monitoring results indicate that, for the period from 2022 through the first half of 2026, of the 87 actions envisaged by the Strategy, 56 were assessed as completed, 12 as partially completed, and 19 as not completed. The procedural (quantitative) performance indicator stood at 64.37%.

Of the 16 actions subjected to a qualitative impact assessment, five were assessed as implemented, five as partially implemented, and six as not implemented. The corresponding performance indicator stood at 31.25%.

A comparison of these results shows that the rate of procedural implementation is substantially higher than the rate at which actions contribute to strategic goals and intended outcomes. In other words, implementing actions did not always resolve the problems or achieve the results they were intended to address. Therefore, when evaluating the effectiveness of the Strategy's implementation, assessment must consider not only whether planned measures were carried out but also the practical outcomes and impact of the actions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A. METHODOLOGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessment of Operational Performance

- ✓ The approach to performance assessment should be revised. Under the current approach, drafting a legal act or submitting it to the Government may be considered sufficient to classify an action as "completed," regardless of subsequent progress. For example, if a strategic action targets the adoption of a legal act, drafting or submitting that act should be treated as an intermediate implementation stage rather than the final outcome.
- ✓ If a draft act is returned for revision, is not submitted to the National Assembly, or—following submission—fails to be adopted, the action should be evaluated based on the actual results achieved, taking into account the timeframe set by the Strategy. The assessment should also distinguish between actions controlled by the responsible body and subsequent stages dependent on decisions by other entities; the inaction of another body should not be attributed to the responsible body.

Assessment of Performance Against Operational Indicators

- ✓ The evaluation of each action should also assess performance against its indicators and establish evidence that they have been met. Overall performance should be calculated according to the extent to which individual components have been fulfilled, taking into account their relative importance and whether they are essential to achieving the action's final outcome.
- ✓ This approach helps prevent the completion of certain tasks from masking failure to meet another significant or critical indicator. If the fulfillment of a particular indicator is a prerequisite for achieving the final outcome of the entire action, its non-fulfillment must be reflected in the overall assessment.

Periodic Updating and Public Disclosure of Reports

- ✓ Reports on the implementation of judicial and legal sector strategies should be updated periodically on the datairav.am platform to reflect both the data available when the report was prepared and subsequent significant developments. In particular, updates should cover the subsequent progress of draft legal acts, including adoption or rejection, further steps by responsible authorities, and measures addressing previously identified shortcomings.
- ✓ This will enable the public and interested organizations to monitor the Strategy's actual implementation progress, assess the sustainability of results, and identify cases in which an action reported as completed achieves its ultimate objective only later, or not at all. It will also help identify actions initially assessed as "not completed" that are subsequently carried out but whose outcomes are not reflected in the report.

General Recommendations

- ✓ Establish a unified rating scale and clarify how multi-component actions are evaluated and how performance relates to the final score and rating.
- ✓ Ensure that the evidence underpinning performance assessments is sufficient and transparent.
- ✓ Evaluate the Strategy's implementation at the outcome and impact levels as well.
- ✓ In addition to summarizing procedural implementation, assess for each strategic objective whether planned intermediate results have been achieved, whether problems have been addressed, and to what extent implemented measures have contributed to that objective. To this end, use measurable outcome indicators, baseline data, and comparable longitudinal data wherever possible.
- ✓ If an impact assessment cannot be conducted at the current stage, state why and specify when it will be carried out and on the basis of what data.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS ON SPECIFIC STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

GOAL 1.

- ✓ Enhance the Usability and Practical Effectiveness of Electronic Judicial Systems
  - Improve the interface, usability, and operational reliability of electronic judicial systems to ensure they are intuitive, accessible, and efficient for all participants in judicial proceedings. These systems should not only enable procedural actions to be carried out electronically but also support their seamless execution throughout the process, including the submission, storage, and accessibility of documents and evidence and their proper inclusion in the case file.
- ✓ Complete the Digitization of Judicial Proceedings and Related Processes
  - Move from using electronic tools for isolated procedural actions toward a fully digital judicial process, encompassing all essential stages of the proceedings, the proper electronic notification of the parties involved, and access to necessary information. Pay particular attention to cases where electronic systems still require the same actions to be performed in parallel on paper or through other non-electronic means. The objective should be not only to digitize individual functions but also to ensure continuity, transparency, and traceability throughout the process.
- ✓ Ensure Access to Judicial Statistics and Measurability of Digitization Results
  - Publish regular, publicly accessible, and comparable statistics on judicial activity. This would enable an assessment of not only whether electronic systems have been implemented but also how extensively they are used and their impact on the efficiency of judicial proceedings. To this end, the data publication system should include measurable indicators on procedural actions carried out electronically, system use, and the outcomes of relevant processes. The assessment must be based on verifiable data, enabling comparison of established targets with actual results.

GOAL 2.

- ✓ Ensure Sufficient Safeguards for the Institutional Independence and Autonomy of the Fact-Finding Commission

- Review the Commission's legal and institutional model, particularly the impact on its independence of operating within the Public Council and of the Public Council's role in its formation, accountability, and organizational support. Clearly define safeguards for the Commission's functional autonomy, administrative arrangements, and financing so that it can fulfill its mandate independently, including when examining state bodies and systemic violations.

✓ Review Mechanisms for Selecting Commission Members and Assessing Their Integrity

- Establish clear criteria for assessing professional competencies in line with the Commission's mandate and apply them when selecting members. The assessment should evaluate candidates' knowledge and experience in areas such as fact-finding, human rights protection, law, history, or related fields. Also establish effective mechanisms for a preliminary, objective assessment of candidates' integrity and potential conflicts of interest to promote transparency in the selection process and public trust.

✓ Ensure the Resources Needed to Fulfill the Commission's Mandate and Direct Access to Information

- Establish clear mechanisms to provide the financial, administrative, human, and technical resources needed for the Commission's operations. These resources should enable the Commission to engage specialists and experts, examine documents and archival materials, manage and store data, organize hearings, and work with victims and witnesses. At the same time, clarify the Commission's authority to access directly the information and documents needed to fulfill its mandate.

✓ Establish Effective External Oversight and Accountability Mechanisms for the Commission

- Clarify mechanisms for assessing the legality, independence, and effectiveness of the Commission's activities, including the possibility of an independent evaluation conducted outside both the Commission and the Public Council. Ensure public accountability for the Commission's activities, documented outcomes, obstacles encountered, and recommendations submitted, while protecting the rights of participants in the fact-finding process and maintaining the confidentiality of protected information.

GOAL 4.

- ✓ Evaluate Training Effectiveness Based on Both Participation and Professional Outcomes
  - Judicial training reports should include not only quantitative participation data but also assessments of training effectiveness and participant satisfaction. Where necessary, these assessments may also examine the practical applicability of the knowledge and skills acquired.
  - Strengthen Assessments of Judicial Independence Measures by Examining Both Legislative Amendments and Their Practical Implementation
  - Ensure the appeal mechanism for Supreme Judicial Council decisions imposing disciplinary liability on judges is fully operational and effectively applied in practice.

GOAL 5.

- ✓ Clarify How the Intended Outcomes for Electronic Tools in Criminal Proceedings Will Be Achieved Following the Implementation of UNICOURT
  - Explain how the envisaged electronic tools will be provided through the unified judicial management system, specifying their functions and implementation timelines. This will help assess whether the new system addresses the underlying issues that prevented completion of the action.

GOAL 6.

- ✓ Link Assessments of Civil Justice Reforms to the Accessibility and Effectiveness of Judicial Protection

GOAL 7.

- ✓ Assess the Effectiveness of Administrative Justice Separately, Focusing on Legal Protection in Relations Between Citizens and State Bodies

Specifically:

- examine the effectiveness of appeals against decisions by administrative bodies and of judicial oversight;
- assess the duration of administrative proceedings, procedural barriers to court access, and challenges in enforcing judicial acts;
- assess the new legislation on administrative offenses in terms of the clarity of offenses, proportionality of liability, and safeguards for the right to a defense;

- determine whether electronic tools actually reduce administrative courts' workloads or merely transfer existing problems into a digital environment.

GOAL 8.

✓ Establish a Mechanism for Periodically Assessing and Publishing the Outcomes of the New Bankruptcy Code

- After the Code enters into force, assess changes in bankruptcy case processing times, the number of financial rehabilitation cases, and the use of prescribed special procedures by publishing comparable data on relevant indicators. This will enable an assessment of not only the adoption of legislative amendments but also their practical impact.

✓ Continue Evaluating the New Code's Outcomes After the Strategy Ends

- Because the implementation deadline was extended and the two-year evaluation period following the Code's entry into force extends beyond the Strategy, establish a clear timeline for subsequent evaluation and designate the responsible bodies. The evaluation must include data on the Strategy's indicators, specifically shorter bankruptcy case processing times, an increase in financial rehabilitation cases, and the actual use of special procedures.

GOAL 9.

✓ Evaluate the Development of Alternative Dispute Resolution Not Only by the Number of Established Structures, Adopted Regulations, Qualified Mediators, or Cases Registered on the Platform, but Also by Their Practical Effectiveness

Study:

- the frequency of mediation and arbitration use, broken down by type of dispute;
- the rate of agreements reached in mediation cases;
- the effectiveness of voluntary and compulsory enforcement of agreements and arbitral awards;
- the geographical and financial accessibility of these services;
- awareness among citizens and lawyers and their trust in these mechanisms.
- Evaluate Legal Aid Reforms Based Not Only on the Number of Service Providers or Beneficiaries but Also on the Accessibility and Quality of the Assistance Provided.

GOAL 10.

Study:

- the ratio of demand for free legal aid to available resources;
- public defenders' workloads, case distribution principles, and service quality;
- the accessibility of legal aid in the regions;
- how the needs of vulnerable groups, including displaced persons and individuals facing financial hardship, are addressed;
- the impact of tax changes on the cost of legal services and the affordability of legal aid;
- whether mechanisms exist to evaluate legal aid effectiveness and obtain feedback from beneficiaries.

GOAL 11.

- ✓ Evaluate the Practical Results of Automating Enforcement Proceedings
  - Publish data on the average duration of enforcement actions and the proportion of processes automated to assess whether the technical and software solutions introduced have accelerated enforcement proceedings and achieved the intended results.
- ✓ Improve Mechanisms for Evaluating Training Outcomes
  - Include assessments of training effectiveness and participant satisfaction in training reports.
- ✓ Assess the Practical Impact of Legislative Reforms
  - Periodically assess the impact of implementing the Law "On Enforcement Proceedings" and amendments to the Law "On the Compulsory Enforcement Service" on the duration of enforcement actions, the efficiency of proceedings, and the organization of enforcement processes. Use the findings to plan any necessary additional legislative or organizational measures.

GOAL 12.

- ✓ When amending the Law on the Academy of Justice, link proposed regulatory changes to the quality of educational programs, the development of practical skills, and the actual training needs of judges, prosecutors, and investigators.