

Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services

List of outstanding items for discussion

(position as at 22 June 2006)

**Proposed
timing for
discussion**

1. Applicability of HKSAR laws to offices set up by the Central People's Government in HKSAR

The item was discussed at a number of meetings of the Panel since 1998, and last discussed on 26 June 2001.

To be confirmed

In response to the Panel's request for an update on the item and advice on the timing for reverting to the Panel, the Secretary for Constitutional Affairs advised on 26 November 2004 and 30 September 2005 that the relevant policy bureaux and departments would introduce the legislative amendments in due course, having regard to competing legislative priorities. The Administration would consult the Legislative Council (LegCo) when concrete legislative proposals were formulated.

2. Review of provision of legal aid services

In October 2001, the Panel formed a Working Group to examine the relevant ordinances and subsidiary legislation concerning the provision of legal aid services in order to identify issues for the purpose of review and to make recommendations where appropriate. A list of issues for review (LC Paper No. CB(2)2646/01-02) was endorsed by the Panel and sent to the Director of Administration (D of Adm) for consideration on 1 August 2002.

To be confirmed

A number of meetings were held by the Panel to discuss issues concerning the annual and biennial review of financial eligibility limits of legal aid applicants and five-yearly review of the criteria for assessing financial eligibility of legal aid applicants.

At a number of meetings held in 2003, the Panel was briefed on the Administration's responses to issues such as scope of legal aid, financial eligibility limits for legal aid applicants, assessing of financial resources and legal aid in criminal proceedings (LC Paper No. CB(2)2581/02-03(03)).

At the meeting on 23 January 2006, Hon KWONG Chi-kin urged the Administration to extend the Director of Legal Aid's exemption power to waive the financial eligibility limits of legal aid applicants to cover cases pertaining to the provisions in the Employment Ordinance (Cap. 57). The Panel noted that the Administration would provide a response

to the recommendations made by the Conditional Fees Sub-committee of the Law Reform Commission in its Consultation Paper on Conditional Fees one of which was, the expansion of the scope of the Supplementary Legal Aid Scheme and the raising of the limit for the Scheme. Members agreed that the Panel would discuss issues related to legal aid when it considered the Administration's response to the Consultation Paper on Conditional Fees at a future meeting.

3. Criminal legal aid fees system

The issue of criminal legal aid fees system was raised by the Bar Association and Law Society at the Panel meetings on 23 June and 29 July 2003 when the item on "Review of provision of legal aid services" was discussed. The two legal professional bodies were of the view that the existing system was outdated and should be reviewed in the context of the Legal Aid in Criminal Cases Rules by the Rules Committee set up under the Criminal Procedure Ordinance.

To be confirmed

The Panel has received submissions from the Bar Association and the Law Society respectively (issued vide LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1588/04-05(01) on 18 May 2005 and CB(2)1793/04-05(01) on 6 June 2005). The Administration was also urged to expedite the review of the criminal legal aid fees system by a working party as suggested by the Chief Justice (CJ).

The Chief Secretary for Administration has responded to an oral question raised by Hon Margaret NG on the issue at the Council meeting on 11 May 2005.

The Panel has also noted the view of the Legal Aid Services Council (LASC) that there is a need to review the Rules (letter from the Chairman of LASC to D of Adm issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)260/05-06(01) on 1 November 2005).

The Panel discussed this item at the meeting on 15 December 2005. D of Adm informed members that the Administration would write to invite representatives from the two legal professional bodies, the Judiciary, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Legal Aid Department before Christmas for joint discussion on the review. A timetable for the review would be discussed at the first meeting. The Administration was requested to inform the Panel through the Secretariat representatives of various parties concerned and the timetable for the review in due course, and to report progress of the review to the Panel in six months' time.

A letter dated 15 May 2006 from D of Admin on the progress of the review was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2058/05-06(01). The Administration advised that it had held two

meetings with the relevant stakeholders and hoped to reach a common proposal around the middle of the year. D of Admin will report to the Panel again on further developments as soon as practicable.

This item was originally scheduled for discussion on 26 June 2006. At the request of the Administration, discussion of this item has been deferred to a future meeting to be advised by the Administration.

4. Court procedure for repossession of premises

At the meeting on 22 July 2002, the Panel agreed to follow up the item referred by the Bills Committee on Landlord and Tenant (Consolidation) (Amendment) Bill 2001. The Bills Committee considered that a fast-track procedure might have to be worked out for landlords to claim repossession of premises, particularly in the event of repeated defaults in payment of rent by tenants. Additional manpower and financial resources might be required to facilitate the courts in handling these claims.

24 July 2006

At the Panel meetings on 29 January and 24 May 2004, the Judiciary Administration briefed the Panel on the measures introduced within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary to streamline the court procedure for repossession of premises. The Judiciary Administration also informed the Panel that CJ had directed that the Lands Tribunal Rules (LTR) as a whole should be reviewed, and the Panel would be consulted when the review was completed.

At its meeting on 25 April 2005, the Panel discussed the Judiciary Administration's paper on the review of both the Lands Tribunal Ordinance and the LTR (LC Paper No. CB(2)1320/04-05(02)) and a submission from the Bar Association on the recommendations in the review (LC Paper No. CB(2)1360/04-05(01)). A revised submission from the Bar Association was subsequently issued to the Panel on 5 May 2005 (LC Paper No. CB(2)1466/04-05(01)). Further comments of the Bar Association and the Administration's response were issued to the Panel on 19 April 2006 (LC Paper No. CB(2)1757/05-06(01)).

The Judiciary Administration advised the Panel that legislative amendments to implement the recommendations were expected to be introduced into LegCo in 2006. The Panel had requested the Judiciary Administration to revert on the progress after completing its consultation with the two legal professional bodies.

This item was originally scheduled for discussion on 26 June 2006 but has been deferred to the meeting in July at the request of the Judiciary Administration.

5. Issues relating to the imposition of criminal liabilities on the

Government

At the House Committee meeting on 4 October 2002, members agreed that this Panel should follow up issues relating to the imposition of criminal liabilities on the Government or any public officers for contravening legislative provisions binding on the Government while performing official duties (LC Paper No. CB(1)2576/01-02 refers). To be confirmed

A Working Group was formed under the Panel to study the relevant issues and to report to the Panel with recommendations where appropriate. The report of the Working Group was considered and endorsed by the Panel at its meeting on 28 June 2004 (LC Paper No. CB(2)2917/03-04(01)). On the continuing operation of Crown immunity in Hong Kong, the Working Group recommended that the Administration should consider –

- (a) in respect of regulatory offences, that Crown immunity should be removed as a matter of policy on a case-by-case basis and when legislative opportunities arose; and
- (b) the development of alternative approaches taken in the United Kingdom and New Zealand in removing Crown immunity.

At the meeting on 27 February 2006, the Administration informed the Panel that it considered that the existing legal policy of not imposing criminal liability on the Government or public officers should be retained. Members agreed that the Clerk should prepare a draft report to the House Committee for consideration by members. The draft report was endorsed by the Panel at the meeting on 22 May 2006. Comments from the Administration on the draft report have been received and sent to members for consideration vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2460/05-06. Subject to members' further views by 26 June 2006, the report will be submitted to the House Committee on 30 June 2006.

6. Budgetary arrangement for the Judiciary

The Research Report on "Budgetary arrangements for overseas judiciaries" prepared by RLSD and the Administration's paper explaining the budgetary arrangements for the Judiciary were discussed at the meeting on 24 November 2003. The Judiciary Administration was requested to take note of the budgetary arrangements in the overseas judiciaries in relation to maintenance of the independent operation of the judiciaries. To be confirmed

The Panel followed up with the Judiciary Administration and the Administration on the budgetary arrangement for the Judiciary at a number of meetings. Pursuant to the discussion of the Panel at its meeting on 25 April 2005, the suggestions of members on the budgetary

arrangement for the Judiciary were forwarded to the Administration and the Judiciary Administration for consideration. The Panel considered the responses from the Administration and the Judiciary Administration at its meeting on 12 July 2005. The Administration advised that a revised budgetary arrangement for the Judiciary would be adopted in the preparation for the 2006-07 draft Estimates.

At the meeting on 27 March 2006, both the Administration and the Judiciary Administration indicated that the revised budgetary arrangement was working satisfactorily and would be extended as a standing practice for the coming Estimates. The Panel requested them to consider whether there was further scope to improve the arrangement and revert to the Panel in due course.

7. Professional Indemnity Scheme of the Law Society

In response to the request of the Subcommittee on Solicitors (Professional Indemnity) (Amendment) Rules 2001, the Law Society agreed to conduct an independent review of the insurance arrangement under its Professional Indemnity Scheme. The purpose of the review was to consider whether at the end of the five-year reinsurance contract (expiring on 30 September 2005) the Law Society should maintain the existing mutual scheme with or without amendment, or to demutualise the scheme and put into effect such other options as might be proposed as a result of the review. In its report to the House Committee on 26 October 2001, the Subcommittee recommended that this Panel should follow up the progress of the review.

To be confirmed

At the meeting on 18 December 2003, the Law Society briefed the Panel on the "Review Report on Insurance Arrangements of the Hong Kong Solicitors Indemnity Scheme" prepared by Willis. The Panel discussed the matter at two subsequent meetings on 26 April and 14 June 2004 respectively.

At the meeting on 22 November 2004, the Law Society informed the Panel that its members had voted for a Qualifying Insurers Scheme (QIS) to replace the existing scheme, and it would proceed with the drafting of the relevant rules to implement the new scheme.

At the meeting on 27 June 2005, the Law Society briefed the Panel on the proposed QIS and provided a copy of the 4th draft of the Solicitors' Professional Indemnity Qualifying Insurance Rules. The Panel was advised that a more realistic date for implementing a QIS would be 1 October 2006.

The Law Society briefed the Panel on the progress of implementation of the QIS at the meeting on 23 January 2006. The Law Society pointed

out that there were legal technical difficulties in obtaining reinsurance cover against the insolvency of a qualifying insurer. The Law Society provided its written response to the issues raised by the Administration in its paper for the Panel (LC Paper No. CB(2)935/05-06(02)) on 26 January and 7 February 2006 (LC Paper Nos. CB(2)1204/05-06(01) and (02)). The Administration had advised its position on the QIS in its letter dated 16 February 2006 (LC Paper No. CB(2)1204/05-06(03)).

The Law Society updated the Panel on the progress on the implementation of the QIS at the meeting on 27 March 2006. The Administration indicated its support in principle of the QIS, subject to the conditions set out in its letter dated 16 February 2006 to the Law Society (LC Paper No. CB(2)1204/05-06(03)).

In its letter dated 18 May 2006, the Law Society informed the Panel that its members had voted by a large majority not to replace the existing Professional Indemnity Scheme by a QIS at its Extraordinary General Meeting on 27 April 2006. The Law Society had set up a Professional Indemnity Scheme Review Working Party to identify any deficiencies in the existing scheme, consider how they might be remedied, and make appropriate recommendations (LC Paper No. CB(2)2079/05-06(01)). The Panel has requested the Law Society to revert to the Panel on further developments in due course. The Law Society advised in its letter dated 5 June 2006 that the Working Party will report back to the Law Society Council in six months.

8. Review of legislative provisions containing the drafting formula "to the satisfaction" of an enforcement agency

The item was referred by the Subcommittee on proposed resolution under section 7 of the Factories and Industrial Undertakings Ordinance and discussed by the Panel on 18 December 2003.

To be confirmed

The Panel requested DOJ to undertake an analysis of the judgment of the Court of First Instance on the Lam Geotechnics case with a view to assessing the extent of its impact on existing legislative provisions containing similar drafting formula, before deciding whether it should proceed to conduct a comprehensive review on the legislative provisions.

At the Panel's meeting on 12 July 2005, DOJ informed the Panel that it had identified 86 provisions in subsidiary legislation and 10 provisions in principal legislation containing drafting formulas similar to the phrase "to the satisfaction of". It appeared that the elements of offence under those provisions were not clearly set out.

The Administration conducted an internal consultation, and briefed the Panel on the outcome at the meeting on 24 April 2006. The Administration considered that the "to the satisfaction of" requirement

should be retained so as to ensure public safety. A general statutory provision would be introduced in each of the 96 provisions, and the drafting of section 306(3) of the Securities and Futures Ordinance (Cap. 571) would be adopted. The Administration was requested to revert to the Panel after consulting the relevant bureaux on the amendments to each of the 96 provisions and on the issues raised by members at the meeting.

9. Development of Hong Kong as a legal services centre

The item was discussed by the Panel at its meeting on 22 March 2004. At the meeting, DOJ briefed the Panel on, among other things, the undertaking of a consultancy study on the demand for and supply of legal and related services in Hong Kong. DOJ provided supplementary information on the cost of the consultancy study, the consultant selected to conduct the study and other relevant details after the meeting (LC Paper No. CB(2)3139/03-04(01)).

2007-08 session

At the meeting of the Chairman with the Administration on 3 November 2004, DOJ advised that the consultancy study had begun, and the first report by the Consultants was expected to be available after July 2005. It was agreed that the matter should be followed up in the 2005-2006 session.

This item was originally scheduled for discussion on 24 July 2006 but has been deferred to the 2007-08 session at the request of the Administration.

10. Transcript fees

Issues relating to the fee charging mechanism for production of transcripts of court proceedings and the impact of transcript fees on litigants' ability to pursue appeals were first discussed at the Panel meeting on 23 June 2003, and followed up at the meeting on 28 June 2004. The Panel requested the Judiciary Administration to consider, inter alia, standardising the fee charging mechanism for both criminal and civil appeal cases, and specifying clear policy guidelines on the circumstances under which the court might exercise discretion to waive the transcript fees in appeal cases.

To be confirmed

The Judiciary Administration briefed the Panel on its proposals on how the fees for transcript and record of proceedings at all levels of court should be set and administered on 15 December 2005. Members and the Law Society had expressed reservation about the proposed revised fees. The Panel requested the Judiciary Administration to reconsider whether the proposed fees could be further reduced, and defer the implementation date pending further discussion on the matter by the

Panel. The Chairman also requested the Judiciary Administration to provide a table to set out the fees proposed for different types of transcript, the types of transcript which were subject to the waiver mechanism and those which would be supplied to the parties without charge for members' reference.

11. Juvenile justice system

On the recommendation of this Panel and the Panel on Security, a Subcommittee was formed by the House Committee on 7 November 2003 to follow up the policy issues arising from the review on juvenile justice system, and also discussed the Consultancy Report released by the Administration on "Measures Alternative to Prosecution for Handling Unruly Children and Young Persons : Overseas Experiences and Options for Hong Kong". The Subcommittee's report was endorsed by the House Committee at its meeting on 25 June 2004 (LC Paper No. CB(2)2895/03-04).

The Subcommittee recommended that the Administration should report to the relevant Panels on the following issues in the 2004-05 legislative session –

- (a) the effectiveness of the enhanced support measures introduced by the Administration since October 2003; and
- (b) the outcome of the review on the development of a new juvenile justice system incorporating the principles and practices of restorative justice.

Where appropriate, the Panel(s) might recommend to the House Committee the setting up of a subcommittee to follow up the relevant issues.

The United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child issued its concluding observations on 30 September 2005 after consideration of the report of the HKSAR under the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Committee has made a number of recommendations relating to criminal responsibility and legal protection of a child in its concluding observations. At its meeting on 8 November 2005, the Panel on Home Affairs agreed that the relevant recommendations should be referred to the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services for follow-up.

Enhanced support resources for unruly children and young offenders

The Administration provided a paper setting out the progress and effectiveness of the enhanced support measures targeting at unruly

To be confirmed

children and young offenders (circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2508/04-05(01) on 31 August 2005).

The item was originally scheduled for discussion on 27 March 2006. At the meeting on 27 February 2006, members decided to defer discussion of the item to a future meeting

Development of a new juvenile justice system

As regards the issue of development of a new juvenile justice system incorporating principles and practices of restorative justice, the Administration advised that it was a more complex matter and deliberations among bureaux and departments were still ongoing (LC Paper No. CB(2)1760/04-05(01) issued on 2 June 2005). To be confirmed

12. Limited liability for professional practices

At its meeting on 31 March 2005, the Panel considered the Research Report on “Limited Liability Partnership and Liability Capping Legislation for the Practice of Law in Selected Places” (RP04/04-05) and a submission made by the Hong Kong Institute of Certified Public Accountants (HKICPA) on professional liability reform in Hong Kong. To be confirmed

The Panel continued discussion on the relevant issues at its meeting on 23 May 2005, with particular reference to the report prepared by the Law Society’s Working Party on Limited Liability Partnership. DOJ advised the Panel that it would prepare a paper on the subject matter for the consideration of the Policy Committee in about six months’ time.

The Consumer Council, which was represented at the Panel meeting on 31 March 2005, submitted its preliminary views on the issue of limited liability partnership to the Panel in a letter dated 24 June 2005 (circulated vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2210/04-05(01)).

At the meeting on 27 March 2006, the Administration informed members that it had decided that no further studies would be carried out into proposals on limitation of liability to pay compensation during the remainder of the Chief Executive (CE)’s term of office. Members, the Law Society and the HKICPA were disappointed at the Administration’s decision and agreed to relay members’s views to the Financial Secretary for consideration (LC Paper No. CB(2)1645/05-06(01)). On 16 May 2006, the Secretary for Financial Services and the Treasury had replied on behalf of the Financial Secretary, reiterating that the Administration had already taken account of all the arguments put forth by the relevant professional organizations as well as views expressed by the Panel in arriving at the decision that no further studies would be carried out into the proposals for limiting liability during the remainder of CE’s term of office (LC paper No.

CB(2)2061/05-06(01)).

13. Solicitors' rights of audience

The item was proposed by the Law Society.

To be confirmed

In June 2004, CJ appointed the Working Party on Solicitors' Right of Audience to consider whether solicitors' existing rights of audience should be extended and if so, the mechanism for dealing with the grant of extended rights of audience to solicitors.

In response to the Panel's enquiry, the Secretary to the Working Party advised that the Working Party intended to complete a consultation paper by the latter half of 2005 to evaluate the arguments for and against extending higher rights of audience to solicitors. It would then identify the issues which needed to be addressed if it was decided that such higher rights of audience should be granted. (LC paper Nos. CB(2)165/04-05(03) and (04) issued on 25 October and 2 November 2004).

At its meeting on 9 November 2004, the Panel agreed that the item should be followed up at a future meeting.

On 9 June 2006, the Working Party issued a Consultation Paper on Solicitors' Rights of Audience to solicit public views on whether solicitors should be granted extended rights of audience in the higher courts of Hong Kong (issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)2312/05-06(01)). The consultation period runs until 31 August 2006.

14. Reform of the law of arbitration

At its meeting on 27 June 2005, the Panel discussed the proposal made in the Report issued by the Committee on Hong Kong Arbitration Law of The Hong Kong Institute of Arbitrators to apply the Model Law of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law to both domestic and international arbitrations in Hong Kong. The implementation of the proposal would result in a unitary regime whereby the distinction between the two types of arbitrations in the Arbitration Ordinance would be abolished.

2007-08 session

The Panel supported the Administration to proceed to the next stage of formation of a working group to draft legislation and to issue the draft legislation as a consultative document. The Administration was requested to revert to the Panel on progress and development in due course.

This item was originally scheduled for discussion on 26 June 2006 but has been deferred to the 2007-08 session at the request of the

Administration.

15. Maximum sentence for offence of perverting the course of justice

DOJ proposed to consult the Panel on the issue of revising the sentencing limit in section 101I of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance. It would prepare and circulate a public consultation paper seeking the views of interested parties including the legal profession, the law schools and the Judiciary Administration. The consultation process was expected to be completed in mid-2005.

To be confirmed

At the meeting on 22 May 2006, DOJ briefed the Panel on its proposed amendment to section 101I of the Criminal Procedure Ordinance (Cap. 221) to remove the limit for the maximum period of imprisonment of seven years for an offence of doing an act tending and intended to pervert the course of public justice, and to provide for such an offence to be punishable by fine and imprisonment at the discretion of the court. Some members expressed reservation on the basis for granting such a discretion to the court. At the request of the Panel, DOJ undertook to provide information on the maximum years of imprisonment for the offence of perverting the course of public justice and the sentences imposed by the courts in other common law jurisdictions; as well as the relevant case law.

16. Enforcement of judgment in civil cases

The issue of enforcement of Labour Tribunal Awards, among other things, was examined by the Judiciary's Working Party on the Review of the Labour Tribunal. The Report issued by the Working Party in June 2004 was considered at a number of joint meetings of this Panel and the Panel on Manpower.

To be confirmed

The Working Party recognised that similar problems concerning enforcement of Tribunal awards also existed in the execution of judgments and orders of other levels of court, and considered that it would be inappropriate for it to recommend measures solely in the context of awards made by the Labour Tribunal. The Working Party suggested that the matter should be left to an overall review of enforcement of judgments in civil cases generally.

The Chairman wrote to D of Adm on 11 March 2005 to seek the Administration's views on, inter alia, how the existing mechanism of enforcement of court judgments in civil cases in general, and in labour and matrimonial cases in particular, could be improved.

The item was tentatively scheduled for discussion on 24 April 2006. D of Adm advised on 20 March 2006 that the Administration was not yet

ready for discussion. The Administration would inform the Panel as soon as it was in a position to do so.

The Panel on Manpower discussed the enforcement of Labour Tribunal awards when it deliberated the measures to protect the statutory entitlement of employees under the Employment Ordinance at its meeting on 16 February 2006. The Panel passed a motion to, inter alia, urge the Government to take up the responsibility of recovering the outstanding wages awarded to the employees on the latter's behalf.

17. Recovery agents

An Executive Summary and a report from the Special Committee on Recovery Agents of the Bar Association was circulated to the Panel vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1516/04-05(01) on 10 May 2005 (Appendix I to the report was issued vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1646/04-05 on 23 May 2005). A circular on "Recovery Agents" issued by the Law Society to its members was circulated to the Panel vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1609/04-05(01) on 19 May 2005.

To be confirmed

The Secretary for Justice had responded to a written question raised by Hon LI Kwok-ying on the issue at the Council meeting on 15 June 2005.

The Panel discussed this item at its meeting on 28 November 2005. The Panel has requested DOJ to respond to the concerns and suggestions raised by members and deputations, and revert to the Panel in two months.

The Administration provided a paper to explain the measures implemented to prevent illegal activities of recovery agents and its policy on recovery agents, which was issued to members vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1560/05-06(01) on 28 March 2006.

18. Pilot Scheme on mediation of legally aided matrimonial cases

At the special meeting of the Panel on 17 October 2005 when members received a briefing on CE's Policy Address 2005/2006 by D of Adm, some members expressed concern about the small number of cases referred to the Legal Aid Department (LAD)'s Pilot Scheme and proceeded to mediation since the Scheme was launched on 15 March 2005.

To be confirmed

The Panel considered the Administration's interim progress report on the Pilot Scheme at the meeting on 22 May 2006. The Administration would provide a final evaluation report to the Panel in 2007.

19. Final Report of the Working Party on Civil Justice Reform

The Final Report of the Working Party on Civil Justice Reform was

26 June 2006

published on 3 March 2004. CJ has accepted all the recommendations made by the Working Party. It is expected that it will take two to three years to implement the recommendations. The Judiciary Administration was requested to provide a progress report of the implementation of the recommendations in the Final Report at the end of this session. and
24 July 2006

On 12 April 2006, the Steering Committee on Civil Justice Reform appointed by the Chief Justice issued a Consultation Paper on Proposed Legislative Amendments for the Implementation of the Civil Justice Reform to seek views from the legal profession and other interested parties by 12 July 2006. The Chairman has requested the Judiciary Administration to brief the Panel on the Consultation Paper at the meeting on 26 June 2006, and the outcome of the consultation exercise at the meeting on 24 July 2006.

20. Review of The Ombudsman Ordinance

At the meeting on 15 December 2005, Hon Emily LAU suggested that the Panel should follow up the review of The Ombudsman Ordinance (Cap. 397) on the possible areas of improvement, including its execution and the Ombudsman's purview, which was being conducted by the Ombudsman. Members agreed that the Research and Library Services Division should be requested to conduct a research study on the purviews of ombudsmen in overseas jurisdictions. The Panel would consider how to follow up the subject after considering the research report. 26 June 2006

The Panel endorsed the proposed research outline at the meeting on 23 January 2006. The research report on "Jurisdiction of Ombudsman Systems in Selected Places" will be presented to the Panel at the meeting on 26 June 2006.