

# Consultation on the Provision of In-Court Interpretation Services

## Summary of responses and way forward

*serving the community through the administration of justice*

### Document Details:

<b>Version:</b>	1.0
<b>Date issued:</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> January 2011
<b>Document Authors:</b>	Peter Luney Jim Coffey

**"To obtain this document in an alternative language please contact  
"Communications Group" at the above address."**

### **Russian**

**"Для получения данного документа на другом языке, пожалуйста,  
свяжитесь с "Communications Group" по вышеуказанному адресу."**

### **Polish**

**Niniejszy dokument można uzyskać w innych językach pisząc do  
„Communications Group” na powyższy adres.**

### **Portuguese**

**"Para obter este documento noutra idioma, por favor, contacte  
"Communications Group" na morada acima indicada."**

### **Lithuanian**

**"Norėdami gauti šį dokumentą kita kalba, prašom kreiptis į "Communications  
Group" aukščiau nurodytu adresu."**

### **Chinese**

**"如需本文件的中文版本，请联络上述地址的 "Communications Group"**

Contents	Page
1.0 Introduction .....	4
2.0 Background and Policy Proposal .....	6
3.0 Summary of views expressed by consultees and Northern Ireland Courts and Tribunal Service response.....	9
4.0 Conclusions and proposed way forward .....	19
Appendix 1 Respondents to The Consultation Exercise.....	22

---

## 1.0 Introduction

---

1.1 This documentation is the post consultation report for the consultation on the provision of in-court interpretation services

1.2 The report provides:

- background and policy proposal
- a summary of the views expressed by consultees together with the NICTS response to the issues
- a conclusion and proposed way forward

1.3 Further copies of this report and the consultation paper can be obtained by contacting:

Consultation Co-ordinator  
Consultation on the provision of in-court interpretation services  
Northern Ireland Courts and Tribunals Service  
Communications Group  
Laganside House  
23 – 27 Oxford Street  
BELFAST  
BT1 3LA

**Phone:** 028 9041 2386      **Textphone:** 028 9041 2920

**Fax:** 028 9072 8942

1.4 A copy of this report will be sent to all those who have responded to the consultation and it will be placed on the Northern Ireland Courts and Tribunals Service (NICTS) website at: [www.courtsni.gov.uk](http://www.courtsni.gov.uk)

1.5 You may make additional copies of this report without seeking permission. If you require further printed copies of this report, we would invite you to access the document through our website and make copies yourself. If you do not have access to the internet and require us to provide you with further copies, please contact the Consultation Co-ordinator at the address at paragraph 1.3 above with your specific request.

1.6 This document is available in alternative formats and in other languages on request. Please contact the Consultation Co-ordinator with your request.

## 2.0 Background and Policy Proposal

---

2.1 On 9th February 2010, the NICTS published a **Consultation Paper on the Provision of In-Court Interpretation Services** for a consultation period of twelve weeks concluding on 4th May 2010.

2.2 The consultation exercise sought views on proposals to define the circumstances in which NICTS will arrange and meet the costs of supplying interpreters for proceedings before a range of courts and tribunals in Northern Ireland. In addition the document provides guidance in relation to the required quality and competency of interpreters.

2.3 NICTS is committed to providing an efficient and effective interpretation service to meet the needs of non-English speakers and deaf and hearing impaired court users.

### Criminal Proceedings

2.4 The policy document sets out formally the tri-partite arrangements for managing and funding of interpreting services before the criminal courts which was approved by the Criminal Justice Board (CJB) in February 2009. It provides that, in cases prosecuted by the Public Prosecution Service (PPS) –

- the cost of supplying an interpreter for defendants at first court appearances will be met by the PSNI;
- the cost of providing in-court interpretation for defendants at second and subsequent hearings will be jointly met by NICTS, the PPS and the Department of Justice (DoJ).

2.5 In criminal cases prosecuted by all other prosecution agencies (e.g. TV Licensing, Driver and Vehicle Licensing, Crown Solicitors Office in extradition cases), NICTS will arrange and pay for the interpreter to support a non-English speaking defendant.

2.6 In all cases, the prosecution and defence will be responsible for arranging and paying for interpreters for their own witnesses.

## **Civil and Family Proceedings**

2.7 In relation to civil and family proceedings, the policy states that when an action is privately funded, the party requiring the services of an interpreter must normally make the arrangements and meet the costs. NICTS will, however, arrange foreign language interpreters for non-English speaking parties in civil and family hearings in the following circumstances –

- in alleged domestic violence cases or cases involving children;
- in committal cases where the individual whose liberty is in jeopardy does not understand or speak English.

2.8 In other civil and family cases, NICTS will arrange and fund an interpreter where –

- the party cannot understand the language of the court well enough to take part in the hearing; and
- cannot get public funding and cannot afford to fund an interpreter privately; **or**
- where the judge directs that an interpreter be arranged by the court.

## **Tribunal Hearings**

2.9 The criteria set out in paragraph 2.8 also apply to the provision of foreign language interpreters in tribunal hearings.

## **Coroner's Inquests**

2.10 For inquests, the policy states that NICTS will arrange and meet the costs of supplying a foreign language interpreter when directed by the Coroner e.g. where a witness is unable to understand English sufficiently to give evidence.

## **Interpreters for Deaf and Hearing Impaired defendants, parties and other persons**

2.11 The policy provides that the arrangements for the provision of British Sign Language (BSL) interpreters or other Language Service Professionals (LSP) for deaf and hearing impaired persons will be analogous to the arrangements for foreign language interpretation summarised above.

2.12 In addition, the consultation paper sets out minimum standards governing the quality and competency of in-court interpreters engaged by NICTS and arrangements for telephone interpretation in court offices.

## 3.0 Summary of views expressed by consultees and NICTS response

---

3.1 We received 10 substantive responses to the consultation paper. A full list of respondents is contained at **Appendix 1**.

3.2 The majority of respondents commented more generally on the proposals in addition to or instead of answering the specific questions posed.

3.3 The main themes emerging from the consultee responses have been summarised below:

- ensuring that the provisions relating to criminal offences are sufficiently broad to cover all proceedings which may be considered criminal under European law;
- ensuring that adequate provision is made for the funding of interpreters for defendants and defence witnesses at court;
- clarifying what tests will be applied in civil, family and tribunal proceedings to determine a party's ability to understand English and/or to privately fund an interpreter;
- extending provision for interpreters at inquests to include persons who are not witnesses e.g. next of kin; and
- increasing the quality standards for interpreters.

3.4 The following summary of responses is grouped according to the specific questions set out in the consultation document. It also deals with issues around equality and the other general comments that were received from respondents.

**Question 1 – Do you consider that adequate provision is made for the provision of foreign language interpretation for defendants in criminal courts?**

**Responses**

3.5 Four of the respondents made reference to jurisprudence from the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) in which the concept of criminal proceedings is broader than under domestic legislation. They flagged the case of *Benham v UK* which involved imprisonment for refusing to pay the poll tax. While the proceedings were clearly civil proceedings under UK law, the ECtHR held that as the proceedings were brought by a public authority and involved a relatively severe penalty, they fell within the ambit of ‘criminal offence’ for the purposes of Article 6(3) of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

**NICTS comments**

3.6 NICTS recognizes that certain civil proceedings will be treated for ECHR purposes in the same manner as criminal proceedings. The policy seeks to accommodate this by providing that the NICTS will arrange and meet the costs of supplying an interpreter in civil proceedings where an individual’s liberty is in jeopardy. In addition, the policy provides an additional judicial discretion for a judge to direct in any case that NICTS arrange and fund an interpreter.

3.7 Some of the respondents accept that this may be an adequate response but suggest that it may be helpful to redraft the policy to make these provisions more explicit in the section dealing with criminal courts. While we are content that those operating the policy understand these provisions fully, we will consider whether there is scope to improve the drafting in light of these comments.

**Question 2 – Do you agree that it is more effective for the prosecution and defence to be responsible for the provision of interpreters for their own witnesses?**

**Responses**

3.8 Five respondents argued that the requirement for the defence to fund interpreters raises equality of arms issues. They argued that if an accused person does not have sufficient resources to fund their own interpreter, their defence, and therefore their right to a fair trial, could be damaged.

3.9 Two of these respondents contended that legal aid should be available to cover the costs of interpreting for defence witnesses and suggested that the draft interpretation policy should set out the practice of the Legal Services Commission in this regard.

3.10 Another two referred to the National Agreement on the Arrangements for the Use of Interpreters, Translators and Language Service Professionals in Investigations and Proceedings within the Criminal Justice System which sets out the comparable arrangements in Great Britain. Under the National Agreement, the defence is responsible for the payment of interpreters' fees incurred during pre-trial case preparation, but the court is responsible for the payment of interpreting for defence witnesses at court.

3.11 In addition to these funding issues, two respondents argued that a Northern Ireland version of the National Agreement would also ensure that there was an agreed set of minimum standards for interpreters across the whole criminal justice system.

### NICTS comments

3.12 The current policy is restricted to the provision of in-court interpretation services and would not, therefore, cover the funding of defence interpreters for the pre-court preparation stage. The defence is responsible for the terms of engagement and payment of interpreters' fees incurred during pre-trial case preparation with prior authority of the Legal Services Commission where appropriate.

3.13 We recognise that the National Agreement in England and Wales provides that the courts will pay for an interpreter for defence witnesses at court regardless of a defendant's ability to pay. While we note the arguments advanced by some of the respondents in relation to obligations under Article 6(3) of the ECHR, we have no immediate plans to adopt similar arrangements in Northern Ireland.

**Question 3 – Do you consider that adequate provision is made for the provision of foreign language interpretation in civil and family courts? Are there any other types of proceedings where Court Service should arrange and pay for an interpreter?**

### Responses

3.14 Two of the respondents said that the policy did not make adequate provision for foreign language interpretation in civil and family courts and suggested that courts and tribunals should fund interpreters in all proceedings consistent with their duty to ensure fairness and equality of arms.

3.15 The 5 other respondents who specifically addressed this question broadly welcomed the proposal but suggested that it could be refined in a number of respects

–

- The funding of interpreters in alleged domestic violence cases, cases involving children and potential committal cases was welcomed. Two respondents asked that further consideration be given to additional categories of case, but did not make any suggestions in this regard;
- Some of the respondents asked for greater clarity around the tests which would be applied to determine a party's ability to understand English and/or to privately fund an interpreter; and
- One respondent queried why there was no judicial discretion in civil and family proceedings to direct the appointment of an interpreter.

### NICTS comments

3.16 NICTS considers that the proposals in relation to civil and family proceedings strikes the correct balance between making adequate provision for the funding of interpreters in certain categories of proceedings or on the basis of an individual's particular circumstances and ensuring that public money is targeted to those cases where the need is greatest.

3.17 We have identified those categories of case where, because of the nature of the proceedings, it is appropriate for the court to arrange and pay for an interpreter. However, we will keep this aspect under review and may amend that list from time to time.

3.18 In relation to the application of the tests to determine a party's ability to understand English and/or to privately fund an interpreter, it is considered that this would be a matter for the judge<sup>1</sup> hearing the proceedings, as is the practice in England and Wales. However, in light of the responses, we agree that it would be helpful to set out more clearly how these tests will be applied and we will work with the judiciary and other key stakeholders to develop and implement appropriate arrangements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brozicek v Italy (App. no. 10964/84) - [1989] ECHR 10964/84

3.19 Finally, we can confirm that the policy does provide for judicial discretion to direct the appointment of an interpreter in civil and family proceedings.

**Question 4 – Do you consider that adequate provision is made for the provision of foreign language interpretation in inquests?**

**Responses**

3.20 The three respondents who specifically answered this question felt that restricting the Coroner's power to direct the appointment of a foreign language interpreter to witnesses failed to fully consider the needs of next of kin or other persons with a legitimate interest in the proceedings who do not understand English.

**NICTS comments**

3.21 NICTS has considered these representations and, following discussions with the Coroners Service, we propose to amend the policy to provide that NICTS will arrange and meet the cost of supplying an interpreter whenever directed by a Coroner.

**Question 5 – Do you consider that adequate provision is made for the provision of foreign language interpretation in Tribunal Hearings?**

**Responses**

3.22 Four of the five respondents who answered this question were broadly supportive but raised similar issues to those in relation to civil and family proceedings i.e. greater clarity around the tests which would be applied to determine a party's ability to understand English and/or to privately fund an interpreter. One of these respondents observed that the administrative arrangements around organising interpreters involved in certain tribunals required improvement.

**NICTS comments**

3.23 As indicated previously, it is considered that the application of the tests to determine a party's ability to understand English and/or to privately fund an interpreter would be a matter for the judge / adjudicator / tribunal chair. However, in light of the responses, we agree that it would be helpful to set out more clearly how these tests will be applied and we will work with the judiciary and other key stakeholders to develop and implement appropriate arrangements. Following the completion of the statutory transfer of tribunals to the NICTS in April 2011 we will review the administrative arrangements around organising interpreters for tribunals with a view to streamline and centralise the service as is the current practice for all other tiers of court.

**Question 6 – Should the arrangements for the provision of interpreters for deaf and hearing impaired persons be the same as the proposed arrangements for foreign language interpreters?**

## Responses

3.24 Five respondents were supportive of the proposition that the provision of interpreters for deaf and hearing impaired persons should be the same as the proposed arrangements for foreign language interpreters. Two respondents disagreed and argued that NICTS should be responsible for arranging and funding court interpreters in all circumstances for deaf and hearing impaired parties.

3.25 Two respondents expressed a view that NICTS should also take account of people with multiple communication disabilities, such as deaf-blindness or combined speech and speech impediments. One respondent contended that sign language should not be treated as separate language, which was contrary to the view of another respondent.

3.26 In addition, three respondents drew attention to the need to specifically refer to Irish Sign Language.

## NICTS comments

3.27 NICTS has carefully considered the responses and has reviewed the arrangements in relation to the provision of interpreters for deaf and hearing impaired persons in court and tribunal proceedings in other jurisdictions. We have concluded that it is appropriate for NICTS to arrange and pay for such interpreters in all cases to ensure the fullest compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the UN Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

3.28 We note that where a person has multiple communication disabilities, such as deaf-blindness or speech and hearing disabilities, we will work with them to ensure that their interpretation needs are met as effectively as possible. It is considered that facilitating individuals with mental health or learning disabilities is outside the scope of the current policy and would be more akin to evidence through intermediaries rather than interpretation. However, in such cases NICTS will work with the parties to determine how such needs may be accommodated.

3.29 NICTS notes that in March 2004 the Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Paul Murphy MP, announced formal recognition of both British and Irish Sign Languages in Northern Ireland, and the policy will be amended to refer to both.

## **Question 7 – Are you satisfied with the minimum standards for interpreters set out in section 7?**

### **Responses**

3.30 Four respondents welcomed the proposals on standards and qualifications but expressed some concerns. There was a view that interpreters should meet increased standards and that interpreters should be trained in the use of Northern Ireland legal terminology. This view also applied to interpreters for deaf and hearing impaired parties.

3.31 One respondent commented that the minimum standards for interpreters in some types of proceedings may not be sufficient to ensure compliance with standards laid down by the ECtHR. One respondent noted that there were no standards or qualifications in respect of supporting people with learning disabilities.

3.32 Two respondents felt that the absence of a professional code of conduct for interpreters (dealing with matters such as confidentiality) was unacceptable.

### **NICTS comments**

3.33 The current policy sets down different minimum standards for different types of proceedings. All interpreters engaged by NICTS must possess as a minimum the Open College Network (OCN) Level 3 accreditation or, where appropriate, be members of the Register of Sign Language Interpreters. For more complex cases, NICTS will require interpreters who are registered with the National Register of Public Service Professionals and possess a Diploma in Public Service Interpreting.

3.34 NICTS considers it appropriate that all interpreters used in the courts or tribunals are subject to a strict regulation and a professional code of conduct and have adequate training in legal terminology. We can confirm that all interpreters engaged through the current contract are subject to a professional code of conduct, which includes strict guidance in respect of confidentiality. This is supplemented by a number of half-day continuing professional development days for interpreters supported and informed by various stakeholders within the justice system. NICTS appointed interpreters are required to have met the minimum training requirements below:

- training in legal issues and evidential procedure;
- understanding of legal terminology as it applies to Northern Ireland;
- familiarity with court processes;
- court procedure and attendance.

3.35 We are satisfied that these minimum standards are sufficient however, we are continuing to work with our service providers to review the quality of interpretation services and encourage the attainment of higher standards. Our current foreign language service provider is working with Queen's University Belfast to introduce an MA degree in interpreting in addition to the existing MA in respect of translation. Additionally, they are working with Belfast Metropolitan College to introduce an OCN Level 4 course to act as a gateway to a postgraduate qualification. By working together we aim to have sufficient numbers of OCN Level 4 qualified interpreters so this becomes the mandatory minimum without adversely impacting on service delivery.

## **Equality Screening**

3.36 One respondent expressed concern that no affected or representative group was contacted during the development of the policy and queried our conclusion that the proposals would not adversely impact any of the section 75 groups or otherwise have significant implications for equality of opportunity.

## **NICTS comments**

3.37 The main driver behind the policy is to promote equality and improve access to justice, particularly for persons from different racial groups and persons with disabilities. We will however, directly engage with those consultees who have expressed particular areas of interest and with those who have expressed a desire to engage in the refinement of these proposals.

## **Other issues raised by Respondents**

### **Interpreting in respect of children**

3.38 One respondent queried whether court interpreters received child protection training and if a referral to the Independent Safeguarding Authority to ensure vetting of proposed court interpreters.

## **NICTS comments**

3.39 NICTS can confirm that court appointed interpreters are subject to vetting by PSNI and ACCESS NI. NICTS can confirm that not all interpreters are required to undergo special child protection training. However, a number of interpreters have undertaken specific child protection training. In addition the OCN Level 3 course is to be extended to include content on interpreting for a child who is a victim, witness or suspect.

## **Use of female interpreters**

3.40 One respondent submitted that there should be an explicit policy that a female interpreter is used in cases of assault or abuse, particularly sexual involving a female victim.

### **NICTS comments**

3.41 NICTS understands the motivation of the request and would advise that the current practice is that, wherever practicable, a female interpreter will be provided in respect of female victims of sexual abuse or assault.

## **Dialect**

3.42 One respondent commented on the need to ensure that dialect variants are identified.

### **NICTS comments**

3.43 NICTS would advise that the current court interpreter booking form allows for a dialect variation to be requested and this will be re-emphasised to all interested parties.

## **To ensure the interpreter is acceptable**

3.44 One respondent proposed that there should be an obligation on NICTS to ensure that the court appointed interpreter is acceptable and suitable.

### **NICTS comments**

3.45 NICTS would advise that the current practice allows for a person who expresses reasonable reservations about the gender, religion, regional origins, political affiliation or cultural background of the interpreter to be supplied that NICTS will arrange for an alternative interpreter where it is practicable to do so.

## **Translation of Legal Documents in Criminal Proceedings**

3.46 Five respondents noted that the policy proposals did not extend to the translation of legal documents and referenced the then draft European Directive on the Right to Interpretation and Translation in Criminal Proceedings.

### **NICTS comments**

3.47 NICTS would advise that the policy proposals were issued in advance of the UK government's decision to participate in the adoption and application of the Directive, which was adopted by the UK government on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010. However,

NICTS will work to ensure that it is able to fully comply with any relevant Directive requirements which it is anticipated will be transposed into UK law by 27<sup>th</sup> October 2013.

## **Training of judiciary and court staff**

3.48 One respondent made observations in respect of training requirements for judiciary and court personnel under the European Directive on the Right to Interpretation and Translation in Criminal Proceedings. Two respondents recommended that some judicial training could improve the quality experience for affected parties including the interpreter.

### **NICTS comments**

3.49 NICTS will engage with Office of the Lord Chief Justice and the Judicial Studies Board to explore whether the current service provider could facilitate training and awareness sessions for the mutual benefit of the judiciary and interpreters.

## **The use of Irish language in courts**

3.50 Some respondents suggested that the policy should make provision for the use of Irish in courts.

### **NICTS comments**

3.51 The policy is intended to make provision for interpreting services where a person cannot understand English sufficiently to participate in court proceedings. It is not intended to cover the elective use of languages other than English.

3.52 Under the Administration of Justice (Language) Act (Ireland) 1737, languages other than English are not permitted to be used in courts, except where a party can't speak or understand English.

3.53 The use of Irish in court proceedings and the 1737 Act was recently the subject of legal proceedings before the Court of Appeal. In its judgment, the Court of Appeal held that the 1737 Act had not been demonstrated to be incompatible with Convention Rights.

3.54 The Northern Ireland (St Andrews Agreement) Act 2006 places the Executive under a duty to agree a strategy for the Irish languages. The 1737 Act will be considered in the context of the Department of Justice's contribution to that strategy.

## 4.0 Conclusions and proposed way forward

---

4.1 NICTS is committed to providing an efficient and effective in-court interpretation service to meet the needs of non-English speakers and hearing impaired court users.

4.2 The policy, which defines the circumstances in which NICTS will arrange and meet the costs of supplying interpreters for court and tribunal proceedings, seeks to strike an appropriate balance between making adequate provision to comply with statutory obligations and to preserve access to justice, and the need to ensure that funding is targeted at those cases where the need is greatest.

4.3 The responses to this consultation exercise have raised a number of important issues which NICTS has carefully considered and which have helped to refine the policy. A summary of the amendments to be made to the policy is set out below –

### **(i) Scope of criminal proceedings under ECHR law**

It is considered that the policy is already sufficiently flexible to accommodate the issues raised by respondents in relation to the scope of criminal proceedings under ECHR law. While we are content that those operating the policy understand these provisions fully, we will consider whether there is scope to improve the drafting in light of these comments.

### **(ii) Application of the tests to determine a party's ability to understand English and/or to privately fund an interpreter**

It is considered that this is primarily a matter for the judge hearing the proceedings however, in light of the responses, we agree that it would be helpful to set out more clearly how these tests will be applied and we will work with the judiciary and other key stakeholders to develop and implement appropriate arrangements.

### **(iii) Coroner's inquests**

The policy will be amended to provide that NICTS will arrange and meet the cost of supplying an interpreter whenever directed by a Coroner. This may include persons not giving evidence and will better address the needs of next of kin or other persons with a legitimate interest in the proceedings who do not understand English.

#### **(iv) Provision of interpreters for deaf and hearing impaired persons**

NICTS has carefully considered the responses and has reviewed the arrangements in relation to the provision of interpreters for deaf and hearing impaired persons in court and tribunal proceedings in other jurisdictions. We have concluded that it is appropriate for NICTS to arrange and pay for such interpreters in all cases to ensure the widest compliance with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 and the UN Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

In addition, the policy will be amended to refer to both British and Irish Sign Languages.

#### **(v) Persons with multiple communication disabilities**

Where a person has multiple communication disabilities, such as deaf-blindness or speech and hearing disabilities, we will work with them to ensure that their interpretation needs are met as effectively as possible.

#### **(vi) Enhanced quality standards**

NICTS recognises the importance of ensuring that any interpreter engaged in court proceedings is sufficiently competent. We are satisfied that these minimum standards are sufficient however we are continuing to work with our service providers to review the quality of interpretation services and encourage the attainment of higher standards.

4.4 In addition to the above changes, consultees raised a number of issues which it is considered are outside the scope of the current policy.

#### **(i) Funding of defence interpreters for the pre-court stage**

The defence is responsible for the terms of engagement and payment of interpreters' fees incurred during pre-trial case preparation with prior authority of the Legal Services Commission where appropriate. While we note the arguments advanced by some of the respondents in relation to obligations under Article 6(3) of the Convention, we have no immediate plans to change these arrangements.

## **(ii) Use of Irish in courts**

The policy is intended to make provision for interpreting services where a person cannot understand English sufficiently to participate in court proceedings. It is not intended to cover the elective use of languages other than English.

The future use of Irish in courts should be considered as part of the broader strategy to be agreed by the Executive under the terms of the Northern Ireland (St Andrews Agreement) Act 2006.

4.5 A copy of this report will be sent to all those who have responded to the consultation and it will be placed on the NICTS website at [www.courtsni.gov.uk](http://www.courtsni.gov.uk). NICTS is grateful to all those who considered and responded to the proposals and we shall continue to work with stakeholders to ensure the satisfactory implementation of these proposals.

**Northern Ireland Courts and Tribunals Service  
December 2010**

## Appendix 1 Respondents to the Consultation Exercise

---

Responses were received from the following organisations –

- Committee on the Administration of Justice
- Disability Action
- Equality Commission for Northern Ireland
- Law Centre (NI)
- Law Society of Northern Ireland
- Mencap
- Northern Ireland Commissioner for Children and Young People
- Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission
- RNID Northern Ireland
- Sinn Féin



Northern Ireland Courts and Tribunals Service  
Laganside House  
23-27 Oxford Street  
Belfast  
BT1 3LA

[www.courtsni.gov.uk](http://www.courtsni.gov.uk)

