



# MCC INDONESIA CONTROL OF CORRUPTION PROJECT:

# SUPREME COURT PUBLIC RELATIONS CONSULTANT REPORT

13-28 JUNE 2007

**July 2007**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Mr. Ron Keefover, Blue Law LLP, working under subcontract to Chemonics International Inc.

# MCC INDONESIA CONTROL OF CORRUPTION PROJECT:

# SUPREME COURT PUBLIC RELATIONS TRAINING CONSULTANT REPORT

**Contract No. DFD-I-00-05-04-00219-00, TASK 04**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.



# CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	1
Background .....	2
Tasks Undertaken .....	3
Deliverables.....	6
Work to Complete Project .....	8
Annexes	
Annex I .....	9
Annex II .....	10
Annex III .....	11
Annex VI .....	12

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To further the Task 1, Activity 3c, Training of Supreme Court Public Relations Staff, I was asked to make a baseline assessment of the existing court transparency and public information processes and structures now in place in Jakarta. I further was asked to recommend training in Jakarta for Fall 2007. To accomplish these tasks, I met with a variety of persons on the ground in Jakarta, and prepared brief interim reports to Mr. Ralph DeLoach, Court Administration Advisor. I also consulted with Mr. David Sellers, Director of Public Affairs for the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts in Washington and current president of the U.S. Conference of Court Public Information Officers, before and after my return to the states. Together, Mr. Sellers and I have designed proposed agendas for awareness-raising training this fall for both judges and journalists in Jakarta. Travel and work in Indonesia on these tasks occurred 13 June – 29 June, 2007. In addition, approximately three days have been spent *pro bono* in the U.S. consulting with Mr. Sellers, designing agendas, and drafting this report.

Based upon my research, interviews and general observations, following are key recommendations for fulfilling Task I, Activity 3c:

- Awareness-raising training on the elements of a court media relations plan should be conducted for all Supreme Court Justices and high-level court personnel. The training could be conducted in late October or early November to follow Ramadan. Agenda items could address such issues as interpersonal communication skills, developing public relations contacts, responding to press and public inquiries, and issuing public relations materials, among others. (See attached proposed agenda.) Such a workshop could prove an excellent forum for modeling best practices in these and related areas, as well as presenting a wide range of printed publications and court websites that are used to promote openness and transparency in the U.S. Presenters would be Mr. David Sellers, Assistant Director for Public Affairs of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and myself. Suggested training dates are proposed to be soon after the conclusion of Ramadan. (See ANNEX I)
- Training for major media representatives who cover the Indonesia Supreme Court on which Supreme Court records and proceedings are open to the public, where the records are located and how they can be accessed, who journalists can contact with questions about records, anatomy of an Indonesian court case, how they proceed from the court of first impression through the Supreme Court and similar topics. Seminar lead presenters would be the same MCC ICCP consultants and follow the court training the next day after the training for the Supreme Court and key court personnel in late October or early November. Often referred to as a mini “Law School for Journalists,” these programs originated in the state of Kansas, in the U.S., more than 25 years ago and are viewed as quite successful in bridging the communication gap between the courts and the media. (See ANNEX II)
- Preparation and publication of a “media rule” that identifies how and what court proceedings and records are to be made available to members of the news media

and general public that would be based on the outcome of decisions currently being made by the Supreme Court working groups. The rule could be developed by a Supreme Court task force that could include respected Indonesia journalists and the director of the independent journalists association in addition to court representatives.

- Creation and maintenance of a media contact list to be used for court pronouncements of “good” news, as well as general court administrative matters, including the budget, judicial and non-judicial staff needs and related areas. This function could be developed by the Legal and Public Affairs Department at the Supreme Court in consultation with Internews and other NGOs that already are maintaining Indonesia media contact lists.
- Presentation of the media rule at a news conference conducted at the court to announce the rule and the Supreme Court’s intention to further promote transparency and openness in the Indonesia court system. The news conference could be led by the Chief Justice and/or the justice designated as the Supreme Court spokesman together with Mr. Nurhadi, Director, Legal and Public relations Office, Supreme Court.
- Production of court information brochures and pamphlets. Examples include an overview of the court system in Indonesia, overview of the Supreme Court and, “You and the *Sharia* Courts of Indonesia,” “You and the Military Courts of Indonesia,” etc. This project could be written by MCC ICCP staff in cooperation with the Supreme Court working groups.
- Expansion of the existing Supreme Court website to include true access for use by the public and media, in lieu of the current litigant-only based system. For example, ensure that emails sent to the courts via the website are received and that a response is forthcoming in a timely manner.
- Creation of a court public information task force that would provide unified direction to increase openness and public relations in the Indonesia courts. The task force could include members of the Supreme Court and key court personnel, representatives of relevant NGOs, journalists and the director of Indonesian journalism organizations, and MCC ICCP staff.

## TASKS UNDERTAKEN

- Perform initial assessment of (1) the court's current public relations processes and training requirements

To accomplish the initial assessment, I interviewed permanent party staff members in the Jakarta MCC ICCP office, including Mr. Ralph DeLoach, Court Administration Advisor; Mr. Paul Dillon, Public Communications Advisor, and Mr. Ardi Prastowo, Public Communications Training Specialist, and others with MCC ICCP who could provide background information about the Indonesia courts, transparency, and the current status of court/media relations. In addition, I was able to interview Mr. Nurhadi, The Supreme Court's Director of the Legal and Public Relations (Hukum & Humas) section and two members of his staff on separate occasions, Supreme Court Justice Mr. Djoko Sarwoko, unofficial designated Indonesia Supreme Court spokesman, Mr. Endy M. Bayuni, editor-in-chief of the *Jakarta Post*; Ms. Wiwiek Awiati, of the Judicial Reform Team; Mr. Rifqi Sjarief Assegaf, Executive Director of the Indonesian Institute for Independent Judiciary, and Mr. Sudjono, SH, a prominent Jakarta lawyer who also serves as legal counsel for Internews Network Inc..

In addition, I read as many written materials as I could find on the subject, including past and current newspaper articles to compare and contrast coverage of the Indonesia Supreme Court with that of coverage in my state and other international jurisdictions I have worked in. Two examples of these articles are "Press Freedom Boosted in Indonesia, Supreme Court Overturns Ruling Against Magazine Editor" and "Indonesia Top Court Doubles Timor Militiaman's term." The former described the court decision as a step in strengthening Indonesia media as an institution. The latter article also proved revealing in that the journalist managed to interview a Supreme Court judge who was a member of the five-judge panel that ruled on East Timorese politician Mr. Eurico Guterres. (The published interview seems to belie what I was told to be a strong bias among Supreme Court justices against dealing with the media.)

Beyond the popular press, I read and generated many questions for this report based on reading the 24-page *Executive Summary of the Annual Report of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia*, as well as websites and power point presentations entitled *Judicial Reform Program Indonesia Supreme Court*, and a Power Point overview of the MCC Indonesia project as presented by Dr. Sarah Tisch. From these and other readings, I was able to study the structure, history, and problems confronting Indonesia Supreme Court, and the four different court systems. Despite the "one roof" concept usually brought up when discussing the Indonesia courts, I could not escape the fact that the Supreme Court does not have control over the integrity of the lower courts, which are under the supervision of the Department of Justice. I view this apparent *status quo* as a major issue to work around as the goals of a transparent and open court system are sought in the Republic. Even more, I have been told that as many as 30 of the current 46 Supreme Court justices are scheduled to retire within the next year, raising the possibility that their replacements will be even less amenable to transparency at the Supreme Court.

Based upon my research, experience, and guidance of Mr. Dillon, I set about continuing the baseline assessment through interviews with key judges, court personnel, journalists and representatives of relevant NGOs as I could during my time in Jakarta. Interviews, notes, and observations are as follows:

**Pak Nurhadi, Director of the Legal and Public Relations (Hukum & Humas).** I visited with Mr. Nurhadi and two of his staff on June 20<sup>th</sup> and again the following day, with two members of his staff, including the Director of Information Technology, for the purpose of learning what public information activities are in place.

What I learned was that Mr. Nurhadi's section's primary role is to provide public information and access to litigants and their lawyers, the latter primarily. The section currently has six staff: Section Director and five Unit Directors, including Legal Regulations, Inter-institutional Relations, Library Services, Information Systems Maintenance, Information Systems Development. Each of the units has been designed to have three sub-units, including a Public Relations/Affairs Sub-Unit of the Inter-Institutional Relations Unit. In short, there is little, if any, real public and media outreach undertaken at the Supreme Court. Further, there does not appear to be a great deal of enthusiasm for additional outreach.

Notwithstanding, I submitted a page and a half of written questions to Pak Nurhadi for this report to facilitate discussions when we met face to face. Rather than repeat the questions and answers (see ANNEX III). Among the series of questions I posted was a list of topics for possible use in a court/media relations training for Supreme Court justices and high level court personnel. Mr. Nurhadi graciously not only responded to the topics but divided into columns what he considered relevant to judicial officers as compared to non-judicial personnel.

I also wanted to determine from this interview what use is being made of technology to present the Supreme Court story and its activities to the public. I got the sense that there was quite a bit of general information on the court's website, but nothing specific. I learned from the interview that the website may not be a viable source for learning about individual cases by the media and general public because inquirers first had to know the case number of the matter of interest. Indeed, one had to be an "interested party" to learn the case number, and that was available only by physically traveling to the local court registry where the matter was heard. (The same issue exists with a touch-screen computer system located in the lobby of the Supreme Court in that what information is available on it can be accessed only if one knows the particular case number.) In short, there is nothing in place at the Court to provide a copy of any court decision to a journalist or an interested citizen. For further information, I have attached the written questions and response received from the Office of Legal and Public Relations to this report (See ANNEX IV).

**Supreme Court Justice Djoko Sarwoko.** I was able to meet with Justice Sarwoko for approximately an hour. As we visited, I could tell that although this judge was much attuned to *keterbukaan*, or openness, there was simply no time for it. I was told via an interpreted summarization of the conversation that Justices of the Supreme Court are swamped in litigation, but have managed to reduce their backlog by 15,000 cases over the last three years. He said he works long into the night, in part, because



of media interruptions. While media questions can run the gamut of court issues, many revolve around negative aspects of court business, including real or perceived corruption by Indonesia judges themselves. Justice Sarwoko reports that there are two kinds of Supreme Court hearings, those which are closed in which the matters are argued and those that are open when the judges render decisions. There seems to be no movement toward opening presentation of oral arguments as is the custom in the U.S. (except when the judges adjourn to deliberate.) The interview concluded with Justice Sarwoko expressing his desire to be relieved of his unofficial court spokesman role.

**Mr. Endy M. Bayuni, Editor-in-Chief of the *Jakarta Post*.** The *Post* is Jakarta's largest circulation English Language newspaper. Circulation was estimated by Paul Dillon as 35,000. Paul and I, as well as retired New Hampshire Supreme Court Justice Joseph Nadeau met with Mr. Bayuni at the *Post* on Friday, June 22. During the conversation, Mr. Bayuni expressed a willingness to work with the Supreme Court to improve coverage of the Jakarta courts. He also said there are general suspicions by the media regarding judges and their alleged propensity to do favors for political or monetary reasons.

Notwithstanding those suspicions, Mr. Bayuni thought forming a task force to consider ways and means of improving the accuracy of court coverage would be useful. He was amenable to participating in such a working group along with judges, NGOs and other stakeholders. The main drawbacks to accurate reporting about the courts for his staff were the lack of written copies of the judges' decisions and the lack of timeliness in their preparation. He was receptive to the concept of receiving summaries of court decisions, a reporter's "tip sheet," (or daily or weekly news story ideas) publications explaining court procedures and trainings for journalists, such as the Law School for Journalists programs conducted in the U.S. The capability of searching cases online by name and then accessing related court documents, including their hearing dates would be a high priority for his office. Presently, one can only search electronically if the case number is known. That number currently can be obtained only by going to the court facility where the matter is pending.

Mr. Bayuni would seem to be a key player in interacting with the courts. The paper's website is [www.thejakartapost.com](http://www.thejakartapost.com).

We next met with Ms. Wiwiek Awiati, of the Judicial Reform Team at the Supreme Court. In our meeting with her, we discussed the idea of forming a task force to develop training and delivery strategies for public information in the Supreme Court and among high court Judges at the appellate and first instance levels. She thought such a task force was a good idea and one that perhaps could include selected representatives of the news media. One of the focus points of the task force could be the dissemination of guidelines for the public release of court records as determined by the Supreme Court working groups.

Our next meeting was with Mr. Rifqi Assegaf, Executive director of the Indonesian Institute for an Independent Judiciary. During the meeting, we discussed his opinion of the state of judicial and media relations and received a rather dismal account. He also thought a task force would be a good beginning and that joint trainings with key judges and journalists would be valuable.

Finally, I met with Mr. Sudjono, a long-time attorney practitioner in Jakarta, who also is general counsel for Internews Network Inc.. Much of the conversation was conducted in Bahasa Indonesia between Mr. Sudjono and Mr. Dillon, which did not generate specifics for improving court-media relations. I was told he expressed a concern that as many as 30 current Supreme Court justices are to retire within the next year and that their successors may be even less enthusiastic to openness in Indonesia Supreme Court affairs.

### **Proposed Trainings**

To accomplish the task of assisting and advising on creation of training of court public relations staff and selected high ranking court staff on the subject area of public and media relations, I propose separate back-to-back, one-day trainings for the Supreme Court and key staff followed by a training for Indonesia journalists from both the print and the broadcast media. These are suggested to be presented as soon after the conclusion of Ramadan as practical (late October or early November.) Proposed agendas for these trainings are attached to this trip report, but their highlights are:

Awareness-raising training on the elements of a court media relations plan should be conducted for all Supreme Court Justices and high-level court personnel. Agenda items could include such issues as interpersonal communication skills, developing public relations contacts, responding to press and public inquiries, and issuing public relations materials, among others. (See attached proposed agenda.) Such a workshop could prove an excellent forum for modeling best practices in these and related areas, as well as presenting a wide range of printed publications and court websites that are used to promote openness and transparency in the U.S. Suggested presenters are Mr. David Sellers, Assistant Director for Public Affairs of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and current president of the U.S. Conference of Court Public Information Officers, and myself. Suggested training date is proposed to be soon after the conclusion of Ramadan. (See ANNEX I)

A “Law School for Journalists” training for major media representatives who cover the Indonesia Supreme Court on what Supreme Court records and proceedings are open to the public, where the records are located and how they can be accessed, who may journalists contact with questions about records, anatomy of an Indonesian court case, how they proceed from the court of first impression through the Supreme Court. Presenters would be the same consultants as above and would follow the court training the next day after the training for the Supreme Court and key court personnel in late October or early November. (See ANNEX II).

### **DELIVERABLES**

I completed development of the following deliverables: I have conducted a baseline assessment of the court’s current public relations processes and found them generally non-existent, drafted two training agendas (see attached) as the first step in developing a meaningful court-media relations program, summarized my meetings with key Supreme Court personnel on public relations training needs, and arrived at

the following recommendations for Indonesia to further the goal of accomplishing Task 1, Activity 3c for this project:

- Increased confidence in the Indonesia Supreme Court requires establishment of and dissemination of information about a shift in judicial policies and procedures regarding access to proceedings and information from the former presumption that most information is not public and is available to the public only on a need-to-know basis to the presumption that most court information is public and accessible to all.
- The Court must develop open and transparent policies and procedures whereby the responsibilities of all judicial and non-judicial personnel to provide increased access to court information and the public's right to such access within an atmosphere of customer service are clearly defined and uniformly implemented.
- The Director of Legal and Public Relations office position should be re-defined to provide true openness and transparency. The position description should include the responsibility to proactively establish and maintain cordial and collaborative relationships with the media; require that members of the office participate in media training about the courts and coverage needs of the media; and that feedback to the media regarding the accuracy of media reporting of court proceedings be given.
- A key to the training should be that court records should be presumed to be public, open and accessible.
- The Supreme Court working group should explore the feasibility of disseminating information through a variety of public information mechanisms and technologies, including television newscasts and public affairs programming, radio call-in programs regarding court procedures and other non-case specific information, publications, court-sponsored videos, public service announcements about the public's right to access, dissemination within and outside the Court of brochures regarding the Court budget.
- Improved public confidence in the Court requires that it both provide and appear to provide unfettered access to its work. The Court should routinely provide access to all public information through the existing accessed touch screen technology in the lobby, but with case name search capability (in addition to the case number only search currently available), hard copies of decisions and electronic means of accessing them, the court's calendar, organization and structure of the court, office location and contact information if additional questions arise.
- The Department of Legal and Public Relations could provide information about the Court through newsletters, annual reports and other publications via donor/NGO resources that might be available to fund and assist in their development and dissemination.

- The Court should establish presumption in favor of allowing public and media access to all its open proceedings. If and when access is to be limited or denied, the decision should be clearly communicated and reasons given for limiting or precluding public access.
- Written rules and training should be provided to better inform media regarding existing policies regarding proscriptions against electronic reporting/recording of court proceedings.
- The Court should widely disseminate statistics on its budget, caseload, backlog, comparative statistics of annual disposition rates; sentencing variations among courts, as well as contextual information for public understanding of the variations.
- Procedures for disseminating a hard copy and an electronic version of Supreme Court opinions are needed not only by the media, but the public as well.

## **WORK TO COMPLETE PROJECT**

In conclusion, there is much work to be done to complete this project, including the drafting, production, and dissemination of the publications described earlier, presentation of the trainings pursuant to the proposed agendas attached to this project, creating a media contact list, and engaging in the other recommendations listed in the deliverables section of this trip report. I believe a task force or working group is sorely needed to systematically address these matters, beginning with the first step of arriving at a date, time, location, and final agenda for the initial two trainings suggested herein. That group also could develop a court media relations manual that lists those documents and proceedings that are open for use at the Supreme Court and eventually at the trial courts of Indonesia. I believe that input from responsible journalists and their organizations could add credibility to such a working group. In short, I believe there is much that remains to be done in this area during the next two years and beyond.

## ANNEX I

### Judicial-Media Relations Training Indonesia Supreme Court, Staff, NGO Stakeholders Agenda Proposal

8:00 – 8:30 A.M.	Registration
8:30 – 9:00 A.M.	Welcomes: Chief Justice Prof. Dr. Bagir Manan, Mr. Jonathon Simon, MCC ICCP Chief of Party
9:00 – 10:15 A.M.	Supreme Court Public Information Program Components Overview (Keefover), including among others: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Press/Public Access</li><li>• Public Information Publications</li><li>• Court Budget Transparency</li><li>• Attorney/Judicial Discipline Transparency</li><li>• Court Spokesman</li><li>• Law-Related Education Programs</li><li>• Managing high profile case publicity</li><li>• Public/Press Access to Court Proceedings, Electronic Court Records</li><li>• Developing a media plan</li></ul>
10:15 – 10:45 A.M.	Break
10:45 – Noon	Dealing with the News Media (Sellers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How best to reach the media</li><li>• Disseminating news releases, media advisories</li><li>• Responding to news media calls</li><li>• Checklist when dealing with media issues during a proceeding</li><li>• Talking to Reporters: A glossary of terms</li></ul>
Noon – 1:30 P.M.	Luncheon (Remarks by Prof. Dr. Bagir Manan)
1:30 – 2:45 P.M.	Handling the Media Interview—Interviewing for Success (Keefover) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• When a reporter calls</li><li>• Before the interview</li><li>• During the interview</li><li>• 20 Commandments of Media Relations</li></ul>
2:45 – 3:15 P.M.	Break
3:15 – 4:30 P.M.	Release/Access to Court Records, Proceedings (Sellers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Providing a mechanism for access</li><li>• Providing a mechanism for release of court records, budget information, and judicial ethics proceedings</li></ul>
4:30 P.M.	Adjourn

## ANNEX II

Law School for Journalists  
Indonesia Supreme Court Press Corps  
Agenda Proposal

8:00 – 8:30 A.M.	Registration
8:30 – 9:00 A.M.	Welcomes: Chief Justice Prof. Dr. Bagir Manan and/ or Prof. Dr. Djoko Sarwoko and Mr. Jonathon Simon, MCC ICCP Chief of Party, Jakarta
9:00 – 10:15 A.M.	Accessing Indonesia Supreme Court Records, Proceedings (Bapak Nurhadi) <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What records, proceedings are open?</li><li>• Where are the records located?</li><li>• How can they be accessed (in person and electronically)?</li><li>• Who may journalists contact with questions about records?</li></ul>
10:15 – 10:45 A.M.	Break
10:45 – Noon	How do cases proceed (Laode.M.Syarif)
Noon – 1:30 P.M.	Luncheon
1:30 – 3:00 P.M.	Journalists Round Table Discussion (Keefover/Sellers)
3:00 – 3:30 P.M.	Break
3:30 – 4:30 P.M.	Wrap-Up: Where do we go from here? (Keefover/Sellers)

## ANNEX III

June 20, 2007

TO: Paul/Ardi  
FROM: Ron  
RE: Visit with Nurhdi/Joko (2)

The questions that occur to me:

- 1) Is the public aware of the capabilities to find information that are available via the Supreme Court website?
- 2) Do the media use the website to track decisions?
- 3) Are the news items on the website updated regularly?
- 4) Is there a central press corps that covers the Supreme Court? Listserv or other email blast system in place for media pronouncements?
- 5) Who responds to media inquiries: telephone, email? Are media calls channeled to the public affairs office?
- 6) Could we get a demo of the touch-screen kiosks in the Supreme Court lobby?
- 7) Could we observe a hearing?
- 8) Is a round-table discussion with journalists a possibility? (When, where, attendees from Supreme Court, media)
- 9) Are there scheduled trainings for Supreme Court personnel this fall?
- 10) Would joint trainings for justices and journalists be viable?
- 11) What is Access 121 and do journalists find it useful?
- 12) Are summaries of high profile Supreme Court decisions possible?
- 13) Of the following, which might be useful as training topics for judges and non-judicial personnel at the Supreme Court:

- Written hypothetical problems relating to dealing with the media
- Identifying the appropriate spokesperson for the Judges
- Writing a press release
- Guidelines for media interviews
- Speaking with print media
- Speaking with TV and Radio Media
- Periodic newspaper columns
- Periodic magazine columns
- Weekly or periodic radio/TV appearances on select issues
- Promoting good news in the media
- Ethics and Ethical constraints
- Learning to write an op-ed piece or “letters to the editor” to respond to a negative or erroneous article
- Coordinating press events, news conferences
- Typical rules permitting cameras in the courtroom
- Handling high profile hearings

## ANNEX IV

### GENERAL ILLUSTRATION ON PUBLIC SERVICE ACCESS AT THE SUPREME COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

- Number of legal cases processed by the Supreme Court within the period from January 2006 to March 2007 amounted to 24,826 cases (15 months)
- The "Akses 121" established since 1997 failed to develop due to the Supreme Court's financial condition and the economic crisis happening in Indonesia.
- The establishment of the Supreme Court's Information System (SIMARI) has been begun since 2003.
- SIMARI's Grand Launching has been conducted since 30 January 2007 at the Plenary Meeting of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. Since then, it was open for public by accessing through the Supreme Court's portal : [www.mahkamahagung.go.id](http://www.mahkamahagung.go.id).
- SIMARI website since its Grand Launching (January through May 2007) has been accessed by ± 6,700 visitors.
- The visitor percentage :

Total cases : 24,826 during 15 months	=	1,655.06
Average case per month	=	1,655.06
Website visitors :		
6,700 during 5 months	=	1,340
Average visitor per month	=	1,340
Visitor percentage	=	1.340:1655.06
	=	80.96 %
- Public understanding, in this case THE LITIGANTS (PEOPLE IN LITIGATION), by looking at the General Illustration it has been clearly seen that at the Supreme Court a good public service facility has been available and can be accessed by them. It means that the figure 80,96% is a real figure since visitors of the SIMARI website can systemically and accurately be counted.
- Meant by the Supreme Court's Judgment is all legal decisions in respect of both Civil, Criminal, Military, Administrative, Religious, Commercial and other cases relating to the disputes received by the Supreme Court. According to the Civil Code, those being entitled to get the copy of these court decisions are the litigants/concerned persons by submitting a request to the District Court. The publications made by a print as well electronic media were conducted so far by interviewing the spokesman of the Supreme Court. (Mr. Joko Sarwoko) and the Head of Legal Bureau and Human Relation of the Supreme Court (Mr. Nurhadi)



- Since the Supreme Court's website does not display the judgments (judicial decisions) not concluded on the basis of the Civil Code, then there is still a controversy with respect to the transparency of the judgments which can be accessed by the public, except for Commercial Judgment.
- It has never been clearly appointed the person being in charge for the website management as well as its operating unit. In the current transitional period, the updating of the website content is carried out by the Supreme Court's Human Relation Sub-Division cooperating with the operator at the Server Room.
- Such updating of the data is still limited only to the domestic news from the print-media.
- For the reporters/journalists coming at the Supreme Court, there is no press-centre available at the Supreme Court ideally a room with the dimensions:
  - 5 x 10 m
  - 3 (three) Internet Accessible Computer Units
  - Other related supporting facilities
- So far, the reporters are only gathered in the room of Human Relation of the Supreme Court.
- What does a special reporter mean? A special reporter means an official reporter from any news agency allowed to take the news-coverage anywhere or distributed according to the reporting skill as assigned by their respective news-agency to obtain additional reports for the news to be published from the reporter's different point of view covering such news (side-channeled reporter); an e-mail blast system is not yet applied by the Supreme Court since each reporter must have their own e-mail address. On the other hand, the Supreme Court will develop to provide the e-mail for their employees.
- All requests for the Supreme Court data (judgment/judicial decision) or other formal news or background of any case received by the Human Relation Sub-division will be delivered to the concerned (authorized) person in such legal case.
- The "touch screen" system existing at the lobby of the Supreme Court building can be accessed by the concerned person whosoever.
- The court session will be conducted openly for the public. Meant by "openly conducted" at the Supreme Court is that session is open for public and anyone may attend and hear whatever said and decided by the judges during the session. To watch and follow such session, anyone must be firstly permitted by the Registrar in lieu for the respective legal case by observing all rules and orders applicable at the sessions of the Supreme Court which is conducted at the small Room of Tribunal Chairman as this session is not attended by the litigants.

- The discussion/meeting with reporters is possible to perform. However, if they are on duty, they are not so eager to get involved in any discussion except when there is an important or substantial news being suitable for their publication. The Human Relation of the Supreme Court had ever conducted a meeting with the reporters at Hotel Avia Puncak in May 2003. However, those coming at the meeting were not the reporters especially for legal cases coverage but they were simply assigned by their respective editorial agencies.
- The training plan for Public Relation Personnel is to provide them with the skill in MAKING THE REPORT and HUMAN RELATION MANAGEMENT taking place at LPPM. Until now, this kind of training has not yet come into realization due to awaiting first to have the Echelon IV position filled-in.
- Basically, the training can be followed by a concerned person whatsoever with a useful material for both training participants and concerned institutions.
- A joint training followed by the Judges and reporters/journalists may also be conducted, however, with the material given is about the Civil Code and how to make a Meeting/Discussion with the print and electronic media so as that the both parties get the equal benefits.
- What so called "Akses 121" is a kind of public service at the Supreme Court, in particular, with respect to any legal proceedings in progress at the Supreme Court which can be felt by the justice seeker even though in a limited condition, in the meaning it is just limited to the number of the legal case and a brief judicial disposition. For the journalists such thing is not much help, if not said as absolutely useless
- The Supreme Court does not recognize what is so called High Level Judgment. What does it mean and what is the criteria? The Supreme Court is only handling the Cassation and a Judicial Review for any legal case.

TRAINING FOR JUDGES	TRAINING FOR NON-JUDGE
Identifying the spokesman suitable for the judge.	Identifying the spokesman suitable for non-judge
-	Hypothesis Problem in relation to the media
-	How to write a press release
Guidance to an interview with the media	Guidance to an interview with the media
Meeting/speaking with print/electronic media	Meeting/speaking with print/electronic media
Periodic column at the newspaper/magazines	Periodic column at the newspaper/magazines.
Promoting good news to the media	Promoting good news to the media
Ethical limitations	Ethical limitations
-	Making a letter to an editor in responding a negative or annoying articles.
General rule to allow or permit the use of	General rule to allow or permit the use of

camera in the room during court session	camera in the room during court session
-	Photography
-	Keeping the recordings
-	Photos and recordings documentation from the CD/DVD
-	Making a Report Human Relation Management
-	Management of Conflict/Change