

Justice for the Poor

Mid-Term Review

An AusAID - World Bank Partnership
World Bank Group Legal Vice-Presidency
Justice Reform Practice Group (LEGJR)

December 2011

Contents

Executive Summary	3
A. Introduction: Program and Mid Term Review	6
1. Overview of the program	6
2. Mid-Term Review: purpose and methods	7
B. Mid-Term Review Findings	8
1. Program objectives and results framework	8
2. Impact: lessons learned from J4P's development effectiveness	10
a. Country programs	11
b. Regional/global program activities	23
3. Relevance: program approach, narrative and operational alignment	29
4. Effectiveness: client country, World Bank Group and AusAID partnership and integration	32
5. Efficiency: program management and administration	34
C. Implementing the findings	37
1. Summary of recommendations	37
2. Priorities for the next two years (2012 to 2013)	39
Annexes	44
Annex I: Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Review	44
Annex II: MTR background papers	50
Annex III: J4P Knowledge Products (2009-2011)	51
Annex IV: Budget	54

Executive Summary

This report sets out the findings of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) that occurred between June and October 2011 of the World Bank Justice for the Poor program (J4P), with emphasis on the East Asia-Pacific World Bank – AusAID partnership (EAP-J4P 2008-2013). The purpose of the MTR was to review and assess the program's initial phase – at the level of country programs and as a whole – against the program objectives, and to identify ways to maximize the program's impact until the end of 2013. This report is in three parts: Part A provides a program overview and description of the MTR purpose and methods. Part B sets out the MTR findings in five sections that address the program's impact to date, its relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. Part C summarizes the MTR proposals, including those already acted upon by program management and those requiring consultation and endorsement; and sets out program priorities and indicative country work programs for the next two years (2012 – 2013).

Overall, the MTR finds that the J4P partnership has succeeded in establishing an innovative program that is contributing to the development community's understanding of how to support the emergence of legitimate and effective justice institutions in environments characterized by low capacity, deep legal pluralism, and acute inequalities in power. The partnership has provided space to test alternative justice reform methods that seek to overcome the limitations of standard capacity building projects. It does this by investing in detailed understanding of the way law works in context, promoting inclusive processes that allow demand to shape institutional reform and justice service delivery strategies, and working across development sectors to address issues of justice and grievance. J4P has succeeded in engaging in a range of difficult development contests in the countries in which it operates. It has become a trusted and highly regarded partner, and has made solid progress in reaching intermediate outcomes as set out in the results framework. The program's influence at a range of levels (strategic, policy and operational) is documented in each of the EAP program countries (Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Timor Leste and Indonesia). Following the first phase of activities that focused primarily on analytical work, stakeholder building and policy dialogue, the program is poised to undertake a series of operational activities in collaboration with, and in support of, partner projects (client country, Bank and AusAID financed). On the global level, the program's approach is increasingly validated by development thinking (e.g., World Development Report 2011; background papers to the AusAID ODE Law and Justice Review), and there is strong demand for J4P engagement with AusAID country programs and across a range of World Bank sectoral work both in the EAP region, and new countries, in particular fragile and conflict-affected settings.

The MTR has also identified a number of challenges. These include: the need to step up measurement of impact and development effectiveness; achieve greater integration with World Bank systems and procedures; improve the coherence of program activities around operational themes; and address management inefficiencies. This report documents these challenges and makes recommendations to strengthen the program's impact, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency over the next two years.

Summary of Findings

1. *Program objectives and results framework*

This section examines the program's objectives, intermediate results framework, and benchmarks of impact. It suggests that while the results framework is aligned to the program's theory of change, it

should be amended to better capture the program's work across three dimensions of impact: (i) strategic and policy impact; (ii) operational impact, and (iii) "end user" impact. The MTR proposes that these benchmarks be incorporated into a revised results framework, the M&E system, and work programs for the next phase of activities. Refining these tools will improve the program's capacity to appraise and manage work streams. At the same time it will enable better evidence to be accumulated on development effectiveness – that is, how to measure the extent to which these impacts are indicative of longer term constructive change processes that result in more equitable outcomes.

2. Impact: lessons learned from J4P's development effectiveness

This section looks at the *impact* of J4P programs at the country and regional level. It lays out program achievements against the intermediate outcomes and how these have contributed to the three dimensions of impact. It further analyzes what accounts for high achievement and, conversely, what accounts for shortcomings. Where J4P activities have had positive impacts, three common factors are evident: (1) flexibility and critical mass of high caliber staff/consultants, (2) credibility and the right mix of program elements; and (3) leveraging of synergies and partnerships within the Bank and other development actors. Where programs have been less successful in achieving positive impact, this has frequently been due to one or more of five factors: (1) flawed execution of the activity; (2) wrong mix of elements (e.g., emphasis on research and capacity building with insufficient attention to how this will translate into change); (3) failure to adapt to changes in context; (4) inadequate strategic integration with AusAID and other Bank programs; and (5) where effectiveness and impact are overwhelmed by externalities.

The section examines three aspects of the regional program. First, it finds that the thematic streams have made important contributions, but need to be more clearly integrated in country programs. This will mitigate program overreach and allow for deeper engagement and knowledge generation across more focused activities. Second, it finds that J4P has engaged in numerous activities to promote knowledge sharing and dialogue, but that a more proactive knowledge management strategy would help the program communicate across different audiences. Third, the J4P partnership should continue to broaden its funding base to further leverage AusAID funding in response to increased demand in line with the innovation and development aspect of the regional program.

3. Relevance: program approach, narrative and operational alignment

This section examines the program's strategic and policy *relevance*. MTR consultations have affirmed that J4P's overarching purpose and approach remains not only relevant, but at the cutting edge of development thinking about how to promote legitimate and effective justice institutions to manage disputes and social contests in fragile and conflict-affected settings. The program has had significant success in positively impacting on key policies and strategies of the World Bank, for example through the World Development Reports 2011 and 2012, and in being recognized within the global justice reform practitioner community. While in its initial phase the program has struggled with visibility in particular with the operational side of the Bank, there are strong indications that this is shifting as Bank country management and task teams are increasingly requesting J4P's engagement in country policy and operational activities. A stronger narrative based on greater programmatic coherence will help the program increase its operational engagements while maintaining a focus on knowledge development. The MTR proposes focusing J4P activities around three 'operational areas' – access to justice, equity in service delivery, and land and natural resource governance – with two cross-cutting themes of gender

and development effectiveness. This more explicit orientation to operations will guide choices about J4P programming, and facilitate the program's interaction with development sectors within the Bank, with AusAID and with other actors.

4. *Effectiveness: client country, World Bank Group and AusAID partnership*

This section argues that the *effectiveness* of the program's cross-cutting approach will be enhanced by greater integration within World Bank operations both corporately and at the country level. The challenge of being housed in a unit that is not part of a Bank sector or 'network' ('justice' is not a sector in the Bank) can be overcome by ensuring that program work streams and deliverables are negotiated and monitored as part of the Banks' annual Work Program Agreements and through the active role of the program's now full time representative in Sydney. This will help put the program inside the arenas where corporate priorities are determined, and will help identify opportunities for scale up, replication and collaboration. The section also suggests ways to enhance the AusAID – J4P partnership to meet the vision of the Program Document and bolster program effectiveness. These proposals, which include efforts to strengthen communication and oversight as well as substantive collaborations on learning exchange, are subject to discussion with AusAID.

5. *Efficiency: program management and administration*

Program management has already begun to implement efficiency-driven changes, including streamlining management responsibilities, investing in staff training and cross-country communications, and improving quality assurance measures. The MTR also suggests revamping the program Steering Committee to create a smaller executive committee comprising Bank and AusAID staff who will more actively and regularly review progress and direction of the program on a regular basis. The MTR further suggests development of a funding strategy to leverage the stability provided by the current trust fund arrangement with additional project financing to enable a ramp up of operational activities over the next period. It is suggested that the World Bank and AusAID soon begin discussions on the future of the J4P partnership beyond 2013.

A. Introduction: Program and Mid Term Review

1. Overview of the program

Justice for the Poor (J4P) is an analytical and operational program housed in the Justice Reform Practice Group (LEGJR) of the Legal Vice Presidency of the World Bank with the following objective: *To influence the theory and practice of development in contexts where engaging with legal pluralism presents a central challenge to promoting equity and managing conflict.* J4P thus supports the emergence of legitimate and effective justice institutions in contexts characterized by institutional fragility, legal pluralism, and acute inequalities in power, wealth and access to services. The program aims to improve justice service delivery and to support sustainable and equitable development processes across sectors by addressing ways to manage grievance and conflict stresses. To do this, J4P undertakes research and analysis, provides technical assistance and engages in policy and operational work, often in conjunction with other Bank and donor teams.

Box 1: J4P's core principles

- A focus on the **viewpoint of the user** of the justice system (particularly the poor and marginalized).
- The need for detailed understanding of the way law works in a particular social and political **context**.
- The **importance of demand** in the development of equitable justice systems.
- The challenge of **justice as a cross-cutting issue** for the practice of development.

Building on formative engagements in Indonesia (2002), Cambodia (2005), Sierra Leone (2007) and Kenya (2007), the World Bank and AusAID partnered to establish the **East Asia Pacific (EAP) J4P program 2008 - 2013**¹. This partnership was premised on mutual recognition of the limitations of conventional approaches to justice reform – which tend to focus on capacity building of formal (state) justice institutions and the content of particular laws, with effective reform understood as compliance with international standards ('best practices') – and a convergence of priorities and principles of approach of both agencies regarding the desirability of exploring the efficacy of alternative strategies.² The partnership was designed with two purposes: first, to enable a regional expansion of J4P activities in order to define and test alternative approaches to justice reform that focus on deep engagement with social and political processes and a wider range of state and non-state institutions; and second, to leverage the multidisciplinary and cross-sector reach of the Bank and the regional expertise of AusAID to "inform and enhance the effectiveness of justice sector and broader sectoral and governance programming supported by both organizations."³ The partnership established a trust fund which, during the phase under review, financed the bulk of J4P's activities.

¹ The partnership was originally intended to run through 2012; in April 2011 the partnership was extended through 2013.

² AusAID's 2006 White Paper 'Australian Aid: Promoting Growth and Sustainability', and World Bank President Zoellick's statements on strategic themes and responses to fragile and conflicted states underpinned this partnership.

³ East Asia and Pacific Justice for the Poor Initiative 2008-2012 (Program Document, March 2008).

The program's engagement strategy involves three essential features:

First, the program invests in **country activities**. In addition to the ongoing programs in Indonesia, Sierra Leone and Nigeria (2010), with AusAID support J4P has established country programs in Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Timor Leste and Papua New Guinea.

Second, the program supports **thematic analytic and advisory work** that draws together comparative country knowledge on a sub/regional basis to inform country activities and contribute to cross-country learning and regional and global dialogue. The EAP-J4P Program Document prioritized four themes: land and natural resource governance; gender equality; legal pluralism; and development effectiveness.⁴

Third, J4P applies a particular **program approach** to justice reform. Key elements of this approach are: (i) establishing an empirical basis for understanding the socio-political context of grievance and dispute resolution; (ii) promoting inclusive processes that allow demand to shape institutional reform and justice service delivery strategies in ways that respond to problems as experienced and prioritized by the poor and marginalized; and (iii) working across development sectors to incorporate issues of justice and grievance management into development initiatives.

2. Mid-Term Review: purpose and methods

This Mid Term Review (MTR), conducted half-way through the life of the Trust Fund (2008-2013), was intended to review and assess the program's initial phase – at the level of country programs and as a whole – against the program objectives, and to identify ways to maximize the program's impact over the remaining period of the Trust Fund. J4P management, in consultation with AusAID, developed an innovative methodology for the MTR that aimed to maximize the outcomes in terms of internal learning and program strengthening. Thus, the MTR utilized a participatory learning process led by a small team of staff and consultants that involved: (i) rigorous critical review of the program's achievements to date, and (ii) identification of specific actions that can be taken to strengthen the program over the next two years. The full Terms of Reference of the MTR are provided in Annex I. The scope of this MTR includes activities since 2008. The primary focus is on operations in East Asia Pacific – Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Timor Leste, Indonesia and Papua New Guinea – but lessons have also been drawn from ongoing programs in Sierra Leone and Nigeria. The MTR has also looked at the merits, funding implications and potential risks of requests to expand J4P's country reach in response to demand from Bank country and task teams and other donors (which is steadily increasing). It should be noted that while the terms of reference envisioned that the MTR would consider options for J4P continuation beyond the life of the Trust Fund, this was deemed to require an additional set of discussions that would be more suited to a separate process. Accordingly, this report suggests that the World Bank and AusAID soon begin discussions on the future of the J4P partnership.

The MTR has involved three steps conducted between June and September 2011. The first step (June) involved reflection and documentation by J4P country teams and thematic leaders on experience and progress to date, consultations with counterparts and stakeholders, and preparation by them of

⁴ An additional theme, paralegalism, is the subject of a study evaluating the effectiveness of paralegal programs in Sierra Leone, Indonesia, Kenya, South Africa and the Philippines, which is currently being completed. J4P also supports paralegal work in Indonesia and Sierra Leone.

indicative proposals for the future (see Part C(3)). In all, 16 notes⁵ were prepared and these formed the basis of the second step (July-August), during which the MTR core team assembled in Washington DC for a week-long consultation and discussion of the notes. This included interviews with 15 key informants within the Bank, followed by further discussion with AusAID partners during mid-August. A preliminary MTR findings report was prepared and circulated within the Bank and AusAID (Law and Justice team and posts in J4P countries) for comment. The third step in the MTR took place in September, and involved a J4P staff workshop to review findings and elaborate proposals and work plans, further discussions within the Bank and with AusAID. This MTR report will be submitted to the Justice for the Poor Steering Committee and AusAID Partnership Committee for review. The MTR process has already provided the basis for a new round of Concept Notes and work programs – currently under preparation (see Part C) – setting out the next phase of country operations and thematic work through the end of 2013. These will be subject to consultation and peer review separately.

B. Mid-Term Review Findings

1. Program objectives and results framework

The MTR took as its starting point the program’s development objectives and results framework. This led the MTR to consider ways to better articulate the benchmarks provided in the results framework, to provide a more useful guide to programming and evaluating success for purposes of the MTR and going forward.

The **Program Development Objective** for EAP-J4P, as set out in the Program Document is: *To influence the theory and practice of development in contexts where engaging with legal pluralism presents a central challenge to promoting equity and managing conflict.*

The program’s results framework identifies four **Intermediate Outcomes**. These have been further developed in the monitoring and evaluation framework of each work stream and provide the basis for six-monthly reporting. These outcomes are:

1. Research informs policy and operational dialogue
2. Capacity is enhanced at the local level to conduct policy research and effect evidence-based policy change
3. Pro-poor justice initiatives are designed, implemented and evaluated
4. Contributions are made to global dialogue on pro-poor justice issues

The Program Development Objective and results framework capture the theory of institutional change that underlies J4P’s approach to achieving these outcomes. In brief, key elements of this theory are as follows. Justice reform is not a technology that can be imported, but rather a process that is deeply embedded in a particular social and political context. “What works” in justice reform is therefore highly context-dependent; while it may be clear what particular functions justice institutions need to

⁵ Country Review Notes: 7; Thematic Notes: 3; Evaluation Review: six-monthly report; Global Positioning Note; Strategic Positioning Note; and 3 Case Illustrations.

fulfill, building systems to realize these functions requires shifting incentives and power relations, and adapting institutions to the realities and capacities of the context. In this process, powerful actors may actively resist changes to protect their interests, and this may be at odds with the public good. Even in the most conducive settings, institutional transformation is a long term and deeply contentious process, measured in generations, with a vast array of externalities likely to exert considerable influence on the trajectories of change. Thus, J4P's aim is to promote constructive pathways to change with the aim of influencing the process of social and political contests in ways that support justice institutions that are more equitable, effective and legitimate, especially from the perspective of end users. It realizes this aim by adopting a general strategy of 'iterative incrementalism' – that is, of taking small steps based on context-specific evidence and real-time feedback – rather than importing end-state institutional templates that have been deemed effective elsewhere.

Given this theory of change, how has the program measured progress on the pathway to change? The MTR terms of reference (see Annex I) suggest that the following 'results chain' lies at the heart of J4P's approach. This argues that (1) by creating an empirically verifiable knowledge base and (2) by engaging local actors (governmental, civil and commercial) in this process, it is possible to (3) support innovative institutional arrangements, both directly through J4P activities and indirectly, that will influence the policies and operations of other agencies, whereby (4) more equitable social contest and dispute resolution may be achieved. Further, it is presumed that the four intermediate outcomes and the evidence base, coupled with mobilization of demand, the demonstration effects of successful pilots, and fostering communities of practice, will (5) have a positive impact on practice and thus serve to exert (and demonstrate) the program's wider influence.

The four Intermediate Outcomes reflect a method for tracking progress. By investing in local research (Intermediate Outcome [IO] 1), the program aims to ensure that innovations are informed by the perspectives of users of justice institutions and are tailored to local context. The research process is also intended to engage counterparts and empower people who are typically at the margins of decisions, to produce evidence that can influence policy debates and to test the impact of policies and programs on the poor. The program also invests in building capacity to promote the collection, interpretation and use of evidence, as well as dialogue amongst stakeholders, and pilot activities to test innovations, leveraging World Bank (and other donor) resources by informing the design and implementation of development projects (IOs 2-3). Seen in this way, the program's activities (research, publications, dissemination, capacity building, dialogue, technical assistance, policy advice, and pilots) are not ends in themselves. Rather, they are elements of a methodology to trigger, leverage, and facilitate change that is sufficiently embedded in local contextual realities to have the chance of being implementable and sustainable.

The Intermediate Outcomes have been used to report on activities, and to assess whether program resources are being used efficiently – is the research project, for instance, well managed? – and effectively – do these activities serve the near term purposes, such as promoting evidence-based dialogue or networks to articulate demands? But as the program consolidates it is also important to more deliberately assess the impact of these activities on the development objective – are they plausibly influencing development thinking and practice in ways that are likely to promote the creation of institutions that can produce more equitable and productive outcomes? Are there reasonable prospects that the particular mix of the program's research and advocacy, networking and operations are resulting in positive interim steps by institutions that shift policy, behaviors or the way resources are used and services accessed? And, from the users' perspective, can the activities of the program be

plausibly tracked to demonstrable improvements in the way institutions – public, private and civil – are meeting public entitlements and expectations with respect to wealth, welfare, equity and conflict?

Revising the results framework to more deliberately incorporate the program’s impact on strategy/policy, operations and end users would help to link Intermediate Outcomes to the Program Development Objective. The MTR finds that it would be useful to track the program’s progress in terms of the following questions, which include three dimensions of impact:

- i) *Strategic and Policy Impact – Are J4P activities resulting in the adoption of new justice-related strategies and policies on the part of policymakers and development practitioners?* At the country level this can be measured in terms of (a) changes in government laws, regulations and policies, and (b) changes in the strategies of non-governmental actors, including civil society and international donors, including both the forming of coalitions and the adoption of certain development methods. At the regional/global level it can be measured in terms of changes in donor and practitioner policies and strategies as articulated in major policy pieces and initiatives.
- ii) *Operational Impact – Is the program impacting on how resources are mobilized and deployed toward pro-poor justice programming?* This can be measured in terms of programming and resource allocation decisions by national governments, civil society, and donors – including other Bank task teams – and in terms of the ways they are evaluating the effectiveness of interventions.
- iii) *End User Impact – Can the activities of the program be plausibly tracked through strategy and operational activities to have demonstrable impacts on justice outcomes for end users?* In some cases end-user impact may be a longer term question (beyond the period of the Trust Fund). Recognizing this, it is reasonable to expect that J4P’s catalytic effect on policies/strategies and operations can be tracked through to demonstrate both current and prospective impacts on end users.

These benchmarks are used to guide the MTR assessment of J4P programs in the next section. The recently hired full time expert on M&E and thematic leader on Development Effectiveness will enable the program to incorporate these benchmarks into revised results frameworks for EAP J4P and the constituent programs, and reflect these in work programs for the next phase of activity (see Part C(3)). While refining the tools for program assessment, the program will also contribute to the larger questions of how best to understand and measure development effectiveness in ways that are consistent with the program’s theory of change – that is, how to measure the extent to which these impacts are indicative of longer term constructive change processes that alter the social and political dynamics in favor of more equitable outcomes. This point will be examined further in the next two sections.

2. Impact: lessons learned from J4P’s development effectiveness

This section looks at the effectiveness and impact of J4P programs at the country and regional levels. It draws lessons from experience to date to guide discussion in subsequent sections of practical measures to strengthen the program. The MTR process commissioned background papers (see Annex II), including

an extended analysis of program outcomes against the Intermediate Outcomes in the six monthly Steering Committee Report (July 2011). Several of these papers included extensive interviews with J4P stakeholders within the World Bank and AusAID, in the global community of practice and in the countries where the program currently operates. The section does not repeat but selectively draws on these papers and interviews to illustrate the main findings and identify what accounts for success and variation of results across EAP country programs.

a. Country programs

J4P country programs have produced an impressive number of research outputs and publications, convened numerous stakeholder dialogue forums and engaged in several significant operational activities. During the period covered by this MTR (the start up phase of several of the country programs – Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Timor-Leste and Papua New Guinea) a premium was placed on conducting local research to form an empirical basis for J4P engagement, credibility and coalition building. A remarkable number of research outputs, including research reports, literature reviews, briefing notes and just-in-time advice have been produced, as well as numerous stakeholder forums, workshops, trainings and dissemination activities held. A full listing of these products can be found in Annex III. This section examines the extent to which these activities have achieved the Intermediate Outcomes and resulted in strategic and policy impact; operational impact; and end user impact. Following a depiction of these results, first in chart and then narrative form, we analyze what accounts for success, and where and why outcomes have fallen short of expectations.

Achievements

J4P country programs have achieved solid progress on Intermediate Outcomes, with positive impacts on strategy and policy, operational programming, and (to a lesser extent) end-users. The following chart lists key achievements on intermediate objectives by country, noting where this has already resulted in positive impacts on the three dimensions.⁶ This is followed by a narrative summary of achievements.

Research informs policy and operational dialogue	
VANUATU	<p>Research on land leasing influencing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amendments to the Environment Impact Regulations (strategy/policy) - Programming of donor funded projects, (AusAID/NZAID Vanuatu Land Program and the GIZ/SPC Climate Change program (operational) - Development of local procedures by communities for approving leases and legal action challenging some leases (strategy/policy; end user) - Broad-based stakeholder dialogue on equity in land leasing (strategy/policy) <p>Research on Island Courts leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy dialogue on the role of Island Courts, including through participation in a multi-country workshop on State Supported Community Justice Systems in Honiara - Requests by the Minister of Justice for inputs to the Vanuatu Law and Justice Sector Strategy.

⁶ The parentheses in the chart indicate the dimension of impact that has been achieved.

SOLOMON ISLANDS	<p>Research on local justice and community officers informing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dialogue with RAMSI PPF and the Royal Solomon Islands Police Force on local level justice reform - A multi-country practitioner's workshop on State Supported Community Justice Systems held in Honiara. <p>Research on public urban land governance leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government formation of a Task Force and Urban Public Land Governance and request for a joint World Bank-J4P-UN-Habitat scoping mission to support it (strategy/policy) <p>Research on land and business in the customary/village domain informing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World Bank/IFC diagnostic studies on long term economic growth prospects and tourism sector development (strategy/policy) - World Bank Interim Strategy Note (2008-2012) (strategy/policy)
TIMOR-LESTE	<p>Research on community land tenure leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An options paper for the Ministry of Justice on Chapter V of the draft Land Law - Guidelines for investors in agribusiness to improve the equity and durability of investment, published with the Chamber of Commerce - Input for the Bank's Diagnostic Trade Integration Study (strategy/policy) - The establishment of an active donor working group on land issues (strategy/policy). <p>Research on local governance and community development initiatives informing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a World Bank project building capacity of the Ministry for Social Solidarity to administer social protection schemes (operational)
INDONESIA	<p>Research and pilots with local justice and paralegals leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant input and support to the drafting of the National Access to Justice Strategy (strategy/policy) - A policy paper developed through a paralegal working group that served as a significant input to the drafting of the Legal Aid Law (strategy/policy) - Influencing reforms in the religious courts aimed at alleviating legal constraints to women-headed households (achieved in concert with the Indonesian Supreme Court, PEKKA, AusAID and the Family Courts of Australia) (strategy/policy; end users)
PNG	<p>Research on ward-level decision-making and dispute resolution leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporation of findings in the design of a Bank financed Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Project (operational) - Collaboration with the Bank's Extractives team and World Bank Institute to conduct follow-on research focused on women's decision-making in mining communities to inform a mining technical assistance project <p>Incorporation of a module on justice in the National Poverty Survey leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy dialogue on the nature and consequences of disputes and crime
SIERRA LEONE	<p>Research on host community engagement in mining governance leading to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incorporation of findings into environmental and social regulations for the mining sector (strategy/policy) - Inputs into the draft extractive industry transparency regime (strategy/policy) - Preparation and dissemination of a simplified handbook on operational procedures and guidelines for the Diamond Area Community Development Fund (strategy/policy)
Capacity enhanced at local level to conduct policy research and effect evidence-based policy change	
VANUATU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local researchers and government officials trained in qualitative research methods, combining class-room sessions, practical field work exercises, writing and analysis workshops - Local researchers paired with international researchers who provided training and mentoring throughout two phases of research - A local researcher was awarded the PIPSA Travel Award by the ANU State Society and Governance in Melanesia Program to present at the Pacific Island Political Studies Association Conference in Samoa in December 2011

SOLS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A two day qualitative researcher training workshop included government officials - Government officials participated in J4P research and dissemination activities, resulting in these officials become lead reform proponents
TIMOR LESTE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A week-long social protection research training held for eight field researchers in February 2011 and a three-day training for eight researchers on social network analysis in March 2011
INDONESIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - J4P supported the development of a monitoring and information system and provided training to several partners in its use - Technical assistance was provided to PEKKA, a women's NGO, to help them effectively engage in evidence-based policy discussions with local government (strategy/policy)
PNG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training provided to 18 local researchers in qualitative and quantitative research methods, including the conduct of focus groups, household surveys and key informant interviews - A local researcher supported to undertake a visiting fellowship at the State Society and Governance in Melanesia project (Australian National University) to write-up and present findings
SIERRA LEONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More than a dozen Sierra Leoneans trained in mixed-methods research.
Pro-poor justice initiatives are designed, implemented and evaluated	
VANUATU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal awareness program implemented with the Department of Lands for communities subject to leasing in concert with research efforts (end users) - Support to design elements of the IDA-funded <i>Vanuatu Geothermal Power and Electricity Sector Development Project</i> related to justice and grievance handling (operational)
SOLOMON ISLANDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The RAMSI PPF/RSIPF community officer scheme evaluated (operational) - Advice provided on the preparation of the World Bank-funded Tina River hydro project (operational) - Scoping mission in support of the National Task Force on Urban Public Land carried out in collaboration with UN-Habitat - A pilot model of advisory services for custom landholders is being planned (see Part C (3)) - A pilot community justice project linking community officers to provincial government to enhance local dispute mediation and resolution is being planned (see Part C(3))
TIMOR LESTE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A community feedback/complaints handling mechanism for community development funds was designed, however due to the lack of Ministry support it will not go forward - Advice was provided on the design of the World Bank project building capacity of the Ministry for Social Solidarity to administer social protection schemes (operational) - A facility to support grievance redress, safeguards and equity in infrastructure projects is being planned (see Part C(3))
PNG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The program is informing the design of the Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Program (operational) - The program is informing technical assistance in the mining sector provided by the World Bank Extractives team (SEGOM) (operational)
SIERRA LEONE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The program has designed and is supporting the randomized implementation and evaluation of accountability tools to improve the delivery of basic health services (operational; end users) - The program is informing the nationwide scale-up of paralegal services (operational; end users)

INDONESIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Women's Legal Empowerment program has been supporting a women's NGO (PEKKA) to implement legal empowerment approaches (operational; end users) - The Integrated Community Legal Empowerment Program (ICLE) for Aceh, to provide support for community legal empowerment and strengthen supply-side justice services, was designed and implementation is beginning - A baseline for an evaluation of the Mediation and Community Legal Empowerment program (MCLE) was completed, and implementation of the program was completed (end users) - The Revitalization of Legal Aid Program was evaluated (operational; end users) - A project involving technical assistance to the Ministry of law and Human Rights and capacity building for legal aid and paralegal organizations is being planned (see Part C(3)) - A project building systems and capacity for prosecution of corruption within PNPM is being planned (see Part C(3))
Contributions are made to global dialogue on pro-poor justice issues	
GLOBAL PROGRAMMING	<p>Made contributions to major policy pieces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World Development Report 2011, <i>Conflict, Security and Development</i> - World Development Report 2012, <i>Gender Equality and Development</i> - UN Women's flagship report 2011, <i>In Pursuit of Justice</i> <p>Held the following conferences and symposia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>State-Supported Community Justice Workshop</i>, October 26-28, 2011, Honiara, Solomon Islands - <i>Justice, Conflict, and Development</i>, University of Sydney Law School, September 15, 2011 - <i>Legal Pluralism and Development</i>, Washington DC, April 2010 - <i>Customary Justice and Legal Pluralism in Post-Conflict and Fragile States Conference</i>, George Washington University, November 17/18, 2009, (co-organized with George Washington University and the United States Institute of Peace) - <i>Engaging Law in Context – A Justice for the Poor Symposium</i>, Indonesia, June/July 2009 <p>Knowledge products include more than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 major policy pieces or books - 6 published chapters and journal articles - 40 program publications - 20 conference and workshop presentations - 10 trainings

Vanuatu

The J4P program – or JBE as it is locally known – was until 2011, the Bank’s only in-country presence in Vanuatu. MTR interlocutors noted that the program has played a particularly constructive role, both on the Bank’s behalf and in wider state-society dialogue. The program’s activities have resulted in numerous small but significant changes in policy, resource allocation and citizen empowerment (Box 2). These changes cannot be wholly attributed to J4P’s research, networking and policy dialogue activities, but taken together the credibility and confidence generated in the program have shifted the substance and pace of reform regarding the highly contentious issue of land leasing for development. Whereas key stakeholders have tended to take stark rhetorical positions, the JBE program is helping to create more inclusive platforms for policy dialogue around issues of land and natural resource governance. JBE’s reputation provides a credible basis on which to pilot activities to promote more equitable land transactions, and to work closely with government and civil society on sensitive issues relating to safeguards and the distribution of benefits and costs in relation to donor-funded infrastructure projects, all of which will involve land transactions. One practical instance of this is that the JBE team has supported the IDA-funded *Vanuatu Geothermal Power and Electricity Sector Development Project* task team to engage more effectively with issues around land and community governance.

Box 2: Vanuatu – From resistance to reform coalitions

Despite the unstable political environment, which has seen multiple changes in government over matters of months, research and stakeholder dialogue conducted by JBE on land leasing – a key site of perceived injustice and grievance – has resulted in the incorporation of provisions intended to improve the transparency, accountability and public consultation elements of land leasing and planning processes, helping to inform several laws, regulations and policies (some passed, some still in draft). JBE has been working collaboratively with the AusAID/NZAID Vanuatu Land Program ‘Mama Graon,’ which has picked up a number of JBE recommendations in the area of land administration, and is planning to focus on additional JBE recommendations to improve the lease creation process in 2012. The GIZ/SPC Climate Change program has taken on board JBE recommendations to link land use planning with leasing processes. Local civil society actors have taken on new activities in support of improved leasing processes and outcomes in ways that can be traced to JBE’s research, dissemination and policy dialogue: the Vanuatu Cultural Center is working with JBE to facilitate the development of more transparent and inclusive kastom governance related to land and natural resource management; customary authorities on Epi and Tanna have engaged with the Department of Lands to change lease registration procedures; and community members have sought legal assistance to challenge leases on the basis of unfulfilled development promises and fraud. There is also evidence that in some specific cases tensions over land have been reduced following JBE sponsored community discussion that clarified what are acceptable claims.

Solomon Islands

J4P activities have impacted positively on policies and strategies of the government, RAMSI, Bank, and AusAID, and are now moving into a phase of developing and informing programming aimed at end users. J4P participation in the Bank’s diagnostic study of growth and conflict – *Solomon Islands Growth Prospects: Constraints and Policy Priorities (October 2010)*⁷ – helped to substantially reorient discussions around ‘custom land’ in respect of economic growth and conflict risk mitigation. J4P research challenged orthodoxies about the centrality of ‘rural custom land’ as a development problem and helped redirect attention to the ways failures in urban land governance are impacting on economic prospects, inequity

⁷ <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPACIFICISLANDS/Resources/SourcesofGrowthSummary.pdf>

and persistent drivers of conflict. This became a key element of the Bank's *Interim Strategy Note (2009-2011)*⁸. Following "just-in-time advice" on the consequences of failed urban land governance, the Government asked the Bank (through J4P) to assist it to establish a Task Force on Urban Public Land Governance. An initial J4P scoping mission with UN HABITAT (supported by AusAID) has recommended a program of technical assistance and/or an investment operation to promote effective urban land governance and mitigate conflict potential. The World Bank has tentatively earmarked IDA funding to support improved urban land governance in Solomon Islands and, should this be confirmed, future J4P activities will be conducted in collaboration with the Sustainable Development department which takes the technical lead in relation to urban development issues in the Bank. J4P's research work on *Justice Delivered Locally* and hybrid courts was designed in support of SIG policy and led to collaboration with RAMSI and in particular the Participating Police Force on the evaluation of a local justice initiative that supported the deployment of 'community officers' in rural Solomon Islands. J4P's leadership of this evaluation has helped to reshape the debate around local policing toward a less siloed appreciation of local governance, in which policing is one part. J4P is now developing a larger scale local justice initiative building on the community officer experience that will aim to improve the management of local conflicts and disputes, improve the responsiveness of the state to local communities, and ultimately inform a sustainable model of justice service provision by RAMSI partners and the government.

Timor Leste

The J4P program has had an impact on policy dialogue on the justice aspects of the use of local development resources and land governance and benefit-sharing arrangements. In a country where the bulk of land is owned communally, and where a legal framework for land has yet to be established, the program has highlighted the significant risk that development activities could result in entrenching inequities. J4P has sought to influence the private sector and communities themselves, by developing "good practice guidelines" on how private investors can enter more equitable and durable bargains with customary land owners, and how the benefits can be distributed more equitably amongst community members. These guidelines were published in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and will be disseminated amongst local decision-makers through partnerships J4P has forged with NGOs. J4P has also sought to impact on government policy through technical assistance to the Ministry of Justice in developing the legal framework for land (a *Policy Options Paper* was produced on Chapter V of the draft Land Law on community land). The J4P team has used the credibility gained through its work and its access to key actors to facilitate policy dialogue towards the goal of building a broad-based coalition, which may be able to exert sufficient political pressure to facilitate the passage of such a law after a near decade-long gestation. J4P has convened a working group among donors, civil society and key Timorese public figures on land issues, including the head of Parliamentary Committee A (the legislative committee) and the Minister of Justice.

⁸ http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64193027&piPK=64187937&theSitePK=523679&menuPK=64187510&searchMenuPK=64187511&entityID=000334955_20100324023920&cid=3001_147

The other strand of the program examined access, decision-making and dispute resolution around the use of local development grants. Experience elsewhere has shown that local grants can become sources of significant dispute and public grievance as citizens, contractors and government authorities negotiate how these grants should be converted into particular investments and facilities. The research probed these possibilities, and examined the operation of a number of Government programs at the local level. This initial work is informing the development of a World Bank project which builds the capacity of the Ministry of Social Solidarity to administer the country's various social protection schemes as well as the second phase of the J4P program on mitigating the social impacts of rapid infrastructure development through both supply and demand side mechanisms to deal with issues of grievance and social accountability.

Indonesia

J4P's support to PEKKA, a local NGO focused on the welfare of women-headed households is the program's best example of impact on end users (see Box 3). The program also supported a Revitalizing Legal Aid pilot which engaged NGO partners at the sub-national level to strengthen existing community legal aid posts in three provinces. Drawing on the experience from these pilots and its research on local level dispute resolution, the J4P program supported the development of the Government of Indonesia's National Access to Justice Strategy. This was followed by support for technical assistance for the development and implementation of a monitoring and evaluation framework for the Strategy. J4P experience supporting legal empowerment programs also led to support for a paralegal working group which produced a policy paper as an input to a *Legal Aid Bill*, which has since been enacted. J4P is now responding to a

Box 3: Indonesia – Improving access to courts, public services and social welfare entitlements for poor women

J4P's Indonesia program's research on women's access to justice services revealed that while programs and services exist to improve the welfare of women-headed households, they invariably lack the required evidence of legal status. These findings were taken into a wider arena of policy dialogue by a larger study led by the Supreme Court of Indonesia, with assistance from the Family Court of Australia and AusAID, which found that while 97% of court users had registered marriages, only 63% of women household heads had registered their marriage. Similarly, 81% of court users had birth certificates for their children compared to 38% of women household heads and less than 5% of divorces experienced by women household heads had been formalized through the Religious Courts. Alongside, J4P supported PEKKA (an NGO) to implement pilot community empowerment programs, focusing on mobilizing community demand and strengthening the capacity of the legal system and district and provincial governments to respond to what the research had found. This involved capacity building of paralegals to provide legal information and assistance to women, support to grassroots policy advocacy, and was complemented by networking with judges, government officials, police, prosecutors, academics and civil society organizations. PEKKA's pilots worked with the local Civil Registry Office to obtain birth certificates for children of poor families in PEKKA villages. Paralegals helped families in need of support to complete forms, and access the civil registry office. This reduced transport costs, but also circumvented village officials who were asking for money to process the certificates. Lasting impacts, and impacts 'at scale' were achieved by two collateral actions: (i) agreement by 46 religious courts and local governments to fund circuit courts to sit in previously unvisited sub-districts to formalize marriages and divorces, and (ii) the government's decision to implement reforms in religious courts nationwide, drawing on their own revenues to increase the budget for fee waivers. This allowed the poor to access free legal services, and increased funding for circuit courts, which brought courts closer to communities. The result was a 14-fold increase in the number of poor clients able to access the courts and a 4-fold increase in the number accessing courts in remote areas. The impact has been to alleviate a key constraint facing the predominantly poor women-headed households – the legal status required for them to access public services and social welfare entitlements.

government request to assist in developing policies and modalities for implementation of the Legal Aid Law by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, while also scaling up efforts to support legal aid providers in meeting this new demand.

Papua New Guinea

J4P work in PNG work was designed to have an impact on the development of a particular World Bank local governance and service delivery project (*Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Project – RSDLGP*), and as a result of that engagement expanded to meet demand of other teams. J4P collaborated with World Bank colleagues in the Social Development and Poverty Reduction and Economic Management departments to study the dynamics of ward-level decision making, inequities, injustices and dispute resolution. The study findings are being incorporated into the design of the RSDLGP and ongoing analytical work by J4P will support its implementation. As follow-on to that study, J4P is collaborating with the Bank's Extractives Team (SEGOM) and the World Bank Institute (WBI) to undertake further research focusing on the formation and implementation of equitable and durable deals around mining, with a particular focus on the role of and outcomes for women. This will feed into the Bank's mining technical assistance work in PNG (through SEGOM), cross-country learning (through J4P's Land and Natural Resources Governance and Gender thematic work) and cross-regional learning (via WBI). J4P also designed a disputes module in a national poverty survey implemented with Bank support by the PNG National Statistics Office, which is now feeding local policy dialogue and has triggered a request by CMU for J4P engagement on a study on the socio-economic costs of crime.

Sierra Leone

A four-year J4P analytical program on host communities and the mining regulatory regime has supported local public dialogue and provided technical expertise leading to the drafting of regulations under mining and environmental laws, as well as to nascent discussions about an Extractives Industry Transparency Initiative regulatory framework. The analytical work also led to the design and implementation – in conjunction with local NGOs – of a rights awareness pilot for diamondiferous communities on the implementation of a community development fund. On the basis of its innovation and scalability, this project won a World Bank Institute competition on Innovations in Extractive Industries.

J4P activities have also formed part of a Bank-supported nationwide decentralization services program through the design, implementation and evaluation of accountability mechanisms for the delivery of basic health services. This work has clear links with justice issues, both in terms of access by clients to basic health services and grievance redress systems, and in terms of how elected local government officials incorporate citizen health entitlements in service planning and delivery. Thus, this work is simultaneously shaping the supply side of the service and empowering end users to claim their rights. The team is now piloting an additional mix of social accountability and legal empowerment techniques to scale-up in the next phase of the decentralized services program, as well as working with other Bank task teams to develop the accountability aspects of their work.

Lessons learned from country programs

Common factors account for positive impacts. Given J4P's emphasis on local context and tailored approaches, there is no single formula for success. However, three common factors provide useful lessons for J4P going forward.

- ***Flexibility and critical mass.*** Positive outcomes have emerged where J4P has successfully taken advantage of the degree of flexibility and 'local autonomy' enabled by the EAP-J4P trust fund to hire high-caliber staff and consultants able to work across a range of demands and a range of methods (mixed methods research, pilots, networking, policy dialogue and capacity building) in ways that reflect a close appreciation of the immediate context, with the agility to make course corrections as necessary. This is particularly marked in small Bank offices, where 'boots on the ground' have allowed the program to be more responsive to country priorities (government, Bank, AusAID), and more influential by making a clear intellectual and substantive contribution.
- ***Credibility and the 'right' mix of program elements and expertise.*** Positive outcomes have emerged where J4P teams have patiently earned credibility in the eyes of government and other stakeholders, where they have produced quality research, just-in-time advice, and carefully managed the effects (and risks) of World Bank 'branding', and have been able to leverage that credibility to identify and act on a range of opportunities leading to impact. Where research has been important, it has two attributes: first, it has involved experts with both extensive understanding of the topic, and an ability to mould their work to the policy setting; and second, this work has been conducted in the context of partnerships with government, NGOs, local advocates and leaders and wider Bank operations, and has been used as an entry point for strategic policy and operational interventions – this has been a feature of activities in Timor Leste (the land policy paper), Solomon Islands (community officer evaluation, sources of growth economic analysis), PNG (local-level decision making and dispute resolution) and Vanuatu (land leasing research).
- ***Synergies and partnerships.*** Positive outcomes have emerged where J4P teams have been able to align work programs to influence and support other development activities led by government, other Bank teams and other donors. As primarily a research and development program (rather than one that generates large scale operations in its own right), J4P achieves an impact at scale where it adds value to or is able to catalyze larger donor-supported operations. This has been done best when partnerships are established with government agencies, Bank sector teams or donor projects at the outset, as in PNG, Sierra Leone, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands.

Key challenges

J4P country activities have also missed some opportunities and fallen short of expectations. While positive impacts can be pointed to in all countries, there are several cases where J4P activities have not as yet resulted in anticipated impacts. In some cases this is due to factors beyond the program's control, which are inevitable and heightened in deliberately innovative and experimental programs. In other cases these shortcomings could be avoided through strengthened management processes and more intense cross country learning among the team (as will be explored in subsequent sections of this report). Some common reasons for J4P's missed opportunities and shortfalls include:

- **Problems in execution.** While varying according to country, staff skills and experience, country programs have commonly experienced longer than anticipated lead times in identifying, hiring and orienting staff, and local consultants and NGO partners. Early experience has been that the availability and capacity of counterpart consultants and NGOs to engage in complex research and policy analysis was over-estimated. In some cases, the relative inexperience of J4P staff and consultant partners, combined with insufficiently intensive supervision by task team leaders (providing strategic guidance, and knowledge of Bank procurement systems, programming and product standards) have resulted in only partial delivery of products (reflecting false starts, longer periods of preparatory training, inappropriate research methods or incomplete products). Examples of this include the Doing Business case study research in Solomon Islands, and some early land research in Vanuatu, which were unable to deliver publishable reports and required the adoption of new approaches. A series of legal empowerment pilots in Indonesia also suffered from difficulties in execution in part because of the modalities (i.e. high transaction costs associated with Bank procurement systems for relatively small scale projects).

Box 4. Timor Leste: Adapting to changes in context

The research on State Building at Local Level in Timor-Leste originally aimed to explore how the Government's substantial expenditure on development programs was affecting traditional decision-making, power dynamics and dispute resolution processes at the local level. The primary subject of study was the Local Development Program, a community block grant program administered by the local government ministry that was designed to build local development planning and financial management capacity in anticipation of a significant government commitment to fiscal and political decentralization. Yet even before fieldwork commenced, the Government began shifting its local development policies away from decentralization, towards faster disbursing, more visible small scale public works programs. These programs involve vastly larger amounts of funding than LDP, little community participation and are implemented through short cut procurement procedures – they are being used largely for redistribution purposes (essentially involving grants to contractors, a means of distributing largesse in an effort to “buy the peace”). The local government ministry became increasingly marginalized, as the Prime Minister's Office was increasingly driving policy in this area. The team did not adequately adjust its work to link to the emerging national political and economic narrative, and broaden its focus beyond LDP to incorporate the dynamics of the new programs, their effects on traditional governance structures nor the broader distribution of power and resources emerging at local level. This shortcoming will be addressed in the new work plan being developed.

- **Wrong type and mix of activities and failure to adapt to changes in context.** Recent evaluations of World Bank experience with engaging in institutional reforms highlight the fact that there are no “tested and true” entry points that will be applicable across contexts or at different times in the same country context.⁹ That said, J4P country programs show several instances of slowness to adapt activities to context, to adjust activities as changes occur in that context, or repeating activities with insufficient attention to documenting and internalizing lessons from past engagements as a springboard to subsequent innovation. In Timor-Leste, early engagements in

⁹ In particular, the reviews of the Bank's experience with public sector management, procurement, demand-side governance and justice sector reforms. See World Bank (2011). *Strengthening World Bank Engagement on Governance and Anti-corruption*, Companion Pieces, November 2.

land leasing in Vanuatu, and doing business case studies in Solomon Islands, the program invested in working with NGOs as research partners on the basis of the Intermediate Outcome calling for capacity building, even when it became clear that this was not an effective way to produce quality research. Subsequent engagements adopted more innovative arrangements that mix local and expatriate research talents, so as to ‘co-produce’ outputs. Some early research activities were oriented to multiple and at times insufficiently clear audiences, producing lengthy, academic style publications without clear avenues for uptake by client and partner stakeholders. More recent work streams (as in the case of Solomon Islands urban land, Vanuatu land leasing policy note) have appreciated the value of just-in-time policy advice, and short, easily digestible briefs for counterpart officials. The understandable need to demonstrate relevance to wider Bank Group and partner organization operations (as in J4P’s contributions to the IFC *Doing Business Surveys* in Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands) has meant that some activities were sustained over time, but which were peripheral to government priorities. There are also instances of the program’s slowness to adapt to changes in the political environment, for example the state building at the local level work in Timor Leste (see Box 4).

○ ***Inadequate strategic integration with the Bank and AusAID.***

By design, the program is oriented to achieving impact at scale principally by contributing to and thereby influencing the larger operations of the Bank and AusAID. As Section B.4 discusses, the program will achieve these aims through greater integration, both strategically and tactically. In some cases J4P has had regular and constructive engagement with AusAID posts, leading to the integration of J4P work in AusAID programming (notably Solomon Islands and Vanuatu). In other cases, notably in Indonesia, the relationship has been more difficult, due to a combination of factors: the lack of established protocols for the involvement of AusAID and J4P staff and contractors in respective programming, and differences in programming priorities (with the former more focused on national-scale engagements with the formal justice sector contrasting with J4P’s orientation to pilot projects). Section B.5 offers suggestions for improving this integration.

Box 5. Indonesia: the downsides of integration

The Mediation and Community Legal Empowerment (MCLE) pilot in Indonesia provides an illustration of some the difficulties that were encountered in an attempt to mainstream J4P activities into a World Bank funded project. In this case the host project, Support for Poor and Disadvantaged Areas (SPADA), was designed to address governance and policy problems in 51 of Indonesia’s poorest districts through the application of bottom-up planning procedures. MCLE was a component of SPADA set up to deliver a package of legal empowerment activities in targeted districts which would then be the subject of a rigorous mixed methods impact evaluation. MCLE, however, suffered from a number of basic problems in implementation. Firstly, SPADA did not move forward as envisaged meaning that MCLE was only implemented as planned in one of two target provinces; secondly, issues around procurement meant that the contract to implement MCLE was awarded to an NGO with less than optimal capacity; and thirdly integration into SPADA structures contributed to a lack of effective management for MCLE. This, coupled with design compromises required to integrate MCLE into SPADA meant that MCLE underperformed the ‘freestanding’ paralegal pilots on which it was based.

With regard to the Bank, Section B.5 notes that J4P has tended to hire staff and consultants from outside the Bank. This has meant comparatively few staff has knowledge of how to navigate the Bank’s corporate culture, systems and procedures. Similarly, when J4P staff has

attempted to influence choices made in mainstream Bank procedures, they have not always been sufficiently aware of the incentives and constraints acting on task managers when it comes to incorporating knowledge derived from J4P activities, or fully exploiting their potential. That said, the MTR has also shown that integration of J4P with Bank activities does not (indeed cannot) always result in “win-win” outcomes. It is in the very nature of development programming that relations between donors and governments are dynamic, fluctuating over time (and within sectors) across a spectrum that may span from deep suspicion to passive indifference to harmonious collaboration.

In other cases, J4P’s activities may be efficiently conducted, but may not align with the tactical approaches by sector task managers as they engage in country dialogue – for example J4P’s engagement with the Bank team responsible for the Solomon Islands Tina River Hydro project underscores how the program may identify important issues but fail (at least initially) in getting buy in for collaboration from the task team. Depending on context and circumstance, this may be a strength or a vulnerability: indeed, over-integration of J4P activities in other Bank operations can also be problematic, as in the case of Indonesia, where the program has struggled to engage in justice issues outside of the remit of larger Bank-supported community development programs (see Box 5), and in Timor Leste where the team has been at times diverted from its core activities by other demands from the Bank country office.

- ***The right mix of activities, but effectiveness overwhelmed or made less relevant by externalities.*** The program’s experience shows several instances of where activities may have been conducted efficiently and effectively around topics of high immediate relevance, but where results (Section B.1) do not play out due to externalities. For instance, in Solomon Islands whilst political interest in land and natural resources governance is perennially high, instability in governing coalitions and as a result frequent changes in counterpart officials stymie the program’s ability to sustain a momentum of collective policy dialogue. In Vanuatu, J4P pursued research on local level decision making in anticipation of a Bank-led rural development program, which was subsequently dropped from the pipeline. At quite a different level, some elements of the J4P program (for instance regarding land and natural resource governance) illustrate well the WDR 2011 point on the non-linearity and long term nature of trajectories of institutional change, particularly around politically contentious issues. Thus, despite high quality investments by the program in research, networking and policy advocacy the dynamics of the political economy of reform may mean that it is difficult to make instrumental impact claims within a program cycle. In these circumstances the challenge is defining a program that combines engagement with high stakes development issues (around which outcomes are likely to be uncertain) with an approach that can confidently be predicted to yield shorter term results.

In summary, the above cases show that in a relatively short period of time the program’s use of research, policy dialogue, innovative pilots, along with networks within and beyond the Bank and building local capacity to create and use evidence has been reasonably successful in facilitating change at the level of policy and strategy, operations and, to a lesser extent, the life experiences of end users of justice institutions. But there are no guarantees that ‘development effectiveness’ will be achieved by a linear progression. As such, despite the program’s commitment to an evidence based approach to justice reform, its work will necessarily be characterized by flexibility with attendant needs for reflexivity and course corrections. It is noteworthy that the program’s country experience confirms wider Bank learning about governance reforms, namely, that there is relatively little explicit evidence about the

entry points and activities that, *ex ante*, are most likely to change behaviors and improve the performance of institutions.

There are several ways in which the program could be better placed to realize its full potential and mitigate risk of setbacks. These are considered in subsequent sections, namely, measures to improve its strategic relevance, the effectiveness of its engagements with counterparts, the Bank's operations, and donor partners, and to more efficiently manage available resources and leverage resources beyond the program.

b. Regional/global program activities

The Program Document acknowledged that a comprehensive regional program is a long term enterprise, which requires significant human and financial resources. Near term initiatives were intended to: (i) develop cross-country **thematic analytic and advisory work** – to begin to create economies of scale in ideas, learning and training; (ii) establish a **community of practice** and promote regional knowledge sharing; and (iii) develop links with other Bank sectors, AusAID, and academic institutions in the region, and enable the program to **contribute to key policy debates** and seek opportunities to **expand and replicate** the program.

Thematic analytical and advisory work

The thematic streams of work have struggled to define regional work streams and their relationship with country programs. The impact of thematic analytical and advisory work has varied across the themes. One challenge has been defining how regional thematic work relates to country programs, in part because country programs were set up prior to engagement of thematic advisors. Through the MTR process, the program has clarified the roles and relationships between regional thematic and country programs with a view to maximizing program depth, impact and knowledge sharing. As the program enters the next phase of activities, thematic work streams will be focused on supporting country programs at the design, implementation and evaluation phases, and ensuring synergies and learning across the country programs. Efforts to facilitate a broader community of practice will focus on distilling lessons and stimulating regional dialogue, rather than initiating special work streams for this purpose.

Land and natural resources

The program document foreshadowed that work under this theme would provide technical support to country programs, and convene regional meetings of academics and practitioners, to define a specific research and operational agenda.

Land and natural resource governance is a major element in all of EAP-J4P country programs, with the exception of Indonesia. The regional thematic program has provided technical expertise to these programs – in particular the land leasing work in Vanuatu, the investor guidelines and options for the land law in Timor Leste, and the doing business line of work in Solomon Islands. Building on these experiences, pilot activities in Solomon Islands and wider regional engagement, the thematic program has defined an operational agenda that is reflected in on-going and prospective country-level activities (see Part C(3)), focused on:

- ***The interface between community holders of land and resource rights, investors, and state.*** Building on J4P work in Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and PNG, this stream is supporting the development of advisory services to improve communities' abilities to negotiate equitable deals and benefit sharing agreements and anticipates beginning a dialogue on possible regional mechanisms to support these services.
- ***Infrastructure projects and the potential for conflict and grievance.*** This stream is aimed at providing analytics and technical assistance to support the implementation of specific infrastructure projects led by other Bank sector departments as they impact on land rights (as noted above, for *Vanuatu Geothermal Power and Electricity Sector Development Project*), while also promoting systemic means of managing grievance and contest around infrastructure projects (as the program is exploring in Timor Leste).
- ***Urban public land management.*** Building on the scoping study in the Solomon Islands, and with a technical lead from the Bank department responsible for urban sector work, further work on this topic is flagged in Vanuatu and Timor Leste to examine justice issues around urbanization coupled with poor urban land management.

Each of these work streams will be appraised as part of peer reviews of individual country concept notes and the regional program will ensure technical coherence and support cross-country and regional learning.

At the regional level, the program sought to engage with the Pacific Islands Forum (PIF) through a study of the impact of the 2008 *Land Management and Conflict Minimization Guiding Principles*. The rationale was clear: it was anticipated that the study would demonstrate uneven application of the principles, that this could prompt dialogue on more politically and administratively relevant and feasible principles, and thus open a path to begin reshaping the PIF agenda informed by evidence accumulated by the program. But during the MTR it was proposed that, since there was insufficient evidence of counterpart engagement, this work stream should be dropped. Concerns were also raised about program overreach and the need to consolidate so as to achieve greater depth. Over the next phase, the MTR proposes that the regional land and natural resource program will focus on providing expert support to J4P country teams on the three issues set out above, and fostering a dialogue with other actors in the region on these issues.

Development effectiveness

While the theory of change underpinning J4P's programmatic approach draws on a significant body of critical evaluations of conventional approaches to justice reforms, this theme was identified in recognition of the dearth of knowledge about how to effectively design, monitor and evaluate 'J4P-type' programs. The program document indicated that work under this theme would include the design and application of research and evaluation methods; technical support to country teams; facilitating cross country comparative research; and that the ground would be prepared for replication of successful approaches and substantive contributions by the program to the Bank's and AusAID's deliberations on justice reforms and development effectiveness.

A full time M&E and Development Effectiveness advisor was recruited only in October 2011. Prior to this, the program had a part time advisor who focused on developing M&E frameworks for each of the country programs. While aspects of the responsibilities envisaged for this advisor were dealt with by short term consultants and World Bank HQ staff, this focused on developing M&E frameworks for each of the country programs. The anticipated links with the Bank's wider research and evaluation agenda, as well as ongoing design and evaluation of AusAID justice interventions, have been sporadic.

The thematic advisor's work streams will include near term deliverables in: (i) revision of the Results Framework, and further development of the M&E framework; (ii) technical assistance to country teams to ensure a consistent approach in country Concept Notes to defining objectives, identification and verification of results; and (iii) defining and providing oversight for the application of more rigorous standards for appraising the program's research and policy products.

Gender equality

This theme was intended to promote the mainstream of gender throughout the program, provide country programs with technical advice and project J4P's activities lessons and insights into appropriate arenas within the Bank, AusAID and other development actors (such as gender assessment, policy flagships and operational partnerships).

A gender thematic advisor was recruited in July 2010. Gender issues have featured specifically in some country program activities (e.g., Indonesia – see PEKKA example, Box 2) and have been the focus of targeted analytic work for example in Timor-Leste around community engagement with agribusiness. J4P country program staff has generally been alert to the gendered nature of disputes, justice and conflict issues and have taken steps to ensure sex disaggregated and gender relevant data and include gender sensitive methodologies and lines of inquiry in research activities. It is noteworthy that the gender advisor has developed gender mainstreaming work plans for the Timor-Leste and Indonesia teams, has worked with all of the country teams on making gender explicit and visible, and has conducted gender mainstreaming training for the World Bank offices in Timor Leste and Vanuatu.

But proactive engagements on the substantive dimensions of gender justice and conflict at the country level have been largely ad hoc, subordinated to broader program goals, and have not resulted in the coherent and consistent program-wide approach that was envisaged as a result of this theme. Going forward, it is intended that the gender advisor will be responsible to ensure a stronger integration of gender issues at the outset of work streams, and that a particular focus will be developed around gender dimensions of the three operational areas: land and natural resources, access to justice and service delivery (as discussed in Section B.3). The program has established a partnership with the *International Food Policy Research Institute* (IFPRI), to bring comparative experience into J4P work on gender and land and natural resources in the Pacific region and to co-sponsor a regional workshop focused on improving outcomes for women in transactions involving communities, investors and the state around land and natural resources.

More consistent results on gender have been achieved at the regional and global levels. J4P prepared six input papers for the WDR 2012 – which are compiled in a WDR background paper entitled *Role of*

*Law and Justice in Achieving Gender Equality*¹⁰ - and directly contributed to the report's discussions of access to justice, enforcement, legal pluralism and agency, and the recommendations which listed access to justice as a priority. J4P has also contributed and given technical advice to the East Asia Pacific companion piece to WDR 2012: Towards Gender Equality in East Asia and the Pacific, Africa region's flagship report on gender equality entitled *Empowering Women: Legal Rights and Economic Opportunities in Africa*, and UN Women's flagship report 2011 *In Pursuit of Justice*.¹¹ In addition, the gender thematic advisor now sits on the Bank's Gender and Development Board.

Legal pluralism and non-state justice

In recognition of the prevalence of non-state institutions in dispute resolution, including the governance of resources, the aim of this theme was to bring substantive knowledge to all country activities about the implications of entrenched legal pluralism, and to synthesize the program's experience for wider expert dialogue.

It was not envisaged that a dedicated advisor would be necessary to support this theme. The program engaged in three primary activities aimed at contributing to networks of development practitioners and scholars, and mapping innovative examples of attempts to engage with multiple rule systems in reform settings around this theme. Interviews conducted during the MTR suggest that the program has been successful in promoting an appreciation of issues of legal pluralism, both within the Bank and donor partners, and that this has been appreciated amongst the scholarly community. The first activity was a two day symposium in Jakarta in June 2009, *Engaging Law in Context*, which brought together national policy makers and practitioners in the region. The second major event was a two-day conference, *Customary Justice and Legal Pluralism in Post-Conflict and Fragile Societies*, held in November 2009 together with the United States Institute of Peace and George Washington University, which brought together over 120 justice and development practitioners to present case studies and discuss issues of human rights, hybridity and research methods.¹² The third was a seminar bringing together leading academics in the field of legal pluralism with development practitioners to explore how development projects can better take account of legal pluralism. This has resulted in an edited volume, *Legal Pluralism and Development Policy: Scholars and Practitioners in Dialogue*, published by Cambridge University Press (forthcoming 2012). The program also made numerous contributions to conferences and publications on the topic of legal pluralism (see Annex III).

Looking forward, the MTR has confirmed a prior decision by program managers not to pursue legal pluralism and non-state justice as a separate theme. The issues are bound up in nearly all of J4Ps activities, and the program believes there is greater value in exploring legal pluralism in the context of the program's operational activities rather than as a separate theme. More generally, to support the increasing orientation of the program toward operational activities (and thus support management and evaluation of this re-orientation) the MTR has proposed a revision to the themes around three operational areas – access to justice, equity in service delivery and land and natural resource

¹⁰ <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWDR2012/Resources/7778105-1299699968583/7786210-1322671773271/Chiongson-law-and-justice.pdf>

¹¹ <http://progress.unwomen.org/pdfs/EN-Report-Progress.pdf>

¹² <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTLAWJUSTICE/EXTJUSFORPOOR/0,,contentMDK:22343431~menuPK:3282985~pagePK:64020865~piPK:51164185~theSitePK:3282787,00.html>

governance (see section B. 3). The program will focus its exploration of legal pluralism as it plays out in each of these three areas.

Community of practice, knowledge sharing, regional and global dialogue

J4P has engaged in numerous activities to promote knowledge sharing and dialogue, but a more proactive knowledge management strategy is needed to communicate clearly across audiences. This aspect of the regional program was intended to increase cross learning between countries, enhance dissemination through collaborative partnerships with government bodies, research institutions and practitioners, and influence development discourse more broadly. J4P has used a variety of forums and activities to this end – as documented in Annex III including websites and blogs, symposia and workshops and high profile contributions to World Bank and UN flagship policy reports.

The MTR conducted 24 interviews with members of the intended audience and partners to review J4P knowledge management activities. Those interviewed suggested that the program occupies an important and unique space in global dialogue, and praised the program for taking on controversial issues and for conducting research that took its analytical aspects seriously. Feedback on workshops and conference participation is very positive, and contributions by senior J4P team members at high-level international gatherings have been received enthusiastically.¹³ At the same time, the program has also received feedback indicating that knowledge products could be managed in a way that makes them more easily accessible and targeted to particular audiences. The quality of J4P publications at the country level is uneven: some are not strategic or targeted to particular audiences, and peer review procedures have not always been effective in filtering out papers that did not warrant publication. Donors reported low levels of familiarity with J4P's country work (while often mentioning a desire to expand partnership arrangements), and had difficulty describing its objective, approach, and impact.

The MTR prompted a revised strategy for knowledge management, one that takes a more proactive approach to the defining and targeting of knowledge products. While country activities remain the main source of J4P's empirical and analytical contributions, the program now has sufficient experience to develop a set of knowledge products that synthesize lessons and are aimed at general policy professionals. At the core of this strategy are four elements:

- **Practical guidance notes.** J4P will prepare notes addressing a series of methodological issues (e.g., quantitative and qualitative research, dispute tracking, monitoring and evaluation) and broader strategic concerns (understanding development effectiveness, supporting constituencies for change, and mainstreaming justice in development activities). These resources will help the donor community and practitioners develop strategies to understand the idiosyncrasies of local contexts and recommend potential approaches for developing projects that may be effective in engaging these issues.

¹³ The International Center for Transitional Justice, for example, is currently revamping its research platform along the lines of the model pioneered by J4P, while broader efforts to link J4P's approach with related initiatives in seemingly very different sectors (public financial management and primary education) have been generously financed by the United Nations University's World Institute for Development Economics Research. Presentations to senior military personnel at the US National Defense University have led to repeat invitations and insistent solicitations of contributions to their leading journal on complex operations.

- **Training.** J4P has sporadically engaged in routine and ad hoc training programs at the Bank. The program will leverage existing opportunities more systematically to engage justice and development practitioners at the Bank and beyond, and will invest in the development of modules based on the practical guidance notes.
- **Expand means of engaging the audience.** In recent months J4P has taken to the blogosphere, targeting several internal Bank sites. J4P will map additional opportunities to engage in practitioner discussions, including through USIP's *International Network to Promote the Rule of Law*.¹⁴
- **Consolidate lessons and experience.** J4P will begin to plan for a report(s) and event(s) that bring together key lessons, examples and analysis from the experience of the program over the several years of its operation. This will involve preparation of 'key note' papers that speak to particular issues and constituencies, and regional workshops drawing on the Bank's convening power to attract scholar practitioners. A concept note will be developed for review.

The program will pursue these in line with the re-articulation of J4P activities around three key operational areas (discussed in Section B.3 below) to maximize reach and integration into existing practitioner areas.

Innovation and Development

The program document anticipated that EAP-J4P's momentum and reputation would result in opportunities to expand and further develop the program. An Innovation and Development Program (within the EAP-J4P) would enable J4P to scope new initiatives, including new country activities. In this manner the PNG work was seeded, leading to an additional contribution from AusAID. The program does not presently have resources – people or funding – to respond in substantial ways to requests to expand the program. However, drawing on other Bank resources, J4P has embarked on initiatives in several countries – although in no case does this amount to a decision to establish a new 'country program'.

These engagements all draw on expertise developed through EAP countries, ranging from design and piloting of dispute resolution mechanisms (Liberia); contributions to the Bank's country strategy and a local governance and service delivery program (South Sudan); contributions to justice related activities identified through the multi-donor Post Conflict Needs Assessment (Pakistan); leadership of a Social Accountability and Legal Empowerment project, and the legal empowerment component of a health sector program (Nigeria); and joining a scoping mission on land and conflict in Mindanao (Philippines). In addition, the program has established close relations with the Bank's *Center for Conflict, Security and Development* in Nairobi, including plans to jointly hire a justice specialist. The range and number of requests for J4P assistance are likely to increase. The MTR has concluded however that there is risk that the expansion in operations will over-stretch staff and other resources, to the detriment of the more intensive task leadership and supervision required for the next phase of existing country activities. In light of this, program management will continue efforts to seek additional programmatic support from existing Bank-administered Trust Funds, bilateral partners, and Bank Budget, and will consult with

¹⁴ <http://www.inprol.org/visitorhome>

principal partners to ensure that they are comfortable with the decisions proposed by program managers.

3. Relevance: program approach, narrative and operational alignment

MTR consultations have affirmed that J4P's overarching purpose and approach remains not only relevant, but at the core of leading development thinking on justice: the promotion of legitimate and effective institutions to manage disputes and social contests that are informed by user perspectives and local dynamics. This agenda has clear resonance with the Bank's Governance and Anti-Corruption strategy, and J4P approaches have significantly informed the Bank's Justice Companion Piece to GAC II (which constitutes the Bank's Justice Strategy), which calls for problem-solving and empirically based approaches to justice reform, emphasis on equity and inclusion, and incorporating justice issues in development projects more broadly.¹⁵

The *World Development Report 2011: Security, Conflict and Development*, emphasizes the critical importance of institutions capable of addressing injustice for overcoming cycles of fragility and conflict. J4P's expertise in this area has been widely recognized within the Bank, with members of the J4P team currently leading the Bank's operationalization of the justice aspects of the WDR in close collaboration with sector departments (such as SDV) and the *Center for Security, Conflict and Development*, and responding to a significant upsurge in requests for support. The *World Development Report 2012 Gender Equality* emphasizes women's access to justice, also relying on J4P staff for both inputs and a strategy going forward. J4P's approach to justice reform has also been recognized and validated by a number of initiatives outside the Bank, including the Development Leadership Program and several of the think pieces commissioned for the AusAID Office for Development Effectiveness law and justice review.¹⁶ The *International Network on Conflict and Fragility* (a subsidiary of the OECD-DAC)¹⁷ has similarly adopted the "process approach" to justice and security reform, which, recognizing the limitations of institutional capacity building, calls for incremental approaches that focus on building relations, negotiating interests and creating space for innovation.¹⁸

However, J4P has not always been successful in making its relevance apparent to the operational side of the Bank. This, it seems, stems from difficulties in articulating the program's identity and demonstrating the value of its core work to some constituencies. The program has indeed struggled to develop a clear and concise pitch, especially given its diverse range of clients. This is perhaps not surprising given the early stage of the program and the innovative approach that it is trying to forge. The fact that J4P takes a crosscutting approach to justice also presents a challenge in articulating a clear program identity distinct from the role of other Bank departments and units. Some MTR interlocutors found J4P's narrative overly academic and theoretical; others found the program's loose congregation of activities around four themes to undermine a clear program identity. At the same time, however,

¹⁵ World Bank, "Strengthening World Bank Engagement on Governance and Anti-Corruption: Companion Pieces."

¹⁶ In particular, think pieces by Adrian Leftwich, Eric Scheye, and Otwin Marenin call for justice reform processes that focus on "locally sustainable change" (Marenin), "endogenously driven so as to ensure locally embedded legitimacy" (Leftwich), and "away from the standard institutional capacity development model and toward a problem-solving approach" (Scheye).

¹⁷ http://www.oecd.org/document/57/0,3746,en_2649_33693550_42113657_1_1_1_1,00.html

¹⁸ INCAF project on security and justice, final terms of reference of Phase 2 (13 October 2011).

demand for J4P analytics from Bank country and task teams is increasing beyond the program's capacity to respond, indicating a growing recognition of the program's relevance and added value.

It is important that the program clarifies its central narrative in terms that are readily understood within the Bank, by its prime interlocutors in the wider professional community and counterparts in the countries it works in. The program's multi-faceted identity enables it to appeal to a variety of stakeholders – operational and policy, technical and academic, government and civil society. However, MTR interlocutors amongst the Bank and AusAID have stressed that the program needs to improve its substantive coherence in order to realize its desired positive influence on the way the Bank, donors and their clients engage around issues of justice in development. Coherence can be supported by two measures: (i) by formulating a clear 'program narrative' that explains J4P's role in achieving core Bank objectives and clarifies the particular angle J4P takes on issues that cut across Bank sectors; and (ii) by streamlining program activities – and making them more 'operational'.

The program has already taken steps in this regard. Through a new knowledge management and communication strategy (see above) the program is developing a set of clear and accessible materials describing the program and its activities, and is engaging with other Bank units and task teams to demonstrate what the program has to offer. Critical to this strategy is the consolidation and re-articulation of program activities around a streamlined set of operational areas. While serving to clarify J4P value added within the Bank, this consolidation – after a period of relatively productive divergence in activities – is needed so as to make better choices in how resources are allocated, achieve greater in-depth experience in countries, and strengthen synergies across the country programs.

The MTR proposes coalescing J4P operational activities around three areas, with two cross cutting themes. Based on the MTR's review of program activities and the program's comparative advantage and value added, the following chart depicts a re-articulation of J4P's core business.

J4P is: An analytical and operational program that supports justice reform in contexts characterized by institutional fragility, legal pluralism, and acute asymmetries of power		
... across 3 operational areas ...		
Access to Justice Improving the legitimacy and accessibility of systems (formal, informal and hybrid) for the resolution of disputes and maintenance of security and social cohesion	Service Equity Improving systems for addressing grievances and increasing equity around the provision of public goods, including health, education, social protection and public works	Land / NR Governance Improving the equity and durability of processes for deal-making and contestation around land and natural resources
... and 2 cross cutting themes ...		
Gender Addressing gender as a primary source of inequity in contestation around rights and entitlements across the three operational areas	Development Effectiveness Developing tools for and assessing the extent to which the ‘program approach’ is an effective way to create durable, legitimate and equitable institutions that promote justice	
... applying a program approach that stresses ...		
Establishing an empirical basis for understanding the socio-political dynamics of grievance and dispute resolution	Promoting inclusive processes that allow demand to shape institutional reform and justice service delivery strategies in ways that respond to problems as experienced and prioritized by the poor and marginalized	Working across development sectors to incorporate issues of justice and grievance management in development initiatives

This revised program articulation will guide choices about J4P programming and facilitate integration and leveraging of Bank and other donor activities. This further provides a coherent structure for generating knowledge, cross-country learning, and analyzing program experience. The MTR proposes that country and thematic work programs reflect these operational areas. A series of concept notes are being developed to guide the program for the remainder of the duration of the EAP-J4P trust fund (2012-13). These documents, once peer reviewed, will provide the basis for allocation of resources and serve as the core instruments for evaluating progress and accountability for results through to the end of the current phase of the program. **Part C(3) provides individual country matrices** indicating how forward work programs can align across this schematic.

4. Effectiveness: client country, World Bank Group and AusAID partnership and integration

Integration in World Bank systems and procedures will enhance quality, relevance and impact. Greater attention to integration in core Bank processes will have several beneficial effects as the program consolidates around the three Operational Areas and seeks to demonstrate its effectiveness across the three dimensions of impact. It will place J4P more consistently in arenas where Bank corporate priorities are determined – in country and sector policy, economic and sector work, and lending operations. This, coupled with greater awareness of Bank systems, country operations and corporate cultures, will improve the ability of the program to draw upon Bank-wide sector expertise and non-Trust Fund resources. This will improve the near-term effectiveness of individual activities sponsored by the program, and present more opportunities to upscale and replicate program activities, thus positively impacting on the program's long term sustainability. Greater integration in Bank Country Management Unit annual Work Plan Agreements (WPAs) will also better engage country and sector managers /directors in internal peer review processes.

In response to MTR consultations, J4P's program management has agreed that country TTLs will be responsible for ensuring that J4P work-streams and products are negotiated and monitored as part of WPAs. The presence of a full time J4P coordinator in Sydney, since November (part-time since May), has and will continue to facilitate these processes and ensure that J4P is integrated in CMU strategy and initiatives. In several cases, J4P country work streams will also be deliberately negotiated as part of collaborative arrangements with on-going and proposed Bank sector work, country strategies and lending operations. J4P will also pursue additional co-hires with other Bank teams, based on the model for the Indonesia task team leader (co-hired with Social Development). These measures will not automatically result in the mainstreaming of J4P operations, but are likely to:

- i. Promote cross-sectoral exchanges on priorities and highlight opportunities to participate in sector operations;
- ii. Ensure that J4P initiatives are linked with respective sector operations, so that continuity of these activities is more assured;
- iii. Augment J4P dialogue with client governments and set J4P initiatives in the context of the Bank's country operational agreements;
- iv. Improve the robustness of peer review processes for J4P products, including concept notes and publications;
- v. Promote integration of J4P activities in the Bank's bilateral agreements with other development partners on a country basis (including donor technical and working groups); and
- vi. Ensure that the program's interests are reflected in Bank management discussions on bilateral donor trust funding.

Improved Bank integration will augment the partnership with AusAID, and the program will benefit from more deliberate efforts to maximize the partnership potential. Although J4P's links with AusAID are regular and productive, they fall short of the full array of 'partnership' engagements envisaged in the program document. AusAID and the Bank have acknowledged that to be successful, this collaboration must receive adequate and consistent financial, programmatic, administrative and leadership support from both parties.

The program document provided two mechanisms – multi-stakeholder working groups, and a regional steering committee. It was envisaged that at country and regional levels, multi-stakeholder working groups would be responsible for preparing annual activity plans, aligned around both AusAID and World Bank country assistance strategies and that, where needed, both AusAID and the World Bank would seek endorsement from country governments. AusAID's presence in these groups was also hoped to ease integration of J4P activities in AusAID country team portfolios; but as importantly, given that AusAID support to J4P is on a country by country basis as well as agency-wide, it was hoped they would provide a venue for the kind of mutual reporting and accountability not possible through the Regional Steering Committee.

The opportunity cost of *ad hoc* multi-stakeholder groups should be weighed against more practical measures, some of which currently work well, as in Solomon Islands. Closer integration with Bank processes and the measures proposed above will help revitalize the World Bank-AusAID partnership around J4P.

Additionally, it is proposed that J4P continue discussions with AusAID on the following:

- i. Establishing more regular means of communication between J4P and AusAID country posts. In particular, prior to six monthly Steering Committee meetings, consultations to review progress, plans for the forthcoming period, and reflecting these in Six-Monthly reports;
- ii. Creating an annual progress review chaired by high level officials in the World Bank and AusAID, around which a wider policy and academic audience would join a symposium on particular J4P operational areas and themes – land and natural resources governance, etc.;
- iii. Responding to AusAID's interest in arranging staff placements in J4P country work streams and J4P's participation in AusAID (and wider Australian Government) staff training;
- iv. Reaching agreement on collaborative alignments between key AusAID-supported programs and J4P. Potential examples exist in Indonesia (Law and Justice program), Timor Leste (proposed CDD operation), Solomon Islands (justice, policing), and Vanuatu (land program);
- v. Co-sponsoring regional leadership dialogues (current examples include the WDR follow-on 'regional leadership dialogue in the western Pacific'); and
- vi. Periodic seminars and learning exchanges on development effectiveness (current examples include AusAID's law and justice review).

5. Efficiency: program management and administration

Program Management is taking steps to ensure staff continuity and an appropriate balance of operational decentralization and centralized management. Program staff is spread out over eight countries, with a small secretariat in Bank headquarters. Because of the limited availability of Bank budget and the trust fund limitation on the amount that can be used for staff costs (37.91%), the program relies for the bulk of country operations on a relatively large number of Trust Funded extended and short-term consultants. This has had the advantage of bringing to the program a range of expertise not typically available to the Bank, and quite appropriately has caused the program to network with academics and professionals who, because they are not motivated by the prospect of a Bank career, are often able to expose the program to unconventional perspectives. But, similar to other fully trust funded programs, it has also been a challenge to the program's ability to provide staff continuity and to integrate and mainstream within the Bank. Program management has experienced staff turnover and shifts in responsibilities in the last year. The program has had few staff with Bank operational experience outside of J4P, and this was exacerbated by a six month lag between program managers, which coincided with the departure from the program of the task team leader for Indonesia and Timor Leste.

Over the last few months the program has addressed the staffing gap by securing an additional staff on assignment from PREM, sharing two staff with the Social Development team, and realigning task team leader responsibilities. The following points summarise additional measures that have been adopted by the program's management during the MTR.

- **Task Leadership norms and assignments:** Task Team Leadership (TTL) responsibilities will be assigned on a 'whole of country operations' basis, rather than for individual work streams within a country program. TTL responsibilities will shift to staff resident in country where it is possible to dedicate Bank budget and trust fund resources to co-term/term appointments. Where the latter measure is not possible, TTL responsibilities will be assigned to staff based in the region where their country responsibilities lie (e.g., Sydney). TTL responsibilities for the three operational areas – access to justice, equity in service delivery, and land and natural resources governance – will remain the responsibility of Bank staff, as will responsibility for work streams on gender and development effectiveness.
- **In-country staff capacity and performance:** In concert with the above measures in-country staff will receive training in core Bank procedures and operations, and more consistent technical and strategic back-up from TTLs. This will aim to improve their knowledge of 'how the Bank works'. Better knowledge of the institutional constraints and opportunities will enable them to deploy their competencies – in research, capacity building, networking and pilot-related ventures. Closer, more regular back-up from TTLs will enable the program to deliver a more consistent standard of quality, and integration with Bank systems.
- **Internal communications and building a community of practice:** The program will seek to create more regular communication and sharing among the country programs -- to overcome the geographic and time barriers that make this difficult – and to create a standing group of country and subject matter experts. J4P's forthcoming work plan will feature joint skills workshops and strategic visits by country staff to other country programs. This will have the

additional advantage of making the program less dependent on the continuity of individual personalities.

- **Quality assurance and review:** The program will renovate three critically important aspects of quality assurance.
 - i. It is proposed that the program's Steering Committee will be revamped. It was intended that the Steering Committee would provide the program with access to senior expertise and attention in AusAID and the World Bank. The Steering Committee has proven effective for administrative purposes, but is cumbersome, lacks energy and continuous engagement by senior officials, and is ineffective in serving the wider purposes of the partnership. The MTR thus proposes to revamp the Steering Committee to develop a smaller executive committee comprising Bank and AusAID staff who will be more actively engaged in reviewing progress and direction of the program, including program administration and budget. While the Steering Committee will continue to meet on a six-monthly basis, the program will engage members of the executive committee on a regular basis to provide oversight and advice on particular program developments.
 - ii. Arrangements for preparation and approval of country programs, and activities in the three operational areas, will be complemented by a standing body of internal and external advisors and peer reviewers selected to ensure quality on a country, corporate and operational area basis.
 - iii. The current M&E framework is outdated and fails to provide an adequate gauge of the relationships between activities, the pathways analysis and the operational hypothesis. This framework will be revamped as part of the preparation of Country Notes, and the program will dedicate more energy and resources to an active monitoring and evaluation program.

The program's spending curve is on track. At mid-point through the program, the rate of program-wide cumulative spending is tracking closely to projections, in which rates of spending would ramp up to FY11, plateau across FYs 12 and 13, and wind down in FY14. By December 2011 approximately 58% of the total trust fund amount has been spent (see Annex IV). The Trust Fund is providing the level of financial stability needed for effective programmatic work: that is, it avoids the stop-start effects and fragmentation that would occur should it be necessary to seek separate funding lines for each stream of work, and enables the program to accumulate professional expertise, country relationships and knowledge.

As the next phase of the program ramps up operational activities and meets increasing demand, it is necessary to build a supplemental funding strategy. The reliance on the Trust Fund was appropriate for the first phase, where the bulk of the work was analytical and coalition building, and where the crucial requirement was to establish country teams, client and Bank relationships. During the forthcoming phase it will be necessary to develop a new funding strategy for the Bank-AusAID partnership to enable the program to realise its potential expansion. The AusAID/Bank J4P program document noted that the partnership's Trust Fund would support innovation and program development, and should this potential be realised, that efforts would be needed to draw additional resources into the program to support the partnership. Program management, in consultation with AusAID will canvass three approaches to expanding funding:

- i. Increasing opportunities to use EAP Trust Fund resources to co-finance operations with other sources (such as the Japan Social Development Fund, the Governance Partnership Facility, the State Peacebuilding Fund, and potentially other bilaterally funded trust funds);
- ii. Associating through WPAs with other Bank projects, and thereby financing J4P activities through these Bank Budgeted sources; and
- iii. On a case by case basis, reaching agreements with AusAID to secure additional resources. This strategy, as anticipated at the outset of the program (and already undertaken for PNG and Solomon Islands), will further the objectives of the World Bank-AusAID partnership by leveraging resources to broaden its reach in a deeper array of activities and across a broader coalition of development partners.

The World Bank and AusAID should begin discussions on the future of the J4P partnership beyond 2013. These discussions are likely to be triggered by discussion around the J4P funding strategy (noted above). They could usefully reflect that with the program's increasing operational focus and alignment with country programs, J4P is developing activities that will go beyond the 2013 end date of the EAP-J4P trust fund. The forthcoming batch of EAP-J4P country program Concept Notes – reflecting the findings of the MTR - will identify interim outcomes for the next two years, while also looking beyond to longer term programming. This will provide an opportunity for peer-review of projects beyond the current end date of the Trust Fund. In addition, these discussions might include the increased demand for J4P engagement in non-EAP countries, in particular on the heels of the World Development Report 2011. J4P is currently seeking to meet increased demand through additional trust fund resources (Bank-Netherlands Partnership Program [for work on justice and conflict, including engagement in South Sudan and Central African Republic], State and Peacebuilding Fund [Liberia and Pakistan], and a joint secondee with the Bank's Nairobi Center on Conflict, Security and Development. The coherence of the program however depends on more predictable, program-wide funding. In looking beyond the current trust fund arrangement, J4P partners could at the same time revisit proposals to expand the partnership for non-EAP activities, in particular focused on fragile and conflict-affected states.

C. Implementing the findings

1. Summary of recommendations

The following chart summarises the state of actions recommended during the MTR process. As will be noted, actions within the remit of J4P management have already been adopted, whereas several deserve peer review and decision by World Bank and AusAID.

<i>MTR findings</i>	<i>Action items</i>	<i>Status/responsibility</i>
Program Objectives and Results Framework	Revise J4P program Results Framework to reflect benchmarks for three dimensions of impact: i) Strategic and Policy Impact ii) Operational Impact iii) End User Impact	Ongoing, program management and M&E specialist. Ongoing, reflected in Country CNs.
	Incorporate impact benchmarks in the development of country Concept Notes and work plans, and develop an active reporting system	Ongoing, M&E specialist.
Lessons learned from J4P's development effectiveness	Focus thematic expertise on country programs, and ensuring synergies across country programs: rather than special 'regional' work streams	Ongoing, program management and thematic advisors
	Drop legal pluralism and non-state justice as a separate theme	Partnership Committee
	Conclude preparation of revised knowledge management strategy	Ongoing, for review
	Continue efforts to secure additional programmatic funding for expansion of activities beyond EAP countries	J4P Management. Partnership Committee
Relevance, value-add, operational alignment and narrative	Consolidate program activities around three operational areas - land and natural resources governance, service equity, and access to justice – and two cross cutting themes – Gender, and Development Effectiveness	Partnership Committee Ongoing Subject to agreement

MTR findings	Action items	Status/ responsibility
Client country, World Bank Group and AusAID partnership and integration	Ensure J4P country program activities are fully reflected in annual World Bank Work Plan Agreements, along with collaborative agreements with on-going and proposed Bank ESW, TA and lending operations.	Ongoing, J4P management
	<p>EAP-J4P partners discuss the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Establishing more regular means of communication between J4P and AusAID country posts. In particular, prior to six monthly Steering Committee meetings, consultations to review progress, plans for the forthcoming period, and reflecting these in summative Six Month reports; ii. Creating an annual progress review chaired by high level officials in the World Bank and AusAID, around which a wider policy and academic audience would join a symposia on particular of the J4P operational areas and themes – land and natural resources governance, etc.; iii. Establishing special purpose agreements in relation to significant AusAID country projects where there exists a coincidence of interests and operations; iv. Reaching agreement on collaborative alignments between key AusAID-supported programs and J4P. Potential examples exist in Indonesia (Law and Justice program), Timor Leste (proposed CDD operation), Solomon Islands (justice, policing), and Vanuatu (land program); v. Co-sponsoring regional leadership dialogues (current examples include the WDR follow-on ‘regional leadership dialogue in the western Pacific’); and vi. Periodic seminars and learning exchanges on development effectiveness (current examples include AusAID’s law and justice review). 	Partnership Committee
Program management and administration	Develop strategy to further expand the funding base of the partnership, to include core Bank Budget, bilateral trust funds, and programmatic agreements at country level.	J4P management in consultation with Partnership Committee
	Assign TTL responsibilities on a ‘whole of country’ basis	Ongoing, J4P management
	Revise Knowledge Management Strategy to detail in-country staff training schedule	Ongoing, J4P management
	<p>Improve internal communications and community of practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Program work plan to include skills workshops, cross country exchange visits 	Ongoing, J4P management
	Revise functions and membership of Steering Committee Revamp Steering Committee, creating executive committee to review progress and direction	J4P Management; Steering Committee and Partnership Committee
	Create standing body of advisors and peer reviewers to appraise whole of country Concept Notes	J4P Management
	World Bank and AusAID consult on the future of the J4P partnership, beyond 2013 and existing EAP operations.	Partnership Committee

2. Priorities for the next two years (2012 to 2013)

Priorities for the immediate post-MTR period and into the next two years include:

- i. ***Consolidating country work streams around equity and justice in the three operational areas.*** This will be reflected in the new set of country concept notes and will continue to guide programmatic choices.
- ii. ***Preparing concept/thematic notes*** for each of the three operational areas, and cross-cutting themes of gender and development effectiveness, for the purpose of further enhancing: i) operational focus; ii) economies of scale; iii) collaboration with AusAID and Bank sector departments (e.g., mining, SEGOM; urban land SD urban); and iv) cross learning.
- iii. ***Actively participating in the development of Bank Country Assistance Strategies.*** Over the next year, these will be developed in Timor-Leste, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and PNG, and beyond EAP, in South Sudan.
- iv. ***Intensifying program investments in Bank technical assistance and operations to incorporate issues of equity and justice*** (e.g., participating in the Bank's geothermal infrastructure team in Vanuatu; developing a framework for managing land aspects of infrastructure programs in Timor Leste; informing mining technical assistance in PNG and Sierra Leone).
- v. ***Enhancing the program's M&E frameworks, evaluating country activities and disseminating lessons.***
- vi. ***Deepening attention to and understanding of gender dimensions across our work*** (with emphasis on gender outcomes in land and natural resource transactions).
- vii. ***Leveraging trust fund resources to secure additional financing for recipient executed components and Bank budget commitments.***
- viii. ***Strengthening cross country learning, distilling lessons and generating dialogue at the regional level.*** This will include regional workshops (e.g., on gender in land and natural resource governance, and on development effectiveness in law and justice reforms) and seminars (e.g., on action oriented qualitative research methods in justice, inclusion of dispute resolution and grievance redress procedures in local governance, infrastructure and CDD operations).
- ix. ***Producing a set of practical guidance notes and training modules drawing on experience from the program.***
- x. ***Publishing, to coincide with the end of the current EAP-J4P trust fund, an anthology of program learning and outcomes, across the operational areas.***

3. Indicative country work programs for the next phase of activities

The following matrices set out indicative country program activities for the next phase (2012-2013, in some cases anticipating longer term engagement). These will be fully developed in concept notes that will be subject to a consultation and peer review process. The aim here is to show how the program is seeking to implement the MTR findings around substantive coherence, strengthened integration, and more operational benchmarks of success.

Country: Vanuatu		
<i>Access to Justice</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Land / NR Governance</i>
<i>Innovations in local justice</i> - Technical assistance for the Vanuatu Law and Justice Sector Strategy (TA)	<i>Participatory processes and equity in infrastructure</i> - Lessons learned on community engagement and resettlement around infrastructure projects (AAA) - Advice on land issues as part of the task team of the geothermal project	<i>Land leasing</i> - Pilot an operational model for provision of advisory services to landholders - Foster innovation in relation to processes of group decision making with regard to land dealings, including through a case study focused on women's role - Support continued policy dialogue on land leasing recommendations in final policy note, play a convening role (TA) <i>Peri/urban land</i> - Undertake scoping mission to identify entry points to build stakeholder coalitions for more equitable management of urban state land (AAA)
Strategy and operational linkages		
- CAS FY12 - AusAID Legal Sector Strengthening Project (Stretem Rod Blong Jastis) - AusAID/NZ land project (Mama Graon) - WB-funded geothermal energy project		

Country: Solomon Islands		
<i>Access to Justice</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Land / NR Governance</i>
<i>Justice Delivered Locally</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pilot linkages between community officers and Provincial government to enhance local dispute mediation and resolution - Policy dialogue at national level on local justice service provision (TA) 	<i>Rural Development Program</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contribute to Bank analytical work (ESW) to inform the second phase of the RDP around issues of local dispute and grievance redress systems 	<i>Advisory services for communal landholders</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pilot provision of advisory services to landholders in L/NR transactions with investors <i>Peri/urban land</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaborate with UNHABITAT, AusAID and World Bank urban specialists to support the Task Force on urban land governance (TA)
<i>Strategy and operational linkages</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAS FY12 - RAMSI and AusAID Law & Justice programs - RDP II preparatory ESW - WB-funded Tina River Hydro project 		

Country: Papua New Guinea		
<i>Access to Justice</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Land / NR Governance</i>
<i>Policy dialogue on crime and justice</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Socio-economic costs of crime and violence study (with Bank Social Development) (AAA) - Analysis of data on disputes in national household survey (AAA) 	<i>Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Program preparatory studies</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of local governance and accountability processes to contribute to RSDLGP preparation and implementation (ESW/TA) 	<i>Equity in mining agreements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of implementation of benefit-sharing agreements with a particular focus on processes and outcomes for women to contribute to SEGOM mining (TA)
<i>Strategy and operational linkages</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAS FY12/13 - Rural Service Delivery and Local Governance Program – RSDLGP - SEGOM's mining technical assistance project 		

Country: Timor Leste		
<i>Access to Justice</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Land / NR Governance</i>
	<p><i>Participatory processes and equity in infrastructure and public works</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grievance redressal and equity in infrastructure development through a recipient executed facility - Analysis of government contracting, small and large scale infrastructure projects. (AAA) 	<p><i>Urban State Land</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Urban land mapping to provide basis for policy discussion about tenure security for IDPS and the poor (AAA) <p><i>Land Policy and Administration</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stakeholder mapping and coalition building to promote effective land policy and administration (AAA) – Technical assistance regarding the law on community land (timing likely to be dependent on the passage of the Land Law) (TA)
<i>Strategy and operational linkages</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CAS FY12 - Roads investment projects funded by IDA, ADB, JICA - Potential CDD operation (AUSAID) 		

Country: Indonesia		
<i>Access to Justice</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Land / NR Governance</i>
<p><i>Legal Aid</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical assistance on implementation of the Legal Aid Bill by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights - Facility to scale up capacity of legal aid and paralegal organizations to provide services under the government legal aid scheme and to facilitate access to justice on select high value issues 	<p><i>Corruption and complaints handling in PNPM</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facility to build structures and capacity for prosecution of corruption within PNPM 	
<i>Strategy and operational linkages</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnership Support Facility for PNPM - AusAID Law and Justice program - UNDP, USAID and other donor support to the National Access to Justice Strategy 		

Country: Sierra Leone		
<i>Access to Justice</i>	<i>Service Delivery</i>	<i>Land / NR Governance</i>
<i>Paralegals</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Technical assistance on the nationwide scale up of paralegal services, including evaluation and their use to bolster the delivery of other basic services 	<i>Decentralized delivery of health services</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guiding the randomized implementation and evaluation of a range of accountability mechanisms to improved the delivery of basic health services 	<i>Extractives governance</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contributions to the drafting and implementation of regulations in the mining sector - Advice on the nascent extractives industry transparency regime
<i>Strategy and operational linkages</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decentralized Services Delivery Project II - Extractive Industries Technical Assistance Project - PRSP preparation FY12/13 		

Annexes

Annex I: Terms of Reference for a Mid-Term Review

Background

Justice for the Poor (J4P) is a World Bank analytical and operational program that aims to support justice and governance reform processes in contexts where institutional fragility, legal plurality, and asymmetries of power and authority are pronounced. A crucial premise of the program is an appreciation that issues of law and justice cut across all sectors of economic life, and that an engagement with the dynamics of existing rule systems and the relationships of power that underpin them is a prerequisite to equitable development. In its current phase (2008-2012), the program's engagement strategy has three essential features.

First, the program invests in **country activities**: Piloted in Indonesia (2002) and Cambodia (2005), J4P established country programs in Sierra Leone (2007), Kenya (2007) and Nigeria (2010). Pursuant to a trust fund established by AusAID, J4P opened an East Asia Pacific regional program (EAP-J4P), including country work in Timor Leste, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu, to run for the period 2008-2012.¹⁹

Second, the program supports **thematic analytic and advisory work** that draws together comparative country knowledge on a sub/regional basis to both inform country activities and contribute to establishing global professional 'communities of practice'. EAP-J4P has prioritized four themes: land and natural resource governance; gender equality; legal pluralism; and development effectiveness. An additional theme, paralegalism, is the subject of a 5-country study.

Third, the program applies a particular **programmatic approach** to the above two features, through which it supports and influences the design and outcomes of local justice and governance reforms:

- a) **Investing in research and influencing policy dialogue and operational activities**: J4P supports inclusive stakeholder policy dialogue on the basis of a verifiable, empirically grounded knowledge base of the dynamics of local level decision making and dispute resolution processes, in ways that promote the voice and interests of people who are typically marginalized from such decisions and processes.
- b) **Enhancing the capacity of local agencies to conduct policy research and influence reforms**. J4P establishes partnerships with government, research and non-government agencies to enable them to source and apply the skills necessary to determine priorities, conduct research and be effective in policy and operational activities.
- c) **Designing, implementing and evaluating results-oriented operations**. J4P directly pilots the application of evidence gained through research and contributes to the activities of client governments, regional bodies and donors focused on economic growth, equity and conflict management. J4P specifically partners with other World Bank teams to incorporate analytics and pilot initiatives aimed at increasing the effectiveness and equity of those programs.
- d) **Contributing to global dialogue on pro-poor justice issues**. J4P draws on the experience gained to prepare high quality research products and presentations to share knowledge in ways that impact on global justice and governance reform policies and practices of development agencies.

In essence, the program's '*operational hypothesis*' is that by creating an empirically verifiable knowledge base of local contests (for instance, around Land/Natural Resources and Gender Equity), and by engaging local actors (governmental, civil and commercial) in this process, it is possible to support innovative institutional arrangements

¹⁹ Operations under this Trust Fund became effective in 2009, and an extension of the term through 2013 has been finalized with AusAID.

– both directly through J4P activities, and indirectly, through influencing the policies and operations of other agencies - whereby more equitable societal contest and dispute resolution may be achieved. Further, it is presumed that this evidence base, coupled with the mobilization of demand, successful demonstration through pilot activities, and by fostering thematic communities of practice, will have a positive impact on practice, and thus ensure the program's wider influence.

These TORs define the purpose, scope, method of working, tasks, assignments and expected results of a Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the J4P program. The scope of the MTR will primarily focus on EAP-J4P (this being the approximate mid-point of the AusAID trust fund, which supports much of the EAP program), but will also consider experience in Cambodia, Kenya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone and elsewhere.

Purpose of the MTR

The MTR has three primary purposes:

1. To enhance J4P's objectives program-wide, thematically, and on a country basis by reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of the diverse range of program activities against their goals, impact, and the program's operational hypothesis.
2. To ensure these objectives give direction to current and future J4P activities, and that these are adequately supported by management, budgets, expertise, and monitoring, evaluation and reporting arrangements, both within the World Bank and with key partners.
3. To enhance J4P's strategic positioning within the Bank (in country programs and at HQ), and within the global development community, and to consider options for J4P continuation beyond the life of the trust fund, as well as expansion into different regional and thematic areas.

MTR Methodology

Although the MTR will draw systematically on the results of the J4P's M&E system, the MTR is not primarily intended to serve as an independent evaluation. Rather, as anticipated in the M&E Framework (August 2010) and evident in the statement of MTR purposes, the MTR provides the first opportunity for program-wide reflection on experience to date, leading where needed, to a recasting and refocusing of activities, so as to establish a firm and commonly endorsed set of priorities for the remaining period of the program.

Consequently, the MTR methodology is designed to emulate the program's action research/learning and participatory approach. This requires that the consultations and analysis integral to the MTR will occur in different ways in different country contexts. A core MTR team will be responsible for coordinating and facilitating active engagement by teams working on a country or thematic basis. In turn, the leaders of these teams will define appropriate ways through which they will consult with key counterparts in government, civil society or the donor community. In some cases, the nature of on-going team work will not require special purpose consultations for the purposes of the MTR, whereas in other cases, the MTR itself will present a point of focus around which systematic consultation will occur – see in particular, Step 1, below.

The MTR will also provide structured opportunities for counterpart agencies, sector specialists and country managers within the Bank and AusAID to contribute. The MTR will also be advised and critiqued by an Internal Review Group and an External Advisory Group – respectively comprised of stakeholders in J4P, and by people independent of these interests.

The MTR will be organized around three steps. The first step involves reflection and documentation by country teams and thematic leaders on experience and progress to date, and preparation by them of indicative proposals for the future. The second step will involve a consultative review of these products and preparation of a program review document by the core MTR team. The third step will engage the J4P teams and the Internal and External

advisory groups in discussions around the program review document, and will ultimately produce a final MTR report.

Step 1: Country, Thematic and Programmatic Reflection:

Drawing on the above materials, Step 1 will involve six kinds of activities/products designed to contribute to subsequent steps in the MTR.

1. **Evaluation Summary.** J4P's M&E Framework generates six monthly reports to provide a common point of focus to meetings of the Steering Committee. The forthcoming six monthly report will serve the dual purpose of an Evaluation Summary as an input to the MTR. This will reflect on the four Outcome areas detailed in the program approach (as above) via the cross cutting general evaluation criteria of i) relevance, ii) effectiveness, iii) efficiency and management and iv) sustainability. Additional reflection will be provided on the functionality of the M&E framework/system. The cross cutting evaluation criterion of 'gender' will be examined through a Thematic Note (see below).
2. **Country Review Notes.** Country teams (Indonesia, Timor Leste, PNG, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Nigeria and Sierra Leone) led by the TTLs, prepare a 5 page note '*Country Reflection Note*.' This document will be produced following (1) a process of facilitated reflection among the country team; and (2) external stakeholder consultations. To the extent possible, country team reflections should reference the four outcome areas of the program approach (above) and be developed in conjunction with the country strategic planning processes that will result in a new set of program concept notes.

The Country Review Notes will cover the following points²⁰:

- a. Country context:
What is the country context with respect to justice and development priorities. What are the key binding constraints and how are these binding in relation to particular economic, social and political outcomes?
- b. Priority issues, and why: What has been done, and why?
What are the principal issues the program has been dealing with?
Why are these issues important? Answers to each question will be illustrated by one short example.
- c. Experience gained and lessons learned: What seems to work, what doesn't, and why?
 - What seems to have worked and why? *Have our activities had the desired outcome (as articulated in the results framework)? Do these outcomes appear to be durable? Have they had unexpected outcomes – positive or negative? Give examples.*
 - What has gone less well, and why? *To what extent does this reflect factors beyond the reasonable control of the program, and/or shortcomings in the way program activities, resources and linkages/partnerships have been managed?*
 - In what ways and why have we shifted course? *Shifts in course are to be expected, and can be an indication of effective program learning. What shifts have occurred, what has prompted these (e.g. resource constraints, change in circumstances (including gov't requests, other political factors etc., new analysis of what can and cannot produce positive influence, etc.)*
 - Lessons learned?
-- about operational modalities – e.g. partnerships with NGOs, with gov't, with other bank teams

²⁰ In drafting responses to these questions, they should be used as guides for reflection, and efforts should avoid suppressing divergent views – important is to point to the complexity and challenges, in a way that illuminates larger programmatic issues for J4P – whether these be managerial, conceptual or operational. Reflection Notes are different from Concept Notes/Papers that detail the way forward for particular lines of work. Note these same points apply for the Thematic Notes – see below.

- etc; resources; our comparative advantages*
- about the theories of change underlying our activities*
- about the nature of the issues we seek to address*
- about risks and other challenges*
- about the translation of research into operational activities*
- about abilities to scale-up*
- about the extent to which J4P's four Outcome areas are reasonably within the scope of a program of the present scale and capacity to achieve*

d. Priority Activities: Looking forward.

*Given the experience and lessons learned, what should be the priorities of the country program?
Is the knowledge base sufficient to program these priorities?
What resources are needed, do we have them, how would we mobilize them?
What partnership agreements are needed/intended to support these activities?*

e. J4P as a program:

A goal of the MTR is to enhance the 'clarity of purpose' of the program as a whole. How would you describe the overarching objective of the country program? How does that relate to the overarching objectives of J4P as a regional program, and a global one?

The MTR core team will assist country teams with this exercise and ensure that notes are comparable across the program.

3. **Thematic Reflection Notes:** The MTR will review the conceptual clarity, progress with ongoing activities and forward proposals across the following themes, and consider ways in which these themes might be adjusted and/or reprioritized, more effectively inform country strategies and operations, and better project this experience in regional foras or communities of practice: land and natural resource governance; gender; legal pluralism; development effectiveness. TTLs and theme specialists will prepare 3-5 page 'Thematic Reflection Notes' which:

a. Interpret the Brief:

Revisit the rationale, objectives and scope and indicative areas of engagement for each theme (Annex B, J4P Program Document, March 2008) and provide a contemporary account of how these have been, or may now be, interpreted.

b. Explain Choices:

Recognizing (as in the J4P Program Document) that initial thematic commitments were 'indicative', explain how choices were made in relation to the program outcomes with respect to the emphasis given to programmatic work in different country activities, cross country/sub-regional comparative work and partnerships, and contributions to donor/professional practice.

c. Propose Priorities:

In light of experience to date, the TTL's knowledge of country priorities, regional and wider community of practice opportunities, propose a limited set of priorities through the remainder of the program.

d. Tasking and Resourcing:

Indicate the resources (budget, expertise) needed, the partnerships required and practical results that seem feasible in the remaining program period.

4. **Case illustrations: 'J4P at work'.** The above tasks/products will help prepare the way for detailed reflection on country and thematic experiences, and achieving greater clarity of purpose and practical tasking for the future. Achieving a common sense of purpose, along with a better appreciation of the opportunities and constraints will also be aided by program-wide reflection on particular 'case experiences'. Two page summaries of three such cases will be documented during Step 1 to illustrate the constraints, successes and

ongoing challenges in relation to the program's 'operational hypothesis' (as above) and will be used to stimulate review during Step 3 of conceptual, operational and management lessons from experience/future proposals.

5.
 - a. Cambodia - Engaging with Disputes around Land and Labor: Though not funded under the AusAID EAP initiative, the J4P program has been engaged in Cambodia focusing on disputes around land and labor since 2005. This has involved significant analytical outputs and membership of task teams working on the IDA funded DFGG and LMAP projects. This experience is considered instructive in relation to the opportunities and risks associated with J4P programming at the Bank, particularly as the latter project was prematurely cancelled and subject to a highly contentious complaint to the inspection panel in the 2nd half of 2009.
 - b. Indonesia: Women's identity, legal empowerment and systemic responses: J4P's 'Women's Legal Empowerment' pilot program identified legal identity constraints for female headed households to access state services and benefits. This issue was effectively advocated by a partner NGO in select districts which put additional money into circuit courts. It was also taken up by partners in an AusAID funded program, who conducted court surveys to understand the scale and nature of the problem, and facilitated the sharing of demand-side data from the NGO. The result has been a dramatic increase in funding by the Supreme Court for circuit courts, court fee waivers, and more recently, legal aid services – significantly, drawing on government's own revenue sources.
 - c. Solomon Islands: Urban land, just in time advice hinged to Bank-wide strategy and analytic work: J4P has been instrumental in refocusing policy dialogue around land management in Solomon Islands; from a focus on the reform of the customary domain of rural land, to the administration of urban land. It has done this by three principal means: by closely aligning program activities with the Bank's Interim Strategy Note; through active participation in PREM analytic work on economic growth and conflict; and providing credible, 'just in time policy advice' that is aligned with the incentives faced by government counterparts.
6. **Global Dialogue Reflection Note**: The program's fourth Outcome area is to impact on global (and regional) justice and governance reform policies and practices. This Outcome implies that knowledge products and their delivery are guided by a strategic sense of the venues, instruments and actors where key policies are discussed and operational priorities are set. This Note will a) identify the implicit/explicit global and regional policy and operational audiences and venues targeted by J4P to date, b) survey and propose such audiences and venues where efforts could be better focused, and c) survey selected external partners and stakeholders from the global development community to gauge their perceptions of J4P, the extent to which they value and are influenced by J4P's work, and will outline proposals to enhance J4Ps engagement in global dialogue. (5 pages max).
7. **J4P Institutional and Strategic Position Note**: This paper will aim to review the program's i) strategic relevance to Bank sector and global priorities (e.g. operationalizing the WDR), ii) current institutional position with respect to its home department LEG, the sectors to which it links most closely, and CMU, and iii) options for modifying its institutional position with a view toward more effective integration with Bank strategic priorities and institutional processes. This will include assessment of how J4P both aligns with and expands institutional priorities, J4P's integration with Bank systems and procedures, and a summary of budget and staffing compared to other Bank programs. Such an assessment is necessary for considering the program's future beyond the life of the AusAID TF.

Producing this note will involve consulting with selected Bank stakeholders, including TTLs, CMs, CDs, and anchor teams to gauge their perceptions of J4P's institutional and strategic position, including examples of both well and poorly managed integration. It will also involve a summary review of budgets and staffing against operations, and analytical products. Particular attention will be paid to examining the potential role of J4P in operationalizing the WDR 2011. (5 pages)

Step 2: Program Review Note

This step will consist of three parts:

1. The MTR core team will prepare a 10-page Program Review Note that takes into account the input documents prepared in Step 1, seeking clarification or supplementation where necessary. The Program Review Note will summarize and highlight core themes from the reflection notes, and will propose ways forward that address the three MTR purposes.
2. Consultation with the Internal and External Advisory groups around the Program Review Note.
3. Preparation for Step 3, including presentation and facilitation materials for the J4P team workshop.

Step 3: Program-wide Consultation, Review and Planning

Step 3 will involve three consecutive activities:

- a) A J4P 'team workshop', which will involve the MTR core team, the J4P Management Team, TTLs, and country and thematic coordinators. We will i) discuss the Program Review Note at large, and workshop selected products from Step 1, and ii) review strategies for implementing accepted proposals on the country, regional and programmatic levels.
- b) Following the workshop, the MTR core team will prepare a final MTR Report that will encompass the revised Program Review Note and implementation strategies. TTLs, country and thematic coordinators will review/finalize programmatic concept notes to reflect the outcomes of the MTR. Consultation will occur with the Internal and External Advisory groups to provide peer review of the MTR Report/Program Review Note.
- c) The MTR core team will develop an outreach plan to present the MTR Report to internal and external stakeholders.

Annex II: MTR Background Papers

Country Reflection Notes

- Indonesia Country Reflection Note
- Papua New Guinea Reflection Note
- Sierra Leone Country Reflection Note
- Solomon Islands Country Reflection Note
- Timor-Leste Country Reflection Note
- Vanuatu Country Reflection Note
- Nigeria Country Reflection Note

Thematic Reflection Notes

- Gender Reflection Note
- Land and Natural Resource Governance Reflection Note
- Development Effectiveness Reflection Note

Case Illustration Notes

- Cambodia Case Illustration (discussing J4P's early work in Cambodia around access to justice and more recent work around land governance)
- Indonesia Case Illustration (discussing the program's work with PEKKA in Indonesia)
- Solomon Islands Case Illustration (discussing the program's work around public land governance)

Other Notes

- Global Dialogue Note (discussing the program's experience and effectiveness in engaging the global development community around issues of justice reform)
- Strategic Positioning Note (surveying key members of the World Bank and outlining recommendations for better integration into Bank processes)

Annex III: J4P Knowledge Products (2009-2011)

Policy Pieces and Books

- Rea Abada Chiongson, Deval Desai, Teresa Marchiori, and Michael Woolcock, *Role of Law and Justice in Achieving Gender Equality*, World Development Report Background Paper 2011 (Background paper for the World Development Report 2012: Gender, Equality and Development)
- Caroline Sage and Deval Desai, *Justice*, Security and Justice Thematic Paper 2011 (Background paper to the World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development)
- Bernard Harborne and Caroline Sage, *Security and Justice*, Security and Justice Thematic Paper 2011 (Background paper to the World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development)
- Doug Porter, Sinclair Dinnen, and Caroline Sage, *Conflict in Melanesia*, Case Study 2011 (Background paper to the World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development)
- Caroline Sage, Brian Tamanaha and Michael Woolcock eds., *Legal Pluralism and Development Policy: Scholars and Practitioners in Dialogue*, Cambridge University Press (forthcoming 2012)
- Deborah Isser ed., *Customary Justice and the Rule of Law in War-Torn Societies*, USIP Press 2011
- Peter Albrecht, Helene Maria Kyed, Deborah Isser, and Erica Harper eds., *Perspectives on Involving Non-State and Customary Actors in Justice and Security Reform*, International Development Law Organization 2011
- Patrick Barron, Rachael Diprose and Michael Woolcock, *Contesting Development: Participatory Projects and Local Conflict Dynamics in Indonesia*, Yale University Press 2011

Published Chapters and Journal Articles

- Deval Desai, Deborah Isser, and Michael Woolcock, "Rethinking Justice Reform in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States: The Capacity of Development Agencies and Lessons from Liberia and Afghanistan," in *World Bank Legal Review*, Volume 3 2011
- Tanja Chopra and Deborah Isser, "Women's Access to Justice, Legal Pluralism and Fragile States," in *Perspectives on Involving Non-State and Customary Actors in Justice and Security Reform*, International Development Law Organization 2011
- Daniel Adler, and Michael Woolcock, "Justice without the Rule of Law? The Challenge of Rights-Based Industrial Relations in Contemporary Cambodia," in Colin Fenwick and Tonia Novitz (eds.) *Human Rights at Work: Perspectives on Law and Regulation* Oxford: Hart Publishing 2010
- Vivek Maru, "Allies Unknown: Social Accountability and Legal Empowerment" *Harvard Journal of Health and Human Rights*, Vol.12, No.1 2010
- Caroline Sage, Nicholas Menzies, and Michael Woolcock, "Taking the Rules of the Game Seriously: Mainstreaming Justice in Development" in Stephen Golub (ed.) *Legal Empowerment: Practitioners' Perspectives*, International Development Law Organization 2010
- Samuel Clark and Matthew Stephens, "Reducing Injustice? A Grounded Approach to Strengthening Hybrid Justice Systems: Lessons from Indonesia," in Janine Ubink (ed.) *Customary Justice: Perspectives on Legal Empowerment*, International Development Law Organization 2011.

Select Justice for the Poor Publications (for a comprehensive listing of publications by country and topic, see www.worldbank.org/justiceforthe poor (publications))

- Daniel Evans, Michael Goddard with Don Paterson, *The Hybrid Courts of Melanesia: A Comparative Analysis of Village Courts of Papua New Guinea, Island Courts of Vanuatu and Local Courts of Solomon Islands*, Justice and Development Working Paper Series No.13/2011
- Zahid Hasnain, Philip Keefer and Nicholas Menzies, *How Capital Projects are Allocated in Papua New Guinean Villages: The Influence of Local Collective Action, Local –Level Institutions, and Electoral Politics*, Research Report, August 2011

- Cate Sumner and Matt Zurstrassen, with Leisha Lister, *Increasing Access to Justice for Women, the Poor, and Those Living in Remote Areas: An Indonesian Case Study*, Briefing Note Volume 6 Issue 2, March 2011
- Shaun Williams, *Public Land Governance in Solomon Islands*, Briefing Note Volume 6 Issue 1, February 2011
- David Butterworth and Pamela Dale, *Local Governance and Community Development Initiatives: Contributions for Community Development Initiatives in Timor-Leste*, Research Report, July 2011
- Milena Stefanova, *Leasing in Vanuatu: Findings and Community Dissemination on Epi Island* Briefing Note Volume 5 Issue 4, November 2010
- *Policy Options for Regulating Community Property and Community Protection Zones in Timor-Leste*, October 2010
- Raewyn Porter and Rod Nixon, *Wan Lis, Fulap Stori: Leasing on Epi Island, Vanuatu*, Research Report, September 2010
- Rebecca Monson, *Women, State Law and Land in Peri-Urban Settlements on Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands*, Briefing Note Volume 4 Issue 3, April 2010
- David Butterworth and Pamela Dale, *Redefining Local Governance through Development Initiatives: Contributions for the Youth Development Program* (Timor Leste) March 2010
- Andrew Harrington and Tanja Chopra, *Arguing "Traditions": Denying Kenya's Women Access to Land Rights*, Research Report, January 2010
- Tanja Chopra, *Justice Versus Peace in Northern Kenya*, Justice and Development Working Paper Series No. 4/2009
- Pamela Dale, *Delivering Justice to Sierra Leone's Poor: An Analysis of the Work of Timap for Justice*, Research Report, November 2009
- Varun Gauri, *How Do Local-Level Legal Institutions Promote Development? An Exploratory Essay*, Justice and Development Working Paper Series No. 6/2009
- *Forging the Middle Ground: Engaging Non-State Justice in Indonesia*, Justice for the Poor Program and World Bank Social Development Unit, 2008

Blogs:

- Vivek Maru, 'For the Sake of Fairness: Justice in Development,' World Bank Governance for Development Blog 2011
- Michael Woolcock, 'The Importance of Time and Trajectories in Understanding Project Effectiveness,' World Bank Development Impact Blog 2011
- Michael Woolcock, 'Development Practitioners: Technocrats, Missionaries or Diplomats?' World Bank Governance for Development Blog 2011
- Nicholas Menzies, 'Why don't we see social accountability in the Pacific?' World Bank East Asia Pacific on the Rise Blog 2011

Conferences and Workshops:

- 12th Conference of the Pacific Islands Political Studies Association (PIPSA), December 8-9, 2011, Apia, Western Samoa (J4P Vanuatu staff member Leisande Otto presented on "Exploring Hybrid Justice: The Operations of Island Courts in Vanuatu")
- *Innovations and Empowerment for Development*, The World Bank Legal Department's Law, Justice and Development Week 2011 (the Justice for the Poor program hosted discussions on justice in conflicted-affected states and women's access to justice)
- *Pacific Judicial Development Program Regional Conference*, October 2011 (Justice for the Poor program Vanuatu coordinator presented to Pacific Chief Justices and PJDP coordinators on the work of the J4P program)

- *State-Supported Community Justice Workshop*, Justice for the Poor Program, October 26-28, 2011 (J4P convened an international workshop on state-supported community justice systems in Honiara, Solomon Islands)
- *Justice, Conflict, and Development*, University of Sydney Law School, Sydney, Australia, September 15, 2011 (J4P convened conference on justice, conflict and development)
- *Law and Culture Conference*, University of the South Pacific, August 29-31, 2011 (Jastis Blong Evriwan in support of the Ministry of Justice & Community Services' review of the Law and Justice Sector Strategy hosted a practitioners panel on "Exploring Hybrid Justice: How can we make it work")
- *World Justice Forum III*, Barcelona, Spain, June 20-23, 2011 (J4P presented on engagement in Vanuatu)
- *Conference on Rule of Law Promotion and Security Sector Reform (SSR)*, Hague Institute for the Internationalization of Law (HiIL), The Netherlands, 28 and 29 April 2011 (J4P presented a paper on justice, conflict and development)
- *Justice in the Round: Perspectives from Custom and Culture, Rights, and Dispute Resolution*, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand, April 18-20, 2011 (J4P presented on customary land ownership in Vanuatu)
- *Development Leadership Program: Leaders, Elites and Coalitions Research & Policy Workshop* Frankfurt, March 10-11, 2011 (J4P discussed role of politics in development)
- *Bringing Justice to the Poor. A Socio-Legal Look at Bottom-Up Law and Development*, February 7-8, 2011. Organized by the University of Amsterdam, Leiden University and International Development Law Organization (J4P discussed legal empowerment and legal pluralism)
- *Asia Pacific Rule of Law Conference*, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, January 26-28, 2011 (J4P participated in working group session on Protecting Land Rights and shared research findings on land leasing in Vanuatu)
- *United Nations Dialogue with Member States on Rule of Law at the International Level*, UN New York, September 2010 (J4P staff drafted submission presented by the Deputy General Counsel of the World Bank)
- *Law and Culture: Meaningful Legal Pluralism Conference*, Port Vila Vanuatu, August/September 2010 (Co-sponsored by J4P with the University of the South Pacific and the University of Otago, including a dedicated J4P session on 'Customary Groups and the Formal Economy' covering findings from J4P research in Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Timor-Leste)
- *Customary Justice and Legal Pluralism in Post-Conflict and Fragile States Conference*, George Washington University, November 17/18, 2009, (Co-organized by George Washington University, the United States Institute of Peace, and the Justice for the Poor program)
- *Engaging Law in Context – A Justice for the Poor Symposium*, Indonesia, June/July 2009 (discussing the practical challenges of designing and implementing reforms in three areas – the justice sector, land and natural resources, and women's empowerment)

Trainings

- *Rule of Law Practitioner's Course*, USIP December 2011 (module on legal pluralism)
- *Land, Property and Conflict Course*, United States Institute of Peace and International Organization on Migration, October 11-14, 2011 (J4P presented on "Land, Property and Conflict" and on "Taking Host Mining Communities into Account")
- *Qualitative Research Workshop*, Port Vila, Vanuatu, Feb 14-16, 2011
- *Qualitative Research Training Workshop*, Honiara, Solomon Islands, Jan 17-21, 2011
- *Recent Developments in Justice Reform at the Bank*, The World Bank Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network (PREM)-week course
- *Researching Justice DEC-LEG Seminar*, World Bank Washington DC, June 2010
- *Quantitative and Qualitative Research Training*, PNG 2010
- *Social Network Analysis training for field researchers*, Timor Leste March 2011.

Annex IV: Budget

Justice for the Poor Funding as of December 15, 2011					
Country	Total Amount	TF Name	Donor Name	Funds Spent	Funds Remaining
AusAID Funding					
Timor Leste	1,982,036	State-Building at the Local Level	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$882,103.77	\$501,245.97
		Customary Systems of Land Management and Rural Development Timor Leste	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$598,686.26	
Vanuatu	2,335,316	Vanuatu Land Sector Framework Technical Assistance	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$622,217.38	\$1,094,516.13
		Vanuatu Law and Justice Sector Strategy Technical Assistance	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$618,582.49	
Solomon Islands	1,513,600	J4P - SI - Justice Delivered Locally	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$743,730.41	\$451,817.94
		Doing Business in the Context of Customary Authority	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$318,051.65	
Indonesia	1,750,898	Supporting the Implementation of Indonesia National Strategy on Access to Justice	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$479,057.92	\$1,170,504.34
		Promoting Development Effectiveness MCLE Qualitative Baseline	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$101,335.74	
Papua New Guinea	375,000	Resource Distribution and Benefit Sharing Research PNG	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$253,161.46	\$121,838.54
Regional Knowledge Management	1,078,200	Regional Knowledge Sharing Program	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$878,640.88	\$199,559.12
Regional Advisory Work	100,000	Regional Advisory Work EAPJ4P	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$99,467.01	\$532.99
Regional Land Work	739,100	Engaging with Land and Natural Resources in context of Legal Pluralism	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$402,265.87	\$336,834.13
Regional M&E Work	400,000	EAP-J4P Monitoring & Evaluation	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$133,348.11	\$266,651.89
Regional Gender Work	689,100	EAP-J4P Gender Program	AusAID EAPJ4P	\$217,841.94	\$471,258.06
Total Allocated AusAID Funds				AusAID Funds Spent	AusAID Funds Remaining
10,963,250				\$6,348,490.89	\$4,614,759.11

Other Sources of Funding					
Sierra Leone and Nigeria Program	125,000	<i>Access to Justice for the Poor</i>	Japan - Ministry of Finance	\$20,219.92	\$2,633,793.05
	2,534,655.00	<i>Nigeria Access to Justice for the Poor</i>	Japan - Ministry of Finance	\$500,000.00	
	400,000	<i>Legal empowerment Approaches to realizing the rights to Health, Water and Education in Nigeria and Sierra Leone</i>	Multiple Donors	\$155,642.03	
	250,000	<i>Evaluating Social Accountability and Legal Empowerment for Health Services in Nigeria and Sierra Leone</i>	The Trust Fund for Environmentally & Socially Sustainable Development (TFESSD)	\$0.00	
Timor Leste	300,000	<i>Timor Leste - Legal & Social Accountability EFO</i>	Irish Aid	15,256.28	\$284,743.72
Timor Leste	\$95,000.00	<i>Women's Participation in Community Investor Negotiations on Land and Rural Dev.</i>	GAP Trust Fund	\$91,577.05	\$3,422.95
Sierra Leone, Kenya, South Africa, Indonesia, Philippines	288,397.39	<i>Community Based Paralegals and Demand for Good Governance</i>	Netherlands - Minister for European Affairs & International Cooperation	\$288,397.39	\$0.00
Global	428,414.00	<i>BNPP-Fragility and Conflict: Developing the Client Expertise in Justice, Security and the Rule of Law in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations</i>	Netherlands - Minister for European Affairs & International Cooperation	\$21,992.76	\$406,421.24
Global	500,000.00	<i>BNPP - Joint 1 Million USD Project with AFTCS</i>	Netherlands - Minister for European Affairs & International Cooperation	\$0.00	\$500,000.00
Indonesia	1,996,047.00	<i>Building Public Demand for Legal and Judicial Reform Project</i>	The Netherlands	\$1,996,047.00	\$0.00
Global	49,000	<i>Community Justice: Melanesian, African and South-East Asian Exchange</i>	World Bank South South Exchange	\$41,939.26	\$7,060.74
Total Other Funding				Total Other Funds Spent	Total Other Funds Remaining
\$6,966,513.39				\$3,131,071.69	\$3,835,441.70

<i>Total Trust Fund Contribution from AusAID</i>	11,535,000
<i>Less 5% World Bank Administration Fee</i>	576,750
<i>Less World Bank Set Up Fee</i>	35,000
<i>Total AusAID Trust Fund</i>	10,923,250