

Date:5 December 2003

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

FS/NIR/01/R16 Strengthening judicial integrity and capacity

Thematic area: Corruption

NIGERIA

Report of the Evaluator

Paul Williams
Research Scholar School of
Social Sciences Australian
National University Canberra

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME

Vienna

Disclaimer

Independent Project Evaluations are scheduled and managed by the project managers and conducted by external independent evaluators. The role of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) in relation to independent project evaluations is one of quality assurance and support throughout the evaluation process, but IEU does not directly participate in or undertake independent project evaluations. It is, however, the responsibility of IEU to respond to the commitment of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in professionalizing the evaluation function and promoting a culture of evaluation within UNODC for the purposes of accountability and continuous learning and improvement.

Due to the disbandment of the Independent Evaluation Unit (IEU) and the shortage of resources following its reinstatement, the IEU has been limited in its capacity to perform these functions for independent project evaluations to the degree anticipated. As a result, some independent evaluation reports posted may not be in full compliance with all IEU or UNEG guidelines. However, in order to support a transparent and learning environment, all evaluations received during this period have been posted and as an on-going process, IEU has begun re-implementing quality assurance processes and instituting guidelines for independent project evaluations as of January 2011.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
EXPLANATORY NOTES	9
INTRODUCTION	10
A. Background	10
B. Scope and purpose.....	10
C. Methodology	10
D. Limitations	11
I. PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN.....	12
A. Overall assessment	12
B. Problem analysis, objectives and achievement indicators	13
C. Outputs, activities and inputs	15
D. Executing modality and managerial arrangements	16
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	16
A. Overall assessment	16
B. Delivery of inputs.....	16
C. Management and implementation of activities	17
D. Monitoring and backstopping	18
E. Circumstances affecting the project (prerequisites)	19
III. PROJECT RESULTS	19
A1. Outputs	20
A2. Impacts	26
B. Immediate objective	27
C. Crime control objective	28
D. Other results	28
E. Sustainability	29
IV. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS.....	31
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	32
V. LESSONS LEARNED.....	42
Annex 1. Evaluation TOR.....	45
Annex 2. Evaluation questions and performance indicators.....	49
Annex 3. Organisations and places visited and persons met	74
Annex 4. Documents included in desk review.....	77
Annex 5. Summary Action Plan Progress – Lagos.....	82
Annex 6. Summary Action Plan – Borno	87
Annex 7. Summary Action Plan Progress – Delta.....	94
Annex 8. Summary Action Plan Progress– Katsina	101
Annex 9. Qualitative ‘reasonable expectation’ measure.....	108
Annex 10. Summary assessment questionnaire	109

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Project was a pilot for the UNODC/UNICRI Global Programme Against Corruption. It was aimed at strengthening the rule of law in Nigeria, both at the national and sub-national levels. In order to achieve this goal the primary objective of the project was to assist the Government in increasing the capacity and integrity of its justice system, in particular of the judiciary. The immediate aim was for ‘An evidence based, broad-based, integrated, comprehensive and pilot-tested Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary and a respective implementation strategy as the foundation for the strengthening of judicial integrity and capacity in Nigeria’. It was launched in October 2001 and had a projected timeframe of two years from commencement to completion. Five sequential outputs were envisioned.

- A Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary drafted;
- Three Integrity and Capacity Assessment Reports for the justice system in three pilot States prepared;
- Anti-Corruption Action Plans for the judiciary in three pilot States;
- Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the judiciary including an implementation Strategy adopted; and
- Project activities periodically monitored and evaluated, allowing for modification of implementation and eventually a project revision.

To achieve the outputs eight sequential activities were proposed.

The present evaluation covers the period to November 2003. It assesses: a) the Project concept and design; b) Project implementation; and c) the outputs, outcomes and impact of the Project. Lessons learned and recommendations on possible follow-up activities have been made, as appropriate. It comprised three components; a desk review of available documents produced during development of the project and subsequently; a site visit to Nigeria incorporating interviews with key informants from Project agencies/ entities; and an examination of extant data. The *desk review* was conducted in the week of 8-14 November 2003. In all, and excluding routine correspondence, it comprised an examination of 113 documents/ reports. The *site visit* to Nigeria took place in the two weeks 16-28 November 2003. Nineteen meetings were held with 14 agencies/entities, involving 38 informants in three states (Lagos, Borno, Delta) and the FCT (Abuja). Preliminary findings from the desk

review and site visit were discussed with UNODC field office in Lagos (28 November 2003), and UNODC Vienna (4-13 December 2003).

Evaluation findings

Précis

- h** The Project was accepted with enthusiasm by Nigerian authorities, the public in general and by participating states;
- h** UNODC completed Project Performance Reviews as and when required; and
- h** That with the possible exception of Delta State, the Project has made important inroads into providing a foundation for improving judicial capacity and integrity.

The evaluation finds that the Project concept was sound and the design (using Action Learning principles) of sequential activities was uncomplicated, though not without attendant implementation risks. Each stage largely depended on the success of that preceding. The most important element (Assessment reports of capacity and integrity in the three pilot states), and despite a successful data collection phase, failed to materialise in a timely or satisfactory manner. This element was to inform the development of Action Plans. Similarly, a follow-up study in January 2003, when combined with evidence from implementation in the pilot states, was to inform both refinements/ modifications to the Action Plans, and the identification of best practices. As a consequence of the failure to materialise, the development of the Action Plans was completed using preliminary data. Impacts were to be measured using a comprehensive set of ‘measures of change’ items which had been developed and adopted in the various integrity meetings. Unfortunately, these data were never systematically collected.

Independent of the ‘measures of change’ data, the Project had eight achievement indicators.

1. The quality of the Federal and State level action plans, specifically with regard to the level of detail, the clear establishment of responsibilities, timeframes and the assessment of human and financial resources needed.

Finding – quality generally high, though some elements overly optimistic or missing.

2. The number and amounts of donor contributions made or pledged in support of the implementation of the action plans, both at the Federal and State level.

Finding – poor. Apart from US\$140,000 from GTZ, ‘in-kind’ courtesies were the only donor contributions received nationally. In Borno, a waiver of production costs by local media for a public awareness campaign was successfully negotiated.

3. The level of commitment in terms of allocation of resources, both human and financial, to the implementation of the single activities proposed under the Federal and State-level action plans.

Finding – moderate. Intellectual and professional commitment generally high; financial commitment constrained by available funding, human resources undocumented.

4. The impact of the single anti-corruption measures carried out within the framework of the State level action plans, specifically in terms of increased awareness of all stakeholders with regard to levels, types, locations, costs and effects of as well as remedies against judicial corruption.

Finding – unable to be measured due to absence of empirical data.

5. The amount of activities undertaken by the Judiciaries within the three pilot States in execution of the respective Action Plans developed under this project.

Finding – In the first 12 months, progress was highest in Lagos (number and significance of activities). Borno also achieved approximately 50% of intended activities. Delta was disappointing.

6. The successful implementation of the project activities resulting in the project outputs;

Finding – Despite a number of implementation difficulties, all activities were undertaken and all outputs achieved to varying levels of quality/ timeliness from poor to excellent.

7. Six-monthly progress reports to be issued according to the outputs envisaged in the project;

Finding – progress reports were prepared in December 2002 and June 2003 and four Project Performance Reviews (PPRs) were completed in December 2001, June 2002, December 2002 and June 2003.

8. Financial monitoring records of expenditures.

Finding – Records of expenditure monitored.

Notwithstanding the absence of empirical evidence, this evaluation finds that there is substantial and compelling anecdotal evidence that the Project has been successful in increasing judicial capacity and integrity. Such evidence includes the response to the installation of complaints boxes and attendant complaints process, and rights awareness

posters; high levels of interest and enthusiasm for the Project has been generated, resulting in high numbers of other Nigerian states lobbying for inclusion in the Project; and procedural reform (e.g. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), Multi-door courts, Civil Law reform, ‘holding charge’ reform) which has reduced court delays and improved access to justice.

Some elements of the immediate aim (Anti-corruption Action Plan(s) implemented) however, were not completely achieved:

- Evidence based – *Not achieved.*
The failure of the Assessment research to materialise prior to the development of the Plans, the postponement of the follow-up research, and the failure to systematically collect the ‘measures of change’ data impeded achievement.
- Broad-based – *partially achieved.*
Support from the judiciary, executive, court users. Legislature not considered in the Project design. ‘Co-partners’ – Police and Independent Corrupt Practices Commission failed to honour commitments.
- Integrated – *partially achieved.*
ICPC, Police (lack of) commitment threatens success of Project. However, most elements of Project now ‘embedded’ in state justice systems.
- Comprehensive – *as practically achievable in the circumstances.*

The primary lessons learned are that an Action Learning model works, that a local presence offers higher chances of success than remote management, and that despite consistent and persistent advice to the contrary, unrealistic financial contribution expectations can build up, leading to unfavorable perceptions about the sincerity of UNODC and its ability to back-up ‘promises’, and eventually to dissatisfaction and resentment among Project participants.

This evaluation recommends that the Project enter a second phase which encompasses a modest expansion from the current four states (which includes the late addition of Katsina), to nine states. In all, the evaluation makes 43 recommendations; five of which were resolved during the evaluation; 24 which involve specific actions; 12 requiring Project revisions; and

two which address evaluation. In Phase Two, greater emphasis on inter-agency cooperation and coordination, and managing expectations (facilitation vs. direct funding) will be required.

EXPLANATORY NOTES

About this report

This report accords with United Nations Evaluation Guidelines in content and format. In particular, the report does not attempt to attribute praise or blame. Rather, it is primarily directed at lessons learned. While the Project envisioned that a ‘final *progress* and evaluation’ report’ would be completed, the current report is strictly an *evaluation* report. A major limitation for readers who are familiar with Project Progress Reports no’s 1 and 2, is that the Guidelines impose strict (word) limits to describe findings. Accordingly, the narrative character of previous Progress reports is replaced in this report with measurement data. It is therefore a *technical* report. Where appropriate, state examples are used to illustrate particular findings. By and large however, results are presented as a *synthesis* of ‘whole of Project’ results, rather than as records of individual state achievements.

CICP/UNODC

The Project commenced under the auspices of the United Nations Center for International Crime Prevention (CICP). Following a restructure in 2003, the Project was absorbed by the new United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

Acronyms

CICP	Centre for International Crime Prevention
DIFD	British Department for International development
GPAC	Global Programme Against Corruption
ICPC	Independent Corrupt Practices Commission
NPC	National Project Coordinator
UNICRI	United Nations Interregional Crime Research Institute
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Assistance on Infrastructure and Development

Acknowledgements

The consultant is grateful for the contributions provided by informants and for assistance provided by the following people during the mission:

Juliet Ume-Ozenke	National Coordinator
Abigail Aina	Consultant, GTZ
Oliver Stolpe	Project Officer, UNODC
Helen Akhibi	UNODC Field office Abuja

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The pilot project on strengthening judicial integrity and capacity of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime/ Global Programme Against Corruption, with a final budget of US\$292,952, was launched in October 2001. It was aimed at strengthening the rule of law in Nigeria, both at the national and sub-national levels. In order to achieve this goal the primary objective of the project was to assist the Government in increasing the capacity and integrity of its justice system, in particular of the judiciary. The immediate aim was for 'An evidence based, broad-based, integrated, comprehensive and pilot-tested Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary and a respective implementation strategy as the foundation for the strengthening of judicial integrity and capacity in Nigeria'. Five outputs and eight sequential activities were envisioned. It had a projected timeframe of two years from commencement to completion. The author¹ was engaged in November 2003 to complete the evaluation² and this report is a product of that evaluation.

B. Scope and purpose

The present evaluation covers the period to November 2003. It assesses: a) the Project concept and design; b) Project implementation; and c) the outputs, outcomes and impact of the Project. Lessons learned and recommendations on possible follow-up activities have been made, as appropriate.

C. Methodology

The methodology is referred to in the literature as a triangulated convergent validity (TCV) study. It comprised three components; a desk review of available documents produced during development of the project and subsequently; a site visit to Nigeria incorporating interviews with key informants from Project agencies/ entities; and an examination of extant data. Evaluation questions were derived from the Project objectives/ activities/ outputs/ expected outcomes, and performance indicators were developed to provide the evidence base for answering these questions³. The rationale for the evaluation design is to obtain as many perspectives as reasonably possible within the available timeframe. Results from each

1 Paul Williams, Research Scholar, School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, Acton ACT. He has provided assistance to UNODC in a variety of capacities since 2001.

2 Refer to Annex 1 for evaluation Terms of Reference.

3 Refer to Annex 2 for evaluation performance indicators.

perspective (using a TCV) are expected to contribute to a fuller picture than that which would be available from only one perspective and they are expected to ‘converge’ or essentially ‘tell the same story’. Most often, the perspectives cross-validate each other, however it is not uncommon to find that there may be inconsistencies. In such circumstances, the skill of the evaluator is relied upon in determining the appropriate weight which should be placed on each perspective.

The *desk review* was conducted in the week of 8-14 November 2003. In all, and excluding routine correspondence, it comprised an examination of 113 documents/ reports⁴. The *site visit* to Nigeria took place in the two weeks 16-28 November 2003. Nineteen meetings were held with 14 agencies/entities, involving 38 informants in three states (Lagos, Borno, Delta) and the FCT (Abuja). Informants were predominantly Chief Judges and members of Implementation Committees, but they also included donor agencies and other interested parties. Informants were invited to provide information as a committee or as personal views and further, such information could be offered as attributable, non-attributable or ‘off-the-record’. Informants enthusiastically adopted all modes. For the purposes of this report, views have been synthesized and generally, appear without attribution. These meetings were supplemented with opportunistic convenience interviews with Nigerian citizens (n=10), a former member of the Nigerian Bar Association, and foreign businessmen (n=4). Five courts and two prisons were inspected⁵.

Preliminary interpretations/ conclusions arising out of the mission to Nigeria were discussed with the UNODC field office in Lagos (28 November 2003), and UNODC Vienna (4-13 December 2003).

D. Limitations

The absence of an agreed *detailed* evaluation framework *as part of the Project document* meant that for many of the evaluation questions and performance indicators which had been developed *post hoc*, required data and information had not been collected during the conduct of the Project (refer also to Impacts, PROJECT RESULTS below). Similarly, ‘Measures of Change Data’ which had been adopted in all Integrity Meetings by the Federal and State Judiciaries and subsequently incorporated into the evaluation framework, had not been

Recs.
10, 30
refer

4 Refer to Annex 4 for a full list of documents

5 Refer to Annex 3 for full list of agency/ entity informants.

systematically collected. Attempts to reconstruct these data were in many instances unsuccessful. Combined with the nature of the Project, which by design might not be expected to deliver empirical outcomes in the short-term, most evidence of impacts is anecdotal. The time available for the evaluation (1 week desk review, 2 week site visit) was extremely short, the timing of the evaluation coincided with the end of Ramadan, and organizational difficulties encountered in the conduct of the mission to Nigeria prevented a number of intended interviews, including in particular, all meetings which had been proposed for Katsina. An assessment of current progress against its Action Plan⁶ was constructed from a desk review only, which compares with those for Lagos, Delta and Borno, completed as part of the consultant's meetings with Implementation Committees in those states. Accordingly, further progress than reported in its last received monthly progress return is likely in Katsina, than that indicated in this report. Finally, a number of Project documents which were requested by the evaluator, were not made available.

I. PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN

The Project was designed to assist Nigerian authorities in the development of sustainable capacities within the judiciary and to strengthen judicial integrity. On completion it was expected that the Nigerian judiciary would have developed, adopted and implemented evidence-based, integrated, comprehensive Action Plans at the Federal level and within the three Pilot States (Lagos, Delta and Borno) and that the pilot experience would inform further development.

A. Overall assessment

The Project invokes and employs 'Action Learning' principles to pass ownership for the development and implementation of activities, and responsibility for outcomes, to the host country. Sometimes reduced to the acronym CDAR (Connect/Decide/Act/Reflect), the concept is simple and uncomplicated. Applied to this Project, the elements were: bring stakeholders together (Integrity meetings); identify the nature and extent of the underlying problem (the Assessments); use what had been learned from the assessments to develop an intervention (Action Plans), implement three pilots, measure the impact (Evaluation), and finally, full circle – bring stakeholders back together, learn from what worked and what didn't during the implementation and from the impacts, and then refine the Action Plans accordingly. Action Learning principles were also employed in the construction and

6 Refer to Annex 8.

activities of the Implementation and sub committees. The principle role of UNODC was that of facilitator.

B. Problem analysis, objectives and achievement indicators

Problem analysis

The over-riding problem was identified as ‘the precarious situation of the rule of law in Nigeria caused by insufficient integrity and capacity of the justice system in general and the judiciary in particular’. At the time of the Project’s development, the main challenges faced by the Nigerian Judiciary were seen as an absence of thorough knowledge and data regarding the extent and nature of and the reasons for the malfunctioning of the judiciary. Finally, there was a lack of a systematic, realistic, time-bound and broad-based anti-corruption action plans, both at the Federal and State levels.

Evaluation finding

Problems were well analysed, supported by appropriate authority and clearly located within the focus of the UNODC/UNICRI Global Programme Against Corruption (GPAC). Accordingly, there was an excellent foundation from which to develop an effective project strategy. The only risks identified in the strategy were the possibilities of fading political will and commitment of the Chief Justice of Nigeria and lack of vigor among the State Chief Judges. Appropriate thought had been given to their likelihood eventuating. There was a more fundamental design risk however, which was not fully appreciated. The sequential dependence of stages (assess, develop, implement, reflect and refine) had the potential to jeopardize timely and/ or complete transition from one to the other. In the event of one element failing, the next in line was in peril. Regardless of whether the outcome was as desired, and if we assume for the moment that the Project did not work, the application of an Action Learning design makes it difficult to determine if the model itself was inappropriate for the problem, or whether the result was due to the actors (which include UNODC/UNOPS), or the actions, or a combination of both.

Objectives

Crime Control objective – ‘the establishment of the rule of law by increasing judicial integrity and capacity and thereby the creation of more favorable conditions for the country’s economic, social and political development’.

Evaluation finding

Appropriate - provides a supportable rationale for the Project, though unlikely to be achievable through the Project alone.

Immediate objective – ‘an evidence based, broad-based, integrated, comprehensive and pilot-tested Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary and a respective implementation strategy as the foundation for the strengthening of judicial integrity and capacity in Nigeria’.

Evaluation finding

The immediate objective is double-barrelled – ‘a Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan’ and ‘a respective implementation strategy’. The former is stronger, providing for measurable benchmarks (e.g. ‘evidence based’, ‘integrated’). The latter (implementation strategy) however, is merely ‘respective’ – that is ‘pertaining to’. ‘Achievable’ and ‘verifiable’ might have been substituted. It is also tautological. The implementation strategy forms part of the pilot testing. It is not subsequent to, or separate from the Action Plan. Nonetheless, the objective(s) is/ are logically directed to achieving the Crime Control objective.

Main objectives (n=5) – Excluding the first which largely replicates the Immediate Objective, and the last (i.e. possible inclusion of Katsina), substantive objectives were to i). establish the scale and scope of corruption in the judiciary, and arising out of that information ii) the development of appropriate Action Plans, and finally iii) the implementation of the Action Plans.

Evaluation findings

The main objectives provide a sound basis for achieving the Immediate Objective and through it, contribute to achieving the Crime Control Objective.

Achievement indicators

Essentially, the Project had three unstated achievement indicators – at the end of the Project, i) the evidence base had been collected, collated and analysed, ii) the Action Plans were developed (and were integrated, broad-based etc.) and finally, iii) the Action Plans had been implemented (effectively and efficiently and in a timely manner???)⁷. One OUTCOME⁷ indicator similarly not declared, ‘the identification of best practices’, is however detectable. The achievement indicators specifically referred to in the project design are eight ‘IMPACT’ indicators, which in the main, attempt to assess the quality of plans, the level of commitment to their implementation, and the appropriateness of monitoring and reporting.

Evaluation finding

The Project is unashamedly process ‘front-loaded’, with an expectation that capacity building will lead to strengthening judicial integrity. It is not surprising then, that the ‘impact’ indicators are in reality PROCESS indicators. One only, ‘the impact of the single anti-corruption measures...’ is an impact indicator. It is possible however, that the capacity building elements were all achieved to a high standard (and in a timely, efficient and effective manner), but for there to be no impact on judicial integrity, due to other factors. It is appropriate therefore that at least one impact indicator was provided for, to assist in identifying, if possible, which elements of the Action Plans had greatest/least impact. However, all achievement indicators, declared or otherwise, lack specificity. During the project, a comprehensive set of Impact Indicators, the ‘Measures of Change’ were

Rec. 10
refers

⁷ And when documented, this will be an OUTPUT, which if subsequently used to refine the Action Plans, becomes an INPUT to the next stage.

developed and adopted by the Federal and State judiciaries. These provide the level of specificity required.

C. Outputs, activities and inputs

Outputs

Five outputs were envisioned. Four were the main objectives restated (e.g. Action Plans). The fifth and last was the only variation - (a possible) modification and revision of the Project arising out of monitoring and evaluation activities.

Evaluation finding

Following on from the uncomplicated structure of the Project design, the outputs are logically and appropriately derived.

Activities

The eight activities, all expressions of the Action Learning model (e.g. Integrity Meetings, development of Action Plans), were designed to sequentially build to a point where implementation of the Action Plans eventuated and subsequently, where monitoring and evaluation could identify possible areas for modification.

Evaluation finding

The construction and sequencing of activities also reflects the uncomplicated structure of the Project design. The scale of each component activity however, was likely to test eventual implementation in sufficient time to measure impacts. Each link in the sequential chain depended to a large extent on completion of the former (e.g. the results of the assessments were intended to inform the development of State Action Plans). Nonetheless, providing unrealistic expectations could be managed (refer also to LESSONS LEARNED #'s 2 and 3 below), the activities were cost effective, and if achieved as planned, likely to lead to the production of planned outputs.

Inputs

The (dollar) amount available was modest in total (originally budgeted at US\$282,000), and similarly so for the States (each US\$50,000), and for the assessments (US\$60,000). In addition to component funding, UNODC was to provide technical and organizational assistance (e.g. for the Integrity Meetings). All of the defined inputs of the Nigerian government were administrative/structural (E.G. provision of office accommodation/ other venues/ equipment/ transportation/ provision of data).

Evaluation finding

Providing that unrealistic expectations could be managed, planned inputs were cost effective. One activity (the Assessments) was under-funded for the scale of tasks and delivery date intended (refer also to LESSONS LEARNED #'s 2 and 3 below).

D. Executing modality and managerial arrangements

The project was to be carried out by the Ministry of Justice. Focal points for all activities at the Federal Level were to be the Chief Justice of the Federation and the Ministry of Justice of Nigeria. Focal points for those activities carried out at the State-level were to be the Chief Judges of the three pilot States. UNODC was to provide expertise, advisory and technical services and UNOPS was to provide local administrative support for the execution of the project and in particular, to hire a National Project Coordinator (NPC), who in turn, was to ensure the operational management of the project locally. To assist with execution and management, a Project Work plan and TOR for the main players were developed.

Evaluation finding

In line with the Action Learning design, which progressively passed responsibility to the host country, the executing modality and managerial arrangements were appropriate. However, once the 'Rubicon' had been passed – implementation of the Action Plans – the Project largely becomes self-managing and the emphasis of UNODC's role reduces to monitoring and motivation. Thereafter, it essentially becomes a matter of 'wait and see'. Concerning supporting documentation, the Work plan lacked sufficient detail (far less than that required of the host country in the construction of its Action Plans), comprising a projected mission itinerary/objectives only) and the division of responsibilities between UNODC Vienna and the UNODC field office, Lagos, was not sufficiently spelled out.

II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

A. Overall assessment

Following successful preliminary meetings and an early conduct of the first Federal Integrity meeting, there was a hiatus when a UNODC funding crisis, late appointment of a National Project Coordinator, and failure of a significant Project element (assessment research) to materialize, ultimately led to late implementation of state Action Plans. Overall, implementation was faulty, but UNODC negotiated these difficulties with skill and professionalism. Nonetheless, late implementation reduced the available time within which impacts could be measured. To date, it is not clear outside of anecdotal evidence, if the Project worked.

B. Delivery of inputs

The government was to provide office accommodation for the NPC, including furniture; secretarial support and meeting facilities for the NPC and UNODC for Integrity and review meetings; and in consultation with the NPC and UNODC, to select and invite participants to those meetings. For its part UNODC was to provide expertise, advisory and technical services, such as the conduct of capacity and integrity assessments, the organisation of

Integrity Meetings for Judges at the Federal and State level and the monitoring of the implementation of the action plans. To this end, UNODC was to provide adequate financial contributions within the projected budget.

Evaluation findings

The government did not deliver office accommodation for the NPC and current facilities (e.g. furniture, telephony/ internet), are unsatisfactory. Timely delivery of UNODC inputs at the local level was hampered by the relatively late appointment of the NPC.⁸ The failure to spell out the division of responsibility between UNODC Vienna and UNODC Lagos field office was not conducive to a fully effective local presence. This was partly offset by five missions to Nigeria by UNODC Vienna personnel. These missions were however, unable to satisfactorily deliver the capacity and integrity assessments in a timely or complete manner (refer also to RESULTS below). Provision of Project funds was characterised by lengthy delays in the order of 6-10 weeks from date of request to date of availability to the NPC.

Rec. 9,
29, 31
refers

C. Management and implementation of activities

Following approval of the Project, intended management structures were established quickly, with the First Federal Integrity meeting, which was conducted between 26 and 27 October 2001, resulting in Nigerian endorsement of the Chief Justice of Nigeria and the state chief judges of the pilot states to serve as focal points for the Project's implementation. An intended smooth sequential progression to the State Integrity meetings, and a second Federal Integrity meeting, and therefore the development and implementation of State Action Plans was prevented by i) lateness of the appointment of the NPC; ii) lateness of results of the capacity and integrity assessment; and iii) suspension of UNODC funding for a period of approximately seven months.⁹ Accordingly, there was a delay of almost 12 months between Federal Integrity meetings and the implementation of Action Plans was not launched until November 2002. For successful implementation, the Action Plans required close cooperation between the judiciary, the Police and the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC).

Evaluation findings

It is understood that this was the first Project developed and managed from its inception, by the then CICP Programme. Management and implementation plans were substantially departed from. The Project Work plan was accepted by UNODC Vienna as a 'rough guide' only. The absence of a formal timetable (e.g. First Integrity meeting by Date X, State # 1 Integrity meeting by Date Y, with persons responsible and sub-tasks allocated), with the usual critical paths identified, and the absence of formal contingency plans for difficulties subsequently encountered, contributed to a delay in the development and implementation of the State Action Plans. With the exception of that applying to the

Rec. 13
refers

8 A short-term seconded appointment had been available for approximately two months in early 2002, however the eventual permanent and current NPC was not appointed until September 2002.

9 UNODC Vienna and the NPC successfully negotiated donor agency funding for the second Federal Integrity meeting.

independent research Institute, TOR were similarly viewed.¹⁰ The relative lateness of the appointment of the NPC has already been referred to and many of the intended functions preceded her appointment. Others were varied by mutual agreement. From appointment, the NPC was efficient and effective despite the substandard facilities available. However, much activity was spent in managing the unrealistic expectations which pilot states had developed (extra-Project direct funding) despite apparent and consistent UNODC advice to the contrary, in maintaining momentum, and in attempting to requisition the required monitoring and progress reports. These activities were beyond that which might have been expected if full, voluntary and enthusiastic cooperation from all parties had been forthcoming. The expected/ hoped for close cooperation between the judiciary, Police and ICPC did not eventuate (refer also to PROJECT RESULTS below).

Rec. 14
refers

D. Monitoring and backstopping

Formal monitoring arrangements were detailed in Output 1.5, Activity 1.5.1; more specifically, the preparation of semi-annual progress reports. These reports were to be presented to two tripartite meetings and they were to serve as the basis of possible revisions by UNODC/ UNOPS in conjunction with the Ministry of Justice and the Chief Justice. The activities of the National Institute of Advanced Law Studies (NIALS), which had been engaged to conduct the capacity and integrity assessments, were intended to be monitored continuously by the NPC. In practice however, regular monitoring on an informal basis was completed through the relationships developed between UNODC and host country Project participants and through missions undertaken to Nigeria. In addition, Project Performance Reviews (PPR's) were conducted by UNODC in line with common practice for all projects, in December 2001, June 2002, December 2002 and June 2003.

Backstopping was not formally detailed in the Project document (nor is this a common practice), beyond that provided for in the 'standard' UNODC/UNOPS letter of agreement. To cover the lateness of the appointment of the NPC, UNODC Vienna provided coordination and management remotely through correspondence and via missions to Nigeria. Similarly, to cover the unavailability of completed capacity and integrity assessments, UNODC appropriately proceeded to conduct the Integrity meetings utilizing preliminary descriptive results.

Evaluation finding

The principal monitoring vehicle (semi-annual progress reports) was to be strengthened from February 2002 by the production, at the pilot State level, of monthly reports of activities. Most States did not comply with this request from the Chief Justice, and none on a strictly monthly basis. The lateness of the appointment of the NPC, among other things, affected UNODC's ability to continuously monitor the independent research institute's activities. A number of meetings held with

Recs. 32-
35 refer

10 For example, and notwithstanding the organizational difficulties encountered in the mission to Nigeria in November 2003 which required substantial revision of intended activities, the author of this report was advised that the evaluation TOR could be varied as and when he thought appropriate.

it during missions from UNODC Vienna, and attempts to more closely monitor it via correspondence from Vienna, were unsuccessful. This research was THE critical element in whether or not the Project had measurable impacts – from a purely pre-post research methodological perspective, and operationally. Results were to inform the development of the Action Plans – the Plans were to reflect the problems identified. Without a more accurate and better picture of ‘the problem’, the Action Plans were necessarily going to be deficient, if not misdirected (refer also to PROJECT RESULTS below).

The PPRs correctly identified the delay in, and reasons for, implementing the state Action Plan in Delta (June 2003), and the emergence of, reasons for and persistence of problems with the NIALS research (June 2002 and subsequently). However, and despite significant progress, the PPRs were overly optimistic concerning the implementation of the Action Plans across all states, and in particular with respect to the cooperation of the Police and ICPC. Pronouncements such as ‘Both timeliness and effectiveness of the action plan implementation is by far exceeding expectations...’ and ‘The sustainability of the outputs already achieved as well as the future objectives seems to be secured...’ (June 2003 PPR), might have called for greater substantiation than that provided.

ICPC had provided valuable support for Project activities leading up to the implementation of state Action Plans. However, its failure to provide officers to the states since then, and as agreed between UNODC, the states and ICPC, delayed significant elements of the Action Plans being implemented. Similarly, the Police had undertaken to contribute to Implementation and sub committee meetings and to provide concrete assistance in implementing reforms which would, for example, improve access to justice. Without exception, Chiefs/ Commissioners of Police do not attend meetings (sending junior subordinates, if at all, instead), and demonstrating variously lack of interest through to hostility (refer also to PROJECT RESULTS below).

Recs. 19,
36,37 refer

E. Circumstances affecting the project (prerequisites)

Prerequisites were few. The Government was to nominate its Ministry of Justice as Government counterpart agency for the contacts between the Government and UNODC ,and the Chief Justice was to function as the focal point for the implementation of all activities under the project. There were some administrative support functions (e.g. provision of meeting facilities and assistance with selecting and inviting participants etc). Access was also to be provided to project sites, relevant crime control data, records, agencies and authorities. The most concrete prerequisite was the provision of office space including furniture for the National Project Coordinator.

Evaluation findings

The government was relieved of its responsibility to provide office accommodation for the NPC and all prerequisites were forthcoming.

III. PROJECT RESULTS

As indicated in PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN above, there were five outputs, one immediate objective and one crime control objective attached to the Project.

A1. Outputs

1.1 A Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary drafted.

Project achievement indicator:

The quality of the Federal and State level action plans, specifically with regard to the level of detail, the clear establishment of responsibilities, timeframes and the assessment of human and financial resources needed.

Evaluation finding

A draft Federal Action Plan appears never to have existed as a discrete document which mapped the process which was eventually followed – it was at best, a conceptual framework. Best described as ‘guidelines’ only (refer also to Output 1.4 below).

1.2. Three Integrity and Capacity Assessment Reports for the justice system in three pilot States prepared.

Project achievement indicator:

None specified.

NIALS Terms Of Reference achievement indicator:

None specified.

UNODC/NIALS contract achievement indicator:

Contract not made available to the evaluator.

Evaluation finding

This element was the ‘big ticket item’ in the Project budget. As previously indicated, it was also the keystone which informed all other project elements. Originally estimated to take a total of three months’ work over a twelve-month period to December 2002, comprising three elements (desk review, survey, focus groups,) and resulting in three analytical reports of 100-150 pages each, the assessment was subsequently modified to accommodate six months work over the same twelve-month period, but comprising eight elements¹¹ and resulting in three analytical reports of approximately 70 pages each. A follow-up study for January 2003 was proposed in October 2001, prior to the commencement of the study discussed here – it is unclear when this proposal was varied. It is clear however, that the final product is unsatisfactory. At some point, it was decided that the intended three reports would be combined into a compendium volume and responsibility for the production of this has now been assumed by UNODC.

The TOR comprised just three pages and the tasks to be performed are described without adequate specifications, in just one page of the three. Subsequently, in February 2002 during a mission to Nigeria, NIALS participated in a comprehensive process of testing instruments and fuller task details were provided. It is unclear whether the full extent of UNODC’s expectations in the absence of a detailed specification beforehand, was known to NIALS when it accepted the contract. UNODC characterizes the February 2002 exposition as a mutual negotiation of terms and conditions. NIALS has a different view, believing itself to have been ‘captive’ to the UNODC design. However, NIALS does not appear to have indicated at this stage that the task might not be achievable in the timeframe or for the available funds. Concerning funding, NIALS was invited to submit an indicative budget in October 2001 (in advance of the detail provided in February 2002). It is again unclear if NIALS submitted same, or whether UNODC imposed a ‘cap’ on funds, or both. The Project budget appears

Recs. 12,
15, refer

11 Many of the ‘new’ elements were merely ‘old’ elements broken down into sub-tasks, but some were indeed ‘new’, compared to the original proposal.

to indicate that indeed a cap of US\$60,000 applied throughout. It is the assessment of this evaluation that the number, type and size of activities required could not have been accommodated within the projected timeframe, or for the available funds, regardless of whether NIALS had a social scientist/statistician in its research team (which it did not). The imbalance is of such a scale that it might be viewed as approaching exploitation.¹²

It is understood that the selection of NIALS, was 'on the recommendation of the Chief Justice of Nigeria'. Subsequently, UNODC sought to confirm the suitability of NIALS through a series of meetings. The absence of a social scientist in NIALS' research team was matched by the absence of a social scientist in UNODC's team for the conduct of these meetings. The subsequent recommendation to UNOPS for NIALS' engagement was favorably drafted by UNODC and UNOPS failed to detect anything which might have suggested the difficulties which were eventually encountered.

1.3. Anti-Corruption Action Plans for the judiciary in three pilot States

Project achievement indicators:

- (a) The quality of the Federal and State level action plans, specifically with regard to the level of detail, the clear establishment of responsibilities, timeframes and the assessment of human and financial resources needed;
- (b) The amount of activities undertaken by the Judiciaries within the three pilot States in execution of the respective Action Plans developed under this project; and
- (c) The successful implementation of the project activities resulting in the project outputs.

Quality of Plans.

Evaluation findings

Lagos

Level of detail – high. Establishment of responsibilities – clear. Time frames – starting dates clear, but optimistic and no expected completion dates indicated. Assessment of financial resources needed – appropriate. Assessment of human resources needed – not documented. Absence of achievement indicators.

Delta

Due to a printing error, the published Action Plan replicated the Action Plan of Lagos. The original Plan, which included allocation of responsibilities etc., does not appear to have been retained in its entirety, certainly not in printed/ electronic form.¹³ During 2003, the previous Chief Judge and Chief Registrar retired. Since the appointment of the current Chief Judge and Chief Registrar, the State has embarked on a review of its Action Plan. A new, partial, interim Action Plan comprising nine components/ Actions which have been considered, was tabled at the meeting with the evaluator. All expected details, save achievement indicators and human resources needed are present. 'Financial resources required' however, illustrate the level of unrealistic expectations which built up during the Project. Excluding the undocumented costs for provision of two 'UNODC funded' Black Marias for prisons, actions totaling ₦11,816,000 to be 'sourced from UNODC' are listed. Inclusive of the two vehicles, the amount to be sourced from UNODC, could amount to in excess of ₦50,000,000. There is

Recs. 16,
17 refer

12 It is understood that UNODC was aware that the study could not be completed within the available budget and that the net difference between funds available and costs incurred by NIALS 'was appreciated by NIALS and, as a non-profit Institute, NIALS viewed this as an investment in its own capacity building'. NIALS did not assist its own cause by failing to engage the services of a social scientist, and by failing to employ a random quota sample for the survey(s), which directly contributed to a return of almost 6,000 completed questionnaires. Attempts to secure additional funds at this stage were rebuffed by UNODC.

13 An electronic draft Action Plan as of September 2002 survives

a suggestion that Delta's continued participation in the Project might be contingent on UNODC being able to provide further financial assistance.

Borno

Level of detail – high. Establishment of responsibilities – clear. Timeframes – starting dates clear, but optimistic and no expected completion dates indicated. Assessment of financial resources needed – appropriate. Assessment of human resources needed – not documented. Absence of achievement indicators.

Katsina

Level of detail – high. Establishment of responsibilities – clear. Timeframes – starting dates clear, but optimistic and no expected completion dates indicated. Assessment of financial resources needed – appropriate. Achievement indicators selected – a mixture of true indicators and performance directions/ targets.

Amount of activities undertaken.

An 'amount of activities' measure is at best a crude instrument (Table 1).¹⁴ It is crude from a number of perspectives. While providing a 'ready reckoner' or snapshot of the absolute number, it takes no account of the importance of the activities, and it takes no account of the level of specificity attached to each. For example, 'Establish committee X' might appear (alone) in one Action Plan, while in another, it might appear as 'Establish', 'select committee members', 'conduct first meeting', 'develop TOR' etc, in another. Similarly, it makes no distinction between a significant activity (e.g. implementing ADR) and a less significant activity (e.g. 'CJ to sign letter').

Table 1: Summary of activities implemented, by pilot state, November 2003^{a, b}

	Lagos	Borno	Delta	Katsina	Total
Implemented	38	66	33	28	165 ^c
Not implemented	43	59	69	107	278 ^c
Total	81	125	102	135	443 ^c
% fully implemented	47	53	32	21	37

Notes: a: Delta assessment applies to original Action Plan; b: Katsina assessment from desk review of monthly reports submitted; c: will involve duplication – e.g. all states include establishing committees

Evaluation findings

It is clear is that if the crude 'amount of activities undertaken' measure is adopted, and with the exception of Delta state, substantial progress has been made in attacking the Action Plans. In the year since implementation of activities commenced, both Lagos and Borno have achieved approximately half of what they set out to achieve through the Project. If a 'significance of activity' weighting is applied, Lagos has clearly made the most progress. Delta, as previously mentioned, after several false starts, has prudently decided to 'take stock' and embark on a review process of its entire Action Plan, still involving (Nigerian) stakeholders who were involved in the original state Integrity Meeting, and it will shortly deliver a 'new' and revised Action Plan. In the circumstances, it

Recs. 16,
17 refer

14 A textual 'by activity' version of this table can be viewed at Annex 5

might now be more appropriate to view Delta as equivalent to Katsina and that state's relative Project infancy. Katsina itself was a late addition to the Project, and understandably, its emphasis has been on establishing the respective committees and getting the administrative infrastructure in place (which it has done).

Successful Implementation

Project achievement indicators

(a). The level of commitment in terms of allocation of resources, both human and financial, to the implementation of the single activities proposed under the Federal and State-level action plans.

(b). The number and amounts of donor contributions made or pledged in support of the implementation of the action plans, both at the Federal and State level.

Level of commitment

Evaluation finding

The level of intellectual and professional commitment has generally been high, with the exception of the Police and late in the process, ICPC (refer also to discussion immediately below). Similarly, within the judiciary, the actual commitment has been high, with most Project activities being completed extra-curricula, in addition to usual duties. Financial commitment levels have been constrained by the absolute funding quantum available to government for all services/ programmes, the relatively small routine allocation to the justice system within that quantum, the usual budgetary cycle (that is, amounts identified in this first year of implementation will not find their way into government funding considerations until the year following); and the strict interpretation of the separation of powers which effectively isolates the judiciary from influencing funding decisions.

Rec. 18,
38 refer

Number and amounts of donor contributions

Evaluation finding

Poor. With the exception of US\$140,000 from GTZ, no (dollar) donations have been received. At the Project level a number of 'assisted' activities eventuated (e.g. USAID and DFID). Similar courtesies were extended through the Project to other-donor non-Project pilot state attendees. At the State level, Borno was successful in negotiating a ₦750,000 production cost waiver by local media for a public awareness-raising package.

Rec. 9, 18
refer

Alternative Approach.

If a different question is asked – “what might ‘reasonably’ have been expected to have been achieved in twelve months?”, a more salient measure of ‘successful implementation’ can be gained than those prescribed in the Project document (Table 2).¹⁵ Substantial progress is evident. If Delta state is excluded from considerations for the reasons already discussed, the Project as whole has made important inroads into providing a foundation for improving judicial capacity and integrity. Coordination within the CJS, has been less than might have been expected.

15 Refer to Annex 9 for schema components

Table 2: 'Expected' progress by thematic areas and state, November 2003^{a, b}

	Lagos	Borno	Delta	Katsina	Project
Access to Justice	9	9	9	9	9
Quality and timeliness of the Court Process	9	9	8	9	9
Strengthen public confidence	9	9	8	9	9
Strengthen public complaints system	9	9	8	9	9
Coordination within the CJS	8	8	8	9	8
Overall assessment	9	9	8	9	9

Notes: a: Delta assessment applies to original Action Plan; b. Katsina assessment from desk review of monthly reports submitted

While progress in the first year has been dramatic, there are areas which could be addressed with more vigor, in the next twelve months (Table 3). As was observed with the 'reasonable expectation' measure in Table 2, success in improving coordination within the CJS was less than that for other areas. The principle reasons identified are failures of the Police and the ICPC to fulfill their previously indicated commitments.

Table 3: Main areas of current concern by thematic areas and state, November 2003^{a, b}

	Lagos	Borno	Delta	Katsina	Project
Access to Justice	Police	Sharia jurisdiction/ training, ADR	ADR	Ensure committees earnest	ADR
Quality and timeliness of the Court Process	Police	Case management flow	All areas	Ensure committees earnest	Case management flow
Strengthen public confidence	Public relations strategy	Procurement and purchasing committee	All areas except complaint boxes, posters	Ensure committees earnest	Public relations
Strengthen public complaints system	Police, ICPC	Court users manual, ICPC	All areas, particularly, Police, ICPC, but excluding Public Complaints Committee	Ensure committees earnest	Police, ICPC
Coordination within the CJS	Police, ICPC	Police, ICPC	All areas, particularly Police, ICPC	Ensure committees earnest	Police, ICPC
Most pressing concern	Police, ICPC	Sharia, ADR	Review of the entire Action Plan	Building momentum	Police, ICPC

Notes: a: Delta assessment applies to original Action Plan; b. Katsina assessment from desk review of monthly reports submitted

From one end of the spectrum, the Police might be viewed as merely ‘uninterested’ or perhaps more charitably, unable to attend to Project responsibilities as much as it would prefer, due to the pressure of other commitments. From the other end of the spectrum, the reaction of the Police might be viewed as ‘obstructive’. Evidence of both emerged during the evaluation. Chiefs / Commissioners of Police do not routinely attend Implementation and sub-committee meetings, if at all. The Police generally do not grant bail in accordance with Project aims, nor will they routinely accept women as sureties. At the other extreme, individual police/ entire police stations have removed and/ or vandalised Project posters which educate citizens of their rights. In between these two extremes is a systemic failure to monitor case flows, with briefs for the DPP being untimely, and significant numbers of case files being ‘lost’, including those retained by transferred officers due to misplaced altruism (e.g. transferred officer is keen to ensure that the brief is completed) and self-interest (e.g. transferred officer is keen to retain so that his tardiness is not detected). In at least one pilot jurisdiction, Police are refusing to serve court notices.

Recs.
19, 20
refer

For the ICPC, it made a valuable and sustained contribution to the development of the Project, including attending, presenting, and facilitating Federal and State Integrity meetings. The Commissioners generously committed to provide technical and other assistance, and significant human resources, principally one outposted ICPC officer per pilot state, to the Project. It had selected at least two such officers, and the relevant states’ Chief Judges had made accommodation available for their placement. States in turn, built into their Action Plans, activities, which in the main, could not satisfactorily proceed without ICPC involvement. For a variety of reasons, the ICPC commitment post-Integrity meetings has not been met (refer also to Sustainability below).

Recs.
36, 37
refer

1.4. Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the judiciary including an implementation Strategy adopted

Project achievement indicator:

The quality of the Federal and State level action plans, specifically with regard to the level of detail, the clear establishment of responsibilities, timeframes and the assessment of human and financial resources needed.

Recs. 21,
22 refer

Evaluation finding

The Federal Action Plan does not exist as a discrete document which maps intended progress – it is a conceptual framework. Best described as ‘guidelines’. Similarly, state Action Plans do not exist as discrete documents.

- 1.5. Project activities periodically monitored and evaluated, allowing for modification of implementation and eventually a project revision.

Project achievement indicator

- (a). Six-monthly progress reports to be issued according to the outputs envisaged in the project.
- (b). Financial monitoring of records of expenditures.

Progress reporting

Evaluation finding

Two six-monthly progress reports were produced. In addition, as discussed in Monitoring and Backstopping, PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN above, four (UNODC internal) Project Performance Reviews (PPRs) were produced. The absence of a 'timely' or 'quality' achievement qualifier for this indicator limits its utility.

Financial monitoring

Evaluation finding

Appropriate financial monitoring was conducted throughout as and when each expenditure item arose and during the six-monthly PPRs. At the local level, the national coordinator maintained appropriate audit trails.

A2. Impacts

The failure to collect the measures of change data, and the delays in finalizing the NIALS research, including the follow-up study in 2003, means for the most part, evidence is largely about process and/ or anecdotal.

The most often cited impact has occurred through the installation of complaints/ suggestion boxes, and the attached complaints process. Reasons are not always for 'increasing public confidence in the courts'. In all jurisdictions (and Federally), the 'screening' of complaints has led to a reduction in the number of complaints being seen (and therefore requiring a response) by the Chief Justice of Nigeria, and Chief Judges. This has no doubt however, released CJs for more important matters which contributes to both improved access to justice and reductions in backlogs. In one jurisdiction, the complaints system's main benefit is seen as providing court users with the opportunity for the first time, to see that (most of) the problems are caused by the Police, or Prisons, and not the judiciary, which has some benefit in increasing confidence in the courts, as a by-product. Across all pilot states, publishing of complaints data is now routine.

The second most frequently cited impact is the installation of posters which advise of users' rights in pilot courts. In one jurisdiction, judges cite users consulting and pointing to the

posters during proceedings. One concrete impact cited is that the number of non-appearances due to a (false) expectation that bail requires cash and/ or some other form of payment, has been greatly reduced.

The third most frequently cited impact is that non-pilot states are ‘clamoring’ for inclusion in the Project. Members of the executive, the judiciary and other agencies thought to have some influence with UNODC, are lobbied for consideration in a second phase. Expectation of direct financial contributions resulting, cannot be excluded as a partial motivator.

The groundbreaking innovations in Lagos, as well as serving as examples for other states to follow, are believed to show significant impacts. Anecdotal evidence of the success of the multi-door court, of other ADR initiatives, of case flow management, and of changes to civil procedures (‘a landmark achievement’), includes reductions in court backlogs, reductions in case lengths, and reductions in numbers of cases going to trial. In Borno, as with Lagos also, the amendment of holding charge procedures (referral of cases to the high court in lieu of magistrates), is believed to have resulted in a marked reduction in the number of prisoners awaiting trial, and the prison data supports this conclusion.

Empirical evidence of impacts will require collection of the measures of change data and a follow-up to the NIALS study.

B. Immediate objective (n=1)

1. An evidence based, broad-based, integrated, comprehensive and pilot-tested Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary and a respective implementation strategy as the foundation for the strengthening of judicial integrity and capacity in Nigeria.

Evaluation findings

Before addressing the individual elements (e.g. evidence based, integrated etc.), the question of a Federal Action Plan per se requires revisiting. The absence of a discrete Federal Action Plan for the current pilots has already been referred to above. Commitment to the production of an Action Plan similar to those produced by the pilot states for this phase, with actions, responsibilities, projected durations of components, human and financial commitments etc., will be required.

The likelihood that the final Federal Anti-Corruption Plan for the Judiciary will be ‘evidence based’ depends very much on a satisfactory resolution of the NIALS pre-implementation research and on the approach adopted for the repeat research. Similarly, it will depend on the routine collection and dissemination of the measures of change data. However, if these matters are attended to with diligence and skill, there is every likelihood that the Project will contribute to a Final evidence based Action Plan.

Concerning *'broad-based'*, there is wide support in the executive, among the judiciary and from court users. There has been very little attention to the legislature and this is understandable, as it was not anticipated that legislative changes might be required. However, during the evaluation possible legislative changes were suggested for ICPC, for Sharia law in the northern states, for the appointment of High Court judges and for the Federal constitution. Additionally, the pilots have been unsuccessful to date in garnering practical and real support from the Police and ICPC (despite ICPC's early and valuable contribution).

Concerning *'integrated'*, this also is imperiled by the Police/ ICPC situation, and to a similar extent, prisons. The latter has a critical role in improving access to justice, in particular. The absence of Black Marias to transport prisoners awaiting trial is a significant issue which requires addressing by government outside the scope of this Project. To the extent that *'integrated'* refers to *'embedded'* in the day-to-day operations of the judiciary, most jurisdictions' views are that Project elements are now *'everyday features of the justice process'*. For example, the public complaints system incorporating complaints/ suggestion boxes, consideration by complaints committees, progress and outcome reporting to court users, and the publication of aggregate outcomes, is entrenched and unlikely to be able to be withdrawn without considerable public and judicial outcry.

Concerning *'comprehensive'*, new challenges will arise which will require new responses, but in the current environment, the Project is as *'comprehensive'* as is practical/ achievable

C. Crime control objective (n=1)

1. The establishment of the rule of law by increasing judicial integrity and capacity and hereby the creation of more favorable conditions for the country's economic, social and political development

Evaluation findings

It is unlikely that the Project alone will result in 'The establishment of the rule of law' absolutum. While laudatory, this is a fanciful objective. Certainly, the Project will contribute to its establishment and to the creation of more favorable conditions for socio-economic and political development, but other threats to the rule of law due to the prevailing relative poverty for example, will persist. For example, the very public face of police checkpoint corruption requires attacking through other means. However, within the judiciary and the judicial system, the Project offers a high likelihood of success.

D. Other results

In addition to specified reports, the Project has been very successful in publishing a variety of Project documents, and in a relatively short time-frame. For example, Progress reports of the first six months and first 12 months post launch, have been printed. Similarly, a compendium volume of the first and second Federal Integrity meetings, including papers presented, is an important achievement, which will serve as a useful primer on judicial corruption for Nigeria and elsewhere.

An unexpected result was the development of unrealistic expectations of direct UNODC financial assistance. Despite consistent and persistent advice to the contrary, pilot states developed the view that UNODC would fund elements which had been included in Action Plans. In one jurisdiction, a particular training forum was developed and subsequently

‘approved’ as appropriate and relevant by UNODC, to the point of imminent implementation (e.g. venue booked, participants selected and invited, agenda determined), in expectation that UNODC was to fund the forum. UNODC had never intended to fund the forum. The national coordinator has an undeserved reputation among pilot states of being ‘inflexible’ on funding matters and the UNODC generally is perceived as having promised more than it delivered.

Another unexpected result was related to that immediately preceding, and that concerns maintenance of UNODC-provided equipment (e.g. PCs, photocopiers). Despite consistent and persistent advice that once supplied, it is the states’ responsibility for ongoing maintenance and servicing, there was (and is) a lingering expectation that UNODC will be responsible for consumables (e.g. paper, ink) and when/ if it malfunctions, will pay for its repair.

Finally, during an evaluation prison visit in Borno, among a group of 36 prisoners awaiting trial, 10 were identified as alleging that they had *never* appeared before a court, with the mean length of incarceration of eight years! The chairman of the Implementation Committee and the Controller of Prisons who were in attendance undertook to immediately investigate their cases and a legal advisor from GTZ was assigned as the appropriate delegate for their findings. This was a significant, though limited result.

Recs. 24,
25 refer

E. Sustainability

Institutionally, there are tensions between the executive and ICPC, between the Police and the judiciary, and in the northern states, between the secular and Sharia judiciaries. The ICPC does not enjoy wide support and the common view in the judiciary, within government, among donor agencies and business, and possibly across all sections of society, is that it has at best failed to live up to expectations and at worst, been a complete failure. The Police are suspected of ‘resenting’ the appearance of having to submit to the judiciary’s wishes on Project-related matters and without receiving any demonstrable direct ‘material’ or organizational benefits, the Police, for this Project, is assessed as somewhere between being unenthusiastic and obstructionist. Far from viewing Case Management Flow as a means to improve administrative burdens, it is seen by the Police as (another) potential disciplinary tool. The tensions between Sharia and secular judiciaries over jurisdiction, appointment of Sharia magistrates/ judges, and training in criminal procedure, may require a sensitive, and

Recs.
19, 20
refer

drawn out, rather than rapid response. The mooted legislative changes to the procedures/ rules for appointment of high court judges and the current bill before the National Assembly to 'strengthen' the ICPC might *increase* sustainability potentials. At the national level, the Project enjoys the support of the Chief Justice and the Project dovetails with the Attorney-General's vision for justice system reform. National elections are not due until 2007. At a state level, political support is thought to be highest in Lagos, marginal in Delta, and unknown in Borno and Katsina.

There are constitutional barriers to sustainability. The strict interpretation to the separation of powers between the judiciary and the legislature/ executive, and the resulting isolation of the judiciary from effective influence in funding/ budget decisions has already been referred to. Some of the reforms of the justice system proposed by the Federal Attorney-General and which will have a direct bearing on the Project (e.g. restructure of courts) are acknowledged within the Ministry to be likely to face constitutional challenges, and at the state level, continued development/ devolvement of matters for Sharia, might also attract constitutional concern.

Socially, the Project also enjoys wide support, if measured by attitudes of court users. However, the continuing relative poverty and 'non-maintenance' culture which exists in the country will be threats to sustainability. The latter, which is most visible in utility infrastructure and the construction and manufacturing industries, has already manifested itself within the Project. For example, in one jurisdiction when the one ream of paper and the one ink cartridge of a printer which was supplied under the Project were exhausted, replacements were not secured (partially due to funding restrictions) and the computer is now used as a static word processor only, with printing outsourced to a commercial company. In another jurisdiction when a low volume photocopier was redeployed by mutual agreement to a high volume environment, the frequency of consumables replacements and maintenance has resulted in its disrepair and non-use for several months.

From a management perspective, a short-term extension to the contract of the National Coordinator is being processed. Longer term, efficient and effective Project coordination will require significant investment in accommodation and office facilities, as those presently available are sub-standard. In the event of Project expansion other assistance will be required and clearer divisions of responsibility between UNODC Vienna and the Nigerian field office are desirable. The level of enthusiasm, diligence and vigor among Implementation and sub

committees varies, as does the available time and attention which Chief Judges can devote to the Project. The Project Committee/ reporting system has greatly increased the administrative burden on pilot states and effective relief, without jeopardizing the Project, is indicated.

Recs 40,
41 refer

Financially, the build up of unrealistic expectations has already been referred to. Their management, particularly concerning newer states to be added, will require clearer and more persistent boundary articulation. For the present phase for example, Delta state's 'new' refined, partial Action Plan elements are *all* underpinned by an assumption that they will be funded by UNODC. A common view in pilot states is that UNODC promised more in the way of direct financial assistance than it provided, and this has led to resentment, and in one jurisdiction, cessation of further strategy development. Across all pilot states, a cursory, but intended, UNODC statement that UNODC might be able to assist with software packages for managing complaints and court registry reforms was seized on as 'guaranteed' (and to be provided in the short-term), when the reality is that this is a long-term customized development. In the interim, all pilot states have largely suspended activities in those areas, appending their Action Plan Progress returns with 'Awaiting provision of UNODC software'.

Recs. 14,
16, 17
refer

Similarly, the apparent unavailability of other donor organization (direct) financial assistance is likely to continue. A companion Project on governance by USAID is almost certain to cease at the expiration of the current funding cycle. In the circumstances, there is a view that scarce resources across the spectrum of donor agencies requires careful management and duplication of effort should be avoided. The 'isolation' of the judiciary from influence over government budgetary decisions has been referred to. With the exception of the very successful Borno negotiation of free media production of a public awareness package, pilot states are reluctant to attempt to source funds external to UNODC or from the usual government budget appropriations.

Rec. 9
refers

Rec.
18, 38
refer

IV. OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Despite a troubled implementation, which was professionally negotiated by UNODC and Nigeria, there are many achievements which can be identified and the Project appears to be providing a firm foundation for improving judicial capacity and integrity, and contributing to the establishment of the rule of law in the country.

What worked?

The best indications are that the Action Learning model *is* appropriate for the problem. All informants external to the Project remarked that they had been impressed with the vigor and enthusiasm with which stakeholders had taken up ownership of the Project, with their willingness to embrace the participatory, collaborative nature of the Project's development and implementation and that stakeholders were not intimidated by UNODC or by government. For their part, Project participants remarked that UNODC had been very professional, demonstrated respect for the Nigerian judicial system and far from being arrogant, UNODC was prepared to listen and to accept a Nigerian developed solution. It is obvious that great interest in the Project has been generated. Operationally, the small, non-capital-intensive items (e.g. complaints boxes, posters) are the most visible and most often cited achievements.

What didn't?

In the absence of a NPC, the largely external monitoring process did not work. Across the full Project period, the reporting regime in format and practice was deficient, resulting in confusion in what had been achieved and what hadn't. Reliance on anecdotal data until empirical evidence is available, perhaps not until 12 months hence, and after new states have been added, implementing from a possibly flawed understanding of the nature and extent of 'the problem', is fraught with danger.

What looks promising?

While empirical evidence is still lacking, ADR, Multi-Door Courts, Civil Law Proceedings amendments and holding charge procedure amendments all show promise of improving access to justice, reducing backlogs, reducing case lengths, and in reducing the number of prisoners awaiting trial.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Issues resolved during evaluation

1. That Borno install intercom systems for High Court judges' access to Registrars.
2. That Borno reinstall complaints boxes and court users' posters in the 'Milk bar' Pilot High court.

3. That Delta replace destroyed/ defaced court user posters.
4. That Lagos install a complaints box in the customary court.
5. That all states commence the systematic collection of the measures of change data.

B. Actions/decisions recommended

6. That the Project continue.

Justification for this recommendation follows on from the apparent success of the Project to date.

7. That a modest expansion of the number of states covered by the Project be undertaken.

There is considerable good will and enthusiasm for the Project, and other states are anxious to be included in the Project. This momentum should not be ignored and allowed to wither.

8. That additional states to be considered for inclusion should be the FCT, Kaduna, Imo, Kwara, Bayelta, and Plateau

Several 'future directions' models emerge as a result of the evaluation:

- a) Status quo – await empirical evidence (as opposed to the current anecdotal evidence) that the Project worked before further expansion.
- b) Enhanced status quo - if the intention is to provide unequivocal 'proof' that the Project works, then provide every assistance possible, even generous assistance, to existing states to ensure 'that it cannot fail'.
- c) Modest expansion – as per recommendation 7 – sufficient to capture existing momentum, but within bounds which can be comfortably accommodated by UNODC management (and budget), and by Nigeria itself.
- d) Cluster expansion (i.e. all states neighboring the existing pilot states be included in phase 2). As the Project is currently configured, the existing pilot states are but a few sparks in an otherwise damp environment, unlikely to ignite in the absence of a sufficient fuel load. The addition of a few other

‘sparks’ remote from each other, might not lead to wider geopolitical/ language group conflagrations, which in turn, might have been expected to spontaneously merge country wide, without further UNODC involvement.

In attempting to resolve the extremes (i.e. status quo vs. cluster expansion), consideration was given to the likely funds for a possible Phase 2, the likely coordination demands attached to any new model, the capacity of Nigeria to comfortably absorb various levels of expansion, and the willingness/ readiness of candidate states. Finally, the absence of empirical evidence (as opposed to the wealth of anecdotal data) that the Project has made a difference, cautions against a rapid, wide expansion.

The selection of suggested states included the considerations following:

Kaduna and the FCT are presently participating in the USAID governance project (as is Lagos). Rather than starting from a ‘blank slate’ the Project can build on what has already been achieved through the USAID project. Lagos has achieved the highest level of implementation in the current Project, which adds weight to such a strategy;

Imo, Bayelsa, Kwara and Plateau possess the characteristics required (willingness, readiness etc); and

Additionally, some clustering is achievable (e.g. Delta – Bayelsa – Imo; and FCT – Kaduna – Katsina – Plateau).

This final ‘collection’ of nine states also constitutes a ‘natural experiment’, which offers an opportunity to observe which combination of factors might explain differential success:

Two raw states (Delta, Borno);

One semi-raw state (Katsina – building on the very brief early Project experience);

One multiple project initiate state – USAID/ UNODC (Lagos);

Two ‘built on’ USAID/ UNODC states (Kaduna, FCT);

Three experiential states - i.e. upon the prior phase one experience (Bayelsa, Imo, Kwara); and

Sharia-present states vs. non-Sharia states.

9. That regardless of the eventual shape of Phase two, UNODC, through the local country representative (which also addresses the identified need to improve the field office involvement/ clarification of division of responsibilities issue) convene a donor agency meeting to discuss this and their Projects. UNDP to be included and efforts to coordinate, possibly merge respective projects explored. More specifically on division of responsibilities and greater field office involvement, the current frequency of missions from Vienna cannot be justified nor sustained.
10. That detailed evaluation frameworks (as opposed to protocols) should be included as part of all Project documents.

The absence of a framework seriously hampered the evaluation. Data which were required to empirically determine if the Project worked had not been collected. Frameworks need not be present during the internal UNODC approval stages, but can be developed collaboratively with the host country between approval and signing, and attached as a schedule to the contract.

11. That UNODC observe best practice in allocating contracts, particularly ‘fair and reasonable’ conditions and payment.

NIALS’ bargaining position was weak and despite UNODC’s view that the terms and conditions were ‘mutually negotiated’ it is the finding of this evaluation that the amount awarded to NIALS for the tasks required did not reach the standards of fair and reasonable.

12. Following on from 11 above, that UNODC insist that in awarding research contracts, studies involving human subjects be submitted to recognized ethics committees.

It is not sufficient that UNODC rely on ‘local provisions’ to avoid best practice in research (this is the oil and natural resources pollution defense – ‘we accord with all local administrative and legislative requirements’). The Assessment study clearly fell within the bounds of requiring ethics approval. The possibility to build (research) ethics capacity in Nigeria as a result, was an opportunity missed.

13. That Work plans, TOR etc. be observed, or changes to them be documented.

Without some certainty as to the proposed and actual conduct of Projects, it is impossible to accurately apportion their contribution to the success (or otherwise) of outcomes.

14. That clearer, consistent and persistent advice as to funding limitations be made at every opportunity and using a variety of media.
15. Also following on from recommendations 11 and 12 above, that research contracts be let out to tender and that tender documents include full specifications as to the tasks required.

It is the finding of this evaluation that the NIALS contract, if let for tender elsewhere, would have required a schedule of between 100-200 pages of specifications in order to have attracted a meaningful bid.

16. That UNODC invite the Chief Judge and the Implementation Committee of Delta to convene an urgent one-day meeting with the National Project Coordinator to determine which of the original Action Plan elements are to be retained in the 'new' revised Action Plan; and
17. That following the one-day meeting, the new Action Plan be submitted to the Chief Justice of Nigeria and UNODC within two weeks.

The NPC can take the opportunity to reinforce the strict budgetary limitations applying to the Project, particularly in light of the apparent misunderstanding of the funding requests attached to the 'new' refined Action Plan currently under development.

18. That pilot states be invited to consider private sponsorship of Project elements.

With the exception of the very successful Borno example, states have not considered private sponsorship for four reasons: they were unaware that they could approach private organisations; there was a sense of 'disloyalty' to UNODC; there is a view among states that if the UNODC is the primary sponsor of the Project, then UNODC is obliged to fund all elements which could be 'reasonably' met; and there is a view

that private sponsorship might create perceptions that ‘he who pays the piper, plays the tune’.

A number of states are unable to publish monthly newsletters for example, due to funding constraints – a suitable ‘neutral’ sponsor might be the Nigerian Bar Association (which could be offered a column on Project-related matters). Similarly, IT/ photocopier equipment does not need to be ‘state of the art’ and ‘second hand’ items might be sourced from companies installing replacements. Opportunities are only limited by lack of resourcefulness. Recommendation 38 also refers.

19. That the Chief Justice of Nigeria be invited to convene a meeting with the Inspector General of Police to discuss this evaluation report, with a view to turning around the apparent Police inactivity/ obstruction.
20. That the Police consider a small amendment to operating procedures which has the effect that prior to transfer, all police officers must account for and return, all case files in their possession.
21. That as a matter of urgency, a discrete Federal Action Plan be produced and published.
22. That State Action Plans be published as discrete documents as a matter of urgency.

At present, the Action Plans exist in various guises as ‘draft’ (e.g. from Integrity Meeting proceedings reports – and Lagos’ is reproduced for Delta in error), and as achievements (i.e. minus the dates, responsibilities etc.) in Progress reports for instance. As a matter of courtesy to court users and the judiciary (and as a form of open disclosure, accountability and discipline), Action Plans should be available ‘off the shelf’ as and when requested, not ‘hidden’ among the clutter of proceedings and progress report documents.

23. That editing of reports for publication be undertaken independently of authors.

The relative speed with which reports (e.g. Progress Reports 1 and 2) were published was a significant achievement. However a number of errors resulted (e.g. Lagos’

Action Plan appearing for Delta; *triplication* of one element of one state's Action Plan; telescoping/ failure to 'wrap' numerous Action Plan 'cells').

24. That pilot states be invited to conduct audits of their prisons to determine the circumstances of prisoners awaiting trial (e.g. offence, last appeared before court, current status etc.) and report results.

There is a nexus between the current Project and PsAT from an access to justice perspective. However, it is unlikely that it is sufficiently strong to come under the Project's mandate. The circumstances of the 'Borno Ten' appear on the surface to be an affront to any criminal justice system.

25. In the absence of a clear mandate from the current Project, that UNODC invite the delegate agreed to by the Borno Controller of Prisons and the Chairman of the Implementation Committee, Mr. Victor Nwakasy, to submit a written report of findings, and to distribute that report within the UN for consideration of a possible wider Project by a relevant Programme.
26. That training in the criminal and penal code for Sharia judges/ magistrates in Borno (and if applicable, Katsina) be given high priority by Nigeria authorities
27. That office accommodation, furniture (including a secure metal cabinet) and telephony/ internet facilities for the national coordinator be upgraded urgently.
28. That in the event of an expansion of the Project (refer also to recommendations 7 and 8 above), human resource assistance be provided to the national coordinator, commensurate with the increased workload.
29. That payment processes be reviewed to determine where delays can be minimized/ eliminated.

This evaluation finds that the average delay from payment request to approval and availability was between 6 and 10 weeks. Similar delays have been identified in other UNODC projects and there appears to be a reluctant acceptance among Project staff and UNODC generally, that 'this is the way it has to be'. 'There are specific UN rules/ delegations/ responsibilities which require numerous steps/ signatures before

funds can be released'. If particular 'bottlenecks' are not identifiable or steps cannot be eliminated/ accelerated, then consideration might be given to building anticipated delays into workplans/ payment schedules, and forwarding payment requests earlier, and/ or allocating a limited pool of funds for more timely disbursement with 'delayed payments' replacing/ topping up the pool, and the balance remitted back to UNODC/ UNOPS on completion of Projects.

C. Project revisions

30. That measures of change data be routinely reported as an integral component in monthly returns (recommendations 5, 32-35 also refer).
31. That greater involvement of the UNODC field office and clearer divisions of responsibility be developed.

The presence of a NPC and Country Representative in Nigeria provided a firm foundation for 'on the ground vigilance' and carriage of the Project. As with other UNODC projects, there was a reluctance to pass responsibility from UNODC Vienna to the field office. Consideration might be given within UNODC to separate project development/ approval activities from implementation activities and to utilize local representation (where available) for the latter function, rather than to attempt to manage implementation remotely.

32. That monthly reports be restructured to always include continual updates of the Action Plans, item by item (as opposed to the current narrative practice of exception or 'new' achievement reporting), and that the reports include measures of change data as per recommendations 5 and 30 above.
33. Following on from 32 above, that participating states be provided with electronic disks, with a preformatted report structure template, which will be the principle medium for reporting *to UNODC*.
34. Following on from 33 above, that submissions of reports via disks be acknowledged on receipt (and failing receipt, that a *pro forma* reminder notice system be employed).
35. That the NPC compare reports from month to month, and more closely monitor progress (e.g., in acknowledging receipt, enquire about inconsistencies).

36. That UNODC seek a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with ICPC on the level and circumstances of ICPC's commitment to the Project
37. That as part of the MOU with ICPC, the Commission provide a specific mandate which identifies positions and responsibilities for Project-attached officers.
38. That consideration be given to greater involvement of business as a stakeholder in the Project.
39. That the Assessment research be repeated in Lagos, Delta and Borno in June 2004, in a modified form.

From a methodological perspective, the Assessment studies were excessive for the purpose. The nature of the subject meant that a truly accurate picture was never going to be achievable. The pursuit of a large sample size for greater statistical purity in such circumstances was unreasonable and unnecessary. From a statistical perspective, UNODC should have been prepared to accept wider confidence intervals from a vastly smaller sample size. When stratified by area of interest (e.g. by state, by court, by user type), in the event of statistical unreliability resulting, an appropriate bootstrapping procedure – e.g. Monte Carlo, could have been employed to return the result to reliability.

It is recommended that for the repeat research, for court users, a minimum quota sample size of 50 only, be applied to each court (high, magistrates, customary, Sharia), with a maximum of 200 overall – per state (i.e. a maximum sample size of 600 court users). Similarly, a maximum of 400 for the remainder of categories of respondents (e.g. judges) should be allocated across all three states, making a total of 1,000, or one-sixth the original research sample size. Finally, it is recommended that the other research components (e.g. case studies, law in the books vs. law in practice), not be repeated. In their place, a small inventory should be constructed of anti-corruption legislation passed (or before the Assemblies), and prosecutions mounted/decided during the Project in the Pilot states and Federally.

40. That the committees be restructured as follows:

Implementation Committees to comprise the Chief Judge, Chairs of all sub-committees, and the Chief Registrar (secretary)

Secretary of all sub-committees to be the Deputy Chief Registrar.

Consideration be given for court users' committees to include a non-NGO/ NBA civil society, and youth representatives.

41. That intra-state committee meetings and reporting be as follows:
- a) Implementation committee formally meet bi-monthly
 - b) Sub-committees meet monthly, and for remote members, bi-monthly attendance, with agenda papers referred for consideration/ comment in the non-attendance month.
 - c) Implementation Committee non-meeting month – Deputy Chief Registrar report progress to Chief Registrar.
 - d) Chief Registrar to maintain a 'running sheet' of progress against the Action Plan, item by item.
 - e) Chief Registrar to prepare monthly report to Chief Justice of Nigeria and UNODC for Chief Judge's approval/ signature according to electronic template as per recommendation 33 above.
 - f) Implementation Committee chair (CJ) to set 'actions arising/ progress targets' at each meeting, requiring reporting back at subsequent meeting.

Specifically in relation to Borno, while an honour to have been invited, it is recommended that the national project coordinator resign/ withdraw from the Implementation Committee.

The restructure is firstly a response to CJ concerns that the plethora of committee work is impeding other non-Project commitments, and that there is a tendency for matters to move between meetings without progress. Secondly, the recommendation acknowledges that minutes/ reports of meetings to date do not disclose any particular administrative (or other) strategic approach to implementation and measurement of progress. Finally, it is a brazen attempt to impose discipline on committees and to maintain momentum.

D. Evaluation specific

42. That UNODC write to the Chief Judge and Implementation Committee of Katsina, if not all four pilot states, to apologise for the inconvenience and disruption caused by the organisational shortcomings of the evaluation mission.
43. That evaluation reports be commensurate with the complexity of the Project and/ or the robustness of the evaluation being completed.

The limit on length in particular, is arbitrary and does not necessarily contribute to a report that is of most benefit to the host country or to UNODC.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

Because this is a pilot Project, it should be expected that there will be results which are less than desired. Part of the piloting is the testing of UNODC approaches. Similarly, there will be positive results which were unexpected. Perhaps the most valuable outcome is in lessons learned.

a) To be avoided

1. There is no substitute for ‘on-the-ground vigilance.

The Project was impeded by the relative lateness of appointment of the NPC and many of the duties/ functions attached to the position preceded the appointment. UNODC chose to carry out these functions remotely from Vienna, rather than involve the local field office more than it could. However, it is acknowledged that it is doubtful if the field office could have responded totally. Nonetheless, there remains a view that there is still not a clear understanding of the division of responsibilities between Vienna and the field office. For Phase two (and the collocation of the country representative with the NPC will assist), greater disclosure and local office control will be required.

Regardless, monitoring and evaluation during the first 12 months was impeded, and an opportunity to embed a routine standardized reporting format/ data collection process was lost.

2. That despite apparent consistent messages that funding was limited, unrealistic expectations still built up, affecting the perception of the sincerity of UNODC.

3. Following on from 2 above, ‘loose lips sink ships’

Seemingly innocuous comments can have widespread consequences. The comment that UNODC ‘might be able to do something’ in relation to the complaints and registry software was seized upon and used as justification for stalling development in those areas, and failing provision in short-order, used as further evidence of UNODC promising without delivering.

4. Acceptance of personal recommendations, even from the highest authority can be problematic.

The failure to let the Assessment research out to tender had far-reaching consequences. The selection of Delta state, on the imminent retirement of the Chief Judge and the Chief Registrar, as a state that possessed the willingness and readiness, the ‘strength of vigor’ necessary to carry the Project, appears to have been unwise.

5. Similarly, verbal assurances are ‘not worth the paper they are written on’.

The judiciary does not exist in a vacuum. Outside of the wider social and political environment, it is more closely aligned with other organs of the justice system (e.g. legislature, executive). The closest of the relationships is with the Police, and specifically concerning corruption, independently appointed ‘watchdogs’; in Nigeria’s case, the ICPC. Both these agencies promised much. For a variety of reasons, commitments did not eventuate.

6. Cooperation can lead to competition and / or duplication

The Project envisaged close cooperation between UNODC and other donor agencies. In particular USAID and DFID were identified. USAID was ‘concerned and annoyed’ that Lagos, a state in which its own governance Project was being run, was selected by UNODC. Other agencies/ entities were similarly anxious that this Project did not duplicate or interfere with their planned or ongoing projects.

7. Courtesy/ comfort infrastructure contributions can lead to wider dissatisfaction.

The small (in \$ value) improvements made to various courts in the Pilot states, and in particular the IT/ Voice/ photocopier equipment contributions led to an expectation that ongoing maintenance was going to be met by UNODC (and despite consistent advice to the contrary). The subsequent 'failure' of the UNODC to provide same, again led to a perception that UNODC promised more than it delivered.

8. Attempts to maximize returns through limiting funding/ imposing unrealistic conditions in the short-term can result in greater expense (financially, in time and in human resources) in the longer term.

Without laboring the point, the NIALS research activities, notwithstanding shortcomings within NIALS itself, were unachievable for the funds available and within the projected timeframe. As a consequence, significant UNODC resources and delays arising, have been expended in unsuccessfully attempting to have NIALS complete the research to a satisfactory level, and subsequently internally within UNODC for data cleaning/ data (re)analysis and report (re)writing. There are any number of publicly available Project Costing and Project Management schema which might have been used by UNODC/ UNOPS and/ or NIALS that would have quickly indicated likely timeframes and financial costs involved.

b) To be considered for similar projects

8. Action Learning works
9. Following on from 8 above, that courtesy, respect, tolerance and willingness to accept locally developed solutions, rather than attempting to impose external solutions, engenders far greater enthusiasm and sense of ownership, and appears to promote higher likelihood of success.

Annex 1. Evaluation TORUNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME
GLOBAL PROGRAMME AGAINST CORRUPTIONProject Evaluation
Terms of reference

Project title: Strengthening Judicial Integrity and Capacity
Project number: FS/NIR/01/R16

BACKGROUND

The pilot project on strengthening judicial integrity and capacity of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime/ Global Programme Against Corruption was launched in October 2001. It was aimed at strengthening the rule of law, both at the national and sub-national level. In order to achieve this goal the objective of the project is to assist the Government of Nigeria in increasing the capacity and integrity of the justice system, in particular of the judiciary.

The project had five main objectives

- An evidence based, inclusive, integrated and impact-oriented, pilot tested Federal Anti-Corruption and Capacity Building Strategy for the Judiciary.
- The conduct of comprehensive assessments of the types, locations, levels and costs of corruption in the judiciary in three pilot States (Lagos, Borno and Delta).
- The development of comprehensive Action Plans in those three pilot States.
- The implementation of the respective Action Plans in nine pilot courts across the three pilot States.
- Upon the specific request of the Chief Justice of Nigeria and the Chief Judge of Katsina State, the development of an Action Plan for the Katsina State Judiciary.

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation is assess and establish if the project did strengthen the rule of law at national and sub-national levels, increased the capacity and the integrity of the justice system in Nigeria. Further, the evaluation will determine if the five objectives of the project were achieved as well as assess what impact has been created by this project.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluator will analyse: a) project concept and design; b) project implementation; and c) the outputs, outcomes and impact of the project. The evaluator will ensure that lessons

learned from the project will be recorded and recommendations on possible follow-up activities will be made, as appropriate.

ASSIGNMENT

1. Project concept and design

The evaluator will analyse the project concept and design with the focus of project elements directly related to strengthening judicial integrity and capacity. The evaluator will review the problems identified by the project and the project strategy chosen in order to address them. The evaluation should encompass an assessment of the appropriateness and obtainability of objectives and of planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to other cost-effective alternatives, if/as available. An evaluation of the executing modality and managerial arrangements will also be included. The evaluator will assess the appropriateness, quality and cost effectiveness of baseline studies and achievement indicators and review the workplan, planned duration of and budget for the project. Finally, an analysis of the clarity, logic and coherence of the project should also be provided for.

2. Implementation

The evaluator will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management, as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project, will be evaluated.

3. Project outputs, outcomes and impact

The evaluator assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved or expected to be achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results, where applicable. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective. If objectives other than the ones relating to strengthening judicial integrity and capacity are stated in the project document, the evaluator will also assess the achievement of these. However, care should be taken to prevent the evaluation from diverting attention to these objectives at the expense of the anti-corruption focus. The evaluator will also assess if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.

4. Recommendations

The evaluator will make recommendations as appropriate. They should constitute proposals for concrete action that could be taken in future to improve or rectify undesired outcomes. Recommendations may also be made in respect of issues related to the implementation of management of the project and follow up projects dealing with the same issues.

5. Lessons learned

The evaluator should record lessons learned from the project that are valid beyond the project itself.

DOCUMENTATION

The following documentation related to the project will be provided as reference documents: the project document, the semi-annual progress reports for the second semester of 2001, the first and second semester of 2002 and the first semester of 2003, the proceeding documents of the First Federal Integrity Meeting of Chief Judges, the State Integrity Meetings for the Judiciaries of Delta, Borno, Lagos and Katsina State and the first and second quarterly progress reports.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will be based on the following:

- desk review of all relevant documents available;
- interviews with participants, their supervisors and the clients in relevant agencies regarding impact of the programme;
- a series of mini-roundtables with participants of the project to discuss the impact of the programme; and
- analysis of extant data collected during the life of the programme.

OUTPUTS

1. A mission report including the report of the interviews and output of one-day workshop above.
2. A completed summary evaluation questionnaire
3. A finalized project evaluation report on the project, covering project concept and design, implementation, outputs, outcome and impact of the project, recommendations, and lessons learned.

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Timely and accurate submission of the documents. Substantive and linguistic quality of the documents prepared. Conformity of the project evaluation report with the standard format and guidelines for the preparation of project evaluation reports and the guidance received.

TRAVEL

The assignment of the consultant will include a mission to Abuja, Asaba, Maiduguri, Katsina and Lagos State for a minimum of a total of 10 working days to carry out the above activities.

WORK ARRANGEMENTS

1. Responsibility for evaluation

As for the methodology and process, this evaluation will be a joint effort between the consultant and the GPAC project team. As for substance, it is critical that the consultant is

independent and conducts a thorough evaluation covering both technical aspects of the project and also the management of the project itself.

2. Briefings, consultations and administrative support

The Officials responsible for briefing the evaluator are: Mr. Petter Langseth, Programme Manager, UNODC Global Programme against Corruption, Mr Oliver Stolpe, Global Programme against Corruption, Ms. Juliet Ume-Ezeoke, national project coordinator. As required, the evaluator will further consult with the UNODC Office Lagos, Mr. Paul Salayle, UNODC Resident Representative and other UNODC staff, and the UNOPS Office Vienna, Mr. Hans Ulrich Hugo.

The consultant will have access to all relevant documents and staff who have worked on the project.

3. Evaluation report and follow-up

At the end of the evaluation mission a debriefing meeting will be held at the UNODC Country Office in Nigeria in order to present a summary of the evaluator's findings and recommendations. The evaluator will submit and discuss (in writing, within 1 week of completion of the mission) the draft evaluation report with the Chief Justice, the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission, the Ministry of Justice, and, to the extent it is possible, with the executing agency and other parties to the project. It should be emphasized that although the evaluation team should take the views expressed into account, it should use its independent judgement in preparing the final report.

The evaluator is requested to follow the UNODC standard format and guidelines for the preparation of project evaluation report. The format and guidelines as well as the summary assessment questionnaire should be annexed to the terms of reference. The final report should not exceed 25 pages (excl. annexes) and should be submitted through the National Project Coordinator to the Head of the Anti-Corruption Unit of UNODC with copy to the Resident Representative, UNODC Country Office Nigeria. The Project Office in, Abuja Nigeria, will distribute the report to concerned parties including the Evaluation Section of UNODC Headquarter. The report should be typed in 1 ½ spacing and in A-4 format. An electronic copy of the evaluation report (annex 1), the evaluation summary (annex 2) and the summary assessment questionnaire (annex 3) will be made available and forwarded to silvia.levissianos@unodc.org

The **draft** report should be submitted through the project Office by latest 7 December 2003 and circulated for comments among all concerned Units and Sections within UNODC The deadline for the submission of the **final** evaluation report will be the 15 December 2003. UNODC will distribute the final report to the other parties of the project.

Annex 2. Evaluation questions and performance indicators

Evaluation questions were derived from the project document and project evaluation Terms of Reference. Performance Indicators were derived from the evaluation questions attached to each of the expected outputs and activities, roles and responsibilities of participants, and from the measures and indicators of change adopted for the ‘comprehensive assessment methodology’ attached to the Action Plans. They are presented in four parts:

- A. IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES;
- B. INDICATORS OF CHANGE;
- C. GLOBAL IMPACTS and
- D. SUSTAINABILITY

All in all, the approach adopted generated 70 evaluation questions and 206 Performance Indicators

A. IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

Immediate Objective 1

An evidence based, broad-based, integrated, comprehensive and pilot-tested Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary and a respective implementation strategy as the foundation for the strengthening of judicial integrity and capacity in Nigeria.

Evaluation question 1a.

Was an evidence-based, broad based, integrated, comprehensive Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan developed in a timely manner?

Evaluation question 1b.

Was the [Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan] pilot tested in a timely manner?

Evaluation question 1c.

Was a respective [Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan] implementation strategy developed in a timely manner?

Output 1.1

A Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary drafted.

Evaluation question 1.1a

Was a Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan drafted in a timely manner?

Activity 1.1.1

Conduct a two-day Federal Integrity Meeting for judges to:

- develop a Draft Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the Judiciary,
- select the three pilot States and

- agree on the methodology used for an assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and integrity of the justice system, including the levels, costs, locations, types and remedies of corruption (herein referred to as Integrity and Capacity Assessment).

Performance Indicators

- *Development of a Draft Federal Anti-Corruption Plan for the Judiciary*
- *Dates development commenced, finalised*
- *Adequacy of Draft Federal Anti-Corruption Plan*
- *Selection of three pilot states*
- *Suitability of selected pilot states*
- *Agreement on Integrity and Capacity Assessment methodology*
- *Adequacy of Assessment methodology*

Inputs 1.1.1:

UNODC/ UNOPS

- UNODC to identify and UNOPS to hire the National Project Coordinator (NPC), who will ensure the operational management of the project.
- Organize and provide funding for the Federal Integrity Meeting for judges, including meeting facilities, lump sum travel costs and lump sum DSA (Covering only room and breakfast) for 35 State Chief Justices, Hospitality for approximately 50 people (four coffee breaks, two dinners and two lunches) and additional meeting costs for renting of Powerpoint presentation equipment, handouts etc

Government

- Chief Justice of the Federation to provide office space for the National Project Coordinator including furniture.
- Chief Justice of the Federation, assisted by the NPC and UNODC, to invite all 36 State Chief Justices to the Federal Integrity Meeting.
- Chief Justice of the Federation, in consultation with UNODC and NPC, to invite representatives from various stakeholder groups (Anti-Corruption Commission, the Attorney General's Office, the Inspector General of Police, the Parliament, the Bar Associations, the Media and relevant NGO's) to attend the Federal Integrity Meetings for judges.
- Chief Justice of the Federation to provide for secretarial support to and transportation of the NPC and UNODC Staff in preparation of, during and for the eventual immediate follow-up activities of the Federal Integrity Meeting.

Evaluation question 1.1.1a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.1.1b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement

November 2003 Output 1.1 status			
Finalised, N.F.A.	Finalised - ongoing	Not completed	Abandoned
Comments:			

Output 1.2

Three Integrity and Capacity Assessment Reports for the justice system in three pilot States prepared.

Evaluation question 1.2

Were Integrity and Capacity Assessment reports for the justice system in the three pilot states prepared in a timely manner?

Activity 1.2.1

Conduct Integrity and Capacity Assessments in three pilot States of the local justice systems, including integrity surveys, focus groups and case studies and prepare three Reports.

Performance Indicators

- *Assessments conducted in the three pilot states*
- *Dates assessments commenced/finalised (including analysis, publication)*
- *Adequacy of assessments*

Inputs 1.2.1:**UNODC/ UNOPS**

- UNODC to identify, in consultation with the Chief Justice of the Federation and the Chief Justices of the pilot states, and UNOPS to subcontract an independent national research institute to conduct three State level Capacity and Integrity Assessments of the justice system and prepare the respective reports under the guidance of the NPC and the Programme Manager of UNODC's Global Programme against Corruption

Evaluation question 1.2.1a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.2.1b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement*

November 2003 Output 1.2 status			
Finalised, N.F.A.	Finalised - ongoing	Not completed	Abandoned
Comments:			

Output 1.3**Anti-Corruption Action Plans for the judiciary in three pilot States.*****Evaluation question 1.3***

Were Anti-Corruption Plans in the three Pilot states developed in a timely manner?

Activity 1.3.1

Conduct three 2-days State Integrity Meetings in the three pilot States, to develop Anti-Corruption Action Plans for the Judiciary. These plans will, among others, outline the areas where outside-assistance by UNODC or other bi- or multilateral donor agencies might be needed.

Performance indicators

- *Integrity meetings conducted*
- *Dates of meetings*
- *Number and suitability of participants attending*
- *Areas where outside assistance by UNODC or other donor agencies outlined*
- *Adequacy, appropriateness of Action Plans*
- *Time taken and date(s) of dissemination of Action Plans*
- *Coverage of Action Plans' dissemination*

Activity 1.3.2

Support within the limits of the indicated lump sum (US\$ 50,000) the launching of the implementation of specific tasks resulting from the State level action plans according to the needs identified and priorities established. Such tasks *could* include:

- the establishment and training of a social control function monitoring the compliance of judges with the Code of Conduct;
- the computerization of court records in selected pilot courts;
- the establishment and support of State-level judicial training institutes;
- the introduction of a court decision monitoring mechanism; and
- a system of 'peer evaluation' etc.

Performance Indicators

- *Number, type and appropriateness of support activities*
- *Dates support activities undertaken*
- *Achievability of support activities within available US\$50,000*

Inputs:**UNODC/ UNOPS**

- Organize and provide funding for the three State Integrity Meetings for judges, including lump sum travel costs and lump sum DSA (Covering only room and breakfast) for 20 participants from outside State capital.
- Hospitality for approximately 50 people (four coffee breaks, two dinners and two lunches) and additional meeting costs for renting of overhead equipment, handouts etc

Government

- Chief Justice of the Federation to designate and provide funding for one representative of the Federal Supreme Court to attend each of the 2-days State level Integrity Meetings.
- Chief Justices of the three pilot States, assisted by the NPC and UNODC, to invite Judicial Officers of all levels and representatives from various stakeholder groups (Anti-Corruption Commission, the Attorney General's Office, the Inspector General of Police, the Parliament, the Bar Associations, the Media and relevant NGO's) to attend the State-level Integrity Meetings.
- Chief Justices of the three pilot States to provide Meeting facilities for the three State-level Integrity Meetings.
- Chief Justices of the three pilot States to provide for secretarial support to and transportation of the NPC and UNODC staff in preparation of, during and for the eventual follow-up the State level integrity meetings.

Evaluation question 1.3.1a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.3.1b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement*

November 2003 Output 1.3 status			
Finalised, N.F.A.	Finalised - ongoing	Not completed	Abandoned
Comments:			

Output 1.4

Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the judiciary including an implementation Strategy adopted.

Evaluation question 1.4a

Was the Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for the judiciary adopted in a timely manner?

Evaluation question 1.4b

Did the adoption include an implementation strategy?

Activity 1.4.1

Conduct Second Federal Integrity Meeting to:

- finalize the Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for judges based on the findings of the three Integrity and Capacity Assessment Reports and the experiences gained from the implementation of the Anti-Corruption Action Plans in the three pilot states,
- reach a broad-based agreement with regard to the single components of the action plan, the responsibilities and timeframes for the implementation of the single activities.
- outline the areas where outside-assistance by UNODC or other bi- or multilateral donor agencies might be needed.

Performance indicators

- *Second Integrity meeting conducted*
- *Dates of meeting*
- *Number and suitability of participants attending*
- *Federal Anti-Corruption Action Plan for judges finalised*
- *Broad-based agreement on single components of Action Plan reached*
- *Adequacy, appropriateness of Action Plan*
- *Implementation strategy finalised*
- *Adequacy of implementation strategy*
- *Areas where outside assistance by UNODC or other donor agencies outlined*
- *Time taken and date(s) of dissemination of Action Plan*
- *Coverage of Action Plans' dissemination*

Inputs 1.4:**UNODC/ UNOPS**

- Organize and provide funding for the Federal Integrity Meeting for judges, including meeting facilities, lump sum travel costs and lump sum DSA (Covering only room and breakfast) for 35 State Chief Justices.
- Hospitality for approximately 50 people (four coffee breaks, two dinners and two lunches) and additional meeting costs for renting of power point presentation equipment, handouts etc.

Government

- Chief Justice of the Federation, assisted by the NPC and UNODC, to invite all 36 State Chief Justices to the Federal Integrity Meeting.
- Chief Justice of the Federation, in consultation with UNODC and NPC, to invite representatives from various stakeholder groups (Anti-Corruption Commission, the Attorney General's Office, the Inspector General of Police, the Parliament, the Bar Associations, the Media and relevant NGO's) to attend the Federal Integrity Meetings for Judges.
- Chief Justice of the Federation to provide for secretarial support to and transportation of the NPC and UNODC staff in preparation of, during and for the eventual immediate follow-up activities of the Federal Integrity Meeting.

Evaluation question 1.4.1a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.4.1b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement*

November 2003 Output 1.4 status			
Finalised, N.F.A.	Finalised - ongoing	Not completed	Abandoned
Comments:			

Output 1.5

Project activities periodically monitored and evaluated, allowing for modification of implementation and eventually a project revision.

Evaluation question 1.5a

Were project activities periodically monitored and evaluated?

Evaluation question 1.5b

Did periodic monitoring and evaluation lead to modification of implementation?

Evaluation question 1.5c

Did periodic monitoring and evaluation lead to project revision?

Activity 1.5.1

To prepare semi-annual progress reports, including all activities undertaken in the reporting period and other events, measures and actions that took place in the country and are relevant to the project.

Evaluation question 1.5.1

Were semi-annual progress reports prepared in a timely manner?

Performance indicators

- *Dates of preparation and submission of semi-annual progress reports*
- *Adequacy of semi-annual progress reports*
- *Number, type and appropriateness of implementation modifications*
- *Type and appropriateness of revisions to Project*

Inputs 1.5.1:**UNODC/UNOPS**

The NPC to prepare the semi-annual progress reports.

Government

- The Chief Justice, and Federal Supreme Court, as well as the involved Chief Justices at the State level collaborate in the preparation of progress report, by providing the NPC with their assessment of the progress made and all other relevant information.

Evaluation question 1.5.1a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.5.1b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement*

Activity 1.5.2

To organise, 12 months from the start of the project, a tripartite meeting between the Minister of Justice, the Chief Justice, UNODC and the associated agency to evaluate, based on the two semi-annual progress reports, the progress made and make recommendations regarding the modification of the implementation or, if needed, a project revision.

Evaluation question 1.5.2a

Was a tripartite meeting between the Minister of Justice, the Chief Justice and associated agency organised and conducted within 12 months from the start of the project?

Evaluation question 1.5.2b

Did the meeting evaluate progress made, based on the two semi-annual progress reports?

Evaluation question 1.5.2c

Were recommendations regarding the modification of the implementation or, if needed, a project revision, made?

Performance Indicators

- *Date of tripartite meeting*
- *Number, type and suitability of implementation modification made*
- *Number, type of project revisions made*

Inputs 1.5.2

UNODC/UNOPS

- UNODC through the NPC prepare and organize tripartite meeting in Abuja, inviting the Minister of Justice, the Chief Justice a local representative of the associated agency and a representative of the UNDCP country office, Nigeria.
- UNODC to provide for (local) travel costs of the representatives of the associated agency and the UNDCP country office

Government

- Chief Justice to provide for meeting location.

Evaluation question 1.5.2a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.5.2b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement*

Activity 1.5.3

On completion of the project conduct an independent evaluation of the project, including recommendations for an eventual second phase for the review of a second tripartite meeting.

Evaluation question 1.5.3

Was an adequate independent evaluation of the project undertaken on completion of the project?

Performance indicators

- *Evaluation completed*
- *Date of evaluation*
- *Adequacy of evaluation*

Inputs 1.5.3**UNODC/UNOPS**

- Provide for an independent international consultant to prepare final progress evaluation report.
- UNODC through the NPC to prepare and organise tripartite meeting in Abuja, inviting the Minister of Justice, the Chief Justice a local representative of the associated agency and a representative of the UNDCP country office, Nigeria.
- Provide for (local) travel costs of the representatives of the associated agency and the UNDCP country office.

Government

- Chief Justice to provide for meeting location.

Evaluation question 1.5.3a

Were inputs provided as specified?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC documentary evidence/advice*

Evaluation question 1.5.3b

Were inputs appropriate for the proposed activities?

Performance Indicator

- *Government, UNODC advice, Evaluator judgement*

November 2003 Output 1.5 status			
Finalised, N.F.A.	Finalised - ongoing	Not completed	Abandoned
Comments:			

ADDITIONAL INPUTS

National Project Coordination (NPC)

National project coordination comprised responsibility for the operational management of the project, and the day-to-day business of the project, including planning, initiating and managing project activities.

Principal duties and responsibilities:

1. Providing operational management of the project according to the project document;

Evaluation question NPC1

Was operational management of the project undertaken according to the project document?

Performance Indicator

- *Level of concordance*

2. Organize in close cooperation with the Office of the Chief Justice of the Federation and UNODC/GPAC the two federal integrity meetings for judges, including the selection of the participants and their invitation, the organization of the travel and accommodation for the attending Chief Justices from the States and the preparation of the background material to be handed out.

Evaluation question NPC2

Were the two federal integrity meetings organised in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- *Dates of Integrity Meetings*
- *Accuracy, completeness of supporting materials provided*
- *Participants' views*

3. Support the UNODC/GPAC staff in the preparation of the reports of the meetings.

Evaluation question NPC3

Were UNODC/GPAC staff supported in the preparation of reports of meetings in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- *number of reports supported*
- *adequacy of support provided*

4. Identify independent institute(s) to conduct the integrity assessments of the justice system in the three pilot states.

Evaluation question NPC4

Was an independent institute(s) to conduct the integrity assessments identified?

Performance Indicators

- number and quality of institutes considered
- adequacy of selection criteria
- date of selection

5. Support and monitor the research activities of the independent research institute(s) and review the reports prepared.

Evaluation question NPC5

Were the research activities of the independent research institute supported and monitored and were review reports prepared in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- number of support/monitoring meetings held with research institute
- research institute views
- number of monitoring reports requested/received from institute
- adequacy of reviews subsequently undertaken

6. Organize the three State level integrity meetings for judges including the selection of the participants and their invitation, the organization of the travel and accommodation for the attending Judges and the preparation of the background material to be handed out.

Evaluation question NPC6

Were the three state integrity meetings organised in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- dates of integrity meetings
- suitability of participants invited
- quality of meeting
- participants' views

7. Support the UNODC/GPAC staff in the preparation of the reports of the meetings.

Evaluation question NPC7

Were UNODC/GPAC staff supported in the preparation of state integrity meetings reports in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- number of reports supported
- adequacy of support
- UNODC views

8. Prepare semi-annual progress reports, including all activities undertaken in the reporting period and other events, measures and actions that took place in the country and are relevant to the project.

Evaluation question NPC8

Were semi-annual progress reports prepared in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- number of reports prepared
- dates of submission
- dates of acceptance by UNODC

9. Organize and prepare two tripartite meetings to evaluate the progress made and make recommendations regarding the modification of the implementation or, if needed, a project revision.

Evaluation question NPC9

Were the two tripartite meetings to evaluate progress made, organised and prepared in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- number of meetings
- dates of meetings
- quality of materials arising

10. Support the evaluation mission of the independent international expert.

Evaluation question NPC10

Was the evaluation mission supported in an appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- international experts' views

11. Provide the UNODC/ GPAC on a weekly basis with all material on corruption and the recovery of assets. (press clippings, reports etc.).

Evaluation question NPC11

Were UNODC/GPAC provided with all material on corruption and the recovery of assets on a weekly basis?

Performance Indicators

- completeness of material provided
- dates of provision
- UNODC views

12. Supervising and coordinating all local administrative matters, including setting up and running a local office structure for the project, and providing assistance to international consultants, as required;

Evaluation question NPC12a

Was the supervision and coordination all local administrative matters efficient, effective and appropriate?

Performance indicators

- Level of local approval
- Level of external (UN and international consultants) approval

Evaluation question NPC12b

Was the establishment of a local office for the project timely?

Performance Indicators

- *date of establishment*

13. Providing substantive input to the work of the Chief Justice of the Federation, the Federal Supreme Court and the Chief Justices of the three pilot states;

Evaluation question NPC13

Were the Chief Justice of the Federation, the federal Supreme court and the three State Chief Justices provided with substantive input?

Performance Indicators

- *level of input*
- *Chief justices' views*

14. Liaising with Nigerian institutions, relevant national and international governmental and non-governmental organizations; and relevant professionals in the criminal justice fields;

Evaluation question NPC14

Were Nigerian Institutions, relevant national and international governmental organisations and relevant professionals in the criminal justice fields liaised with in a timely and appropriate manner?

Performance Indicators

- *number of Nigerian Institutions liaised with*
- *number of national and international organisations liaised with*
- *number of relevant professionals liaised with*
- *appropriateness of liaison mode*

15. Implementing specific tasks of the project, as indicated in the project document, including planning, providing substantive input and organizational and administrative services to the mission(s) of UNODC staff and the international consultant

Evaluation question NPC15

Were project tasks specified in the project document implemented in a timely manner?

Performance Indicators

- *level of concordance*

16. Preparing, updating and regularly revising the project work plan in cooperation with UNODC and UNOPS;

Evaluation question NPC16

Was the project work plan prepared and updated and the project work plan regularly revised in cooperation with UNODC and UNOPS?

Performance Indicators

- *frequency, regularity of cooperation activities*
- *UNODC views*

17. Based on a questionnaire to be provided by UNODC collect all information available on the justice system at the Federal level and within the three pilot states.

Evaluation question NPC17

Was UNODC provided with all information available on the justice system in the federal and within the three pilot states?

Performance Indicators

- *completeness of material provided*
- *dates of provision*
- *UNODC views*

UNODC/UNOPS (UN)

The project was executed by UNODC, which provided expertise, advisory and technical services, such as the conduct of capacity and integrity assessments, the organisation of Integrity Meetings for Judges at the Federal and State level and the monitoring of the implementation of the action plans. For this purpose UNODC was to provide adequate financial contributions. At semi-annual intervals, the project outcomes were to be monitored and progress made evaluated by UNODC and UNOPS in conjunction with the Ministry of Justice and the Chief Justice. Finally, UNOPS was to provide local administrative support for the execution of the project.

Evaluation question UNI

Was the level of guidance and advice provided to the national coordinator timely and appropriate?

Performance indicators

- *National coordinator's views*
- *UNODC/UNOPS views*
- *Adequacy of project documentation*
- *Evaluator judgement*

Evaluation question UN2

Was the monitoring of project implementation by UNODC, UNOPS effective and appropriate?

Performance indicators

- *National coordinator's views*
- *Ministry of Justice, Chief Justices' views*
- *UNODC, UNOPS views*
- *Adequacy of project documentation*
- *Donor countries' views*

Financial management and cost-effectiveness (FM)

Evaluation question FM1

Were funds forwarded in a timely manner?

Performance indicator

- *Intervals between scheduled payments/payment requests and dates of receipt*

Evaluation question FM2

Were received funds disbursed in an appropriate manner?

Performance indicators

- *Appropriate financial governance standards*
- *Completeness/accuracy of financial records*

Evaluation question FM3

Were disbursed funds within budget?

Performance indicator

- *Proportion of budgeted funds disbursed, by activity*

Evaluation question FM4

Was the project in toto and component elements cost-effective?

Performance indicators

- *number of alternatives considered*
- *projected costs of alternatives*
- *selection criteria employed*
- *justification of selection*

C. INDICATORS OF CHANGE

Access to Justice

Measure 1; Code of judicial Conduct

Objective: Implementation of a relevant and up-to-date Code of Conduct for judicial officers

Performance indicators

- *Date of most recent review of Code of Conduct*
- *Number of complaints received under the Code of Conduct*
- *Percentage of complaints received that were investigated*
- *Percentage of complaints received and investigated that were disposed of*
- *Code of Conduct complying with best international standards*
- *Percentage of officers trained on Code of Conduct*
-

Measure 2; Public awareness about rights and obligations

Objective: Enhance the public's understanding of basic rights and obligations dealing with court-related procedural matters

Performance indicator

- *The number of judges involved in public information programmes offered to the media and to the public in general*

Availability of the judicial Code of Conduct to the public

Measure 3; ease access for witnesses in criminal procedural matters

Performance indicator

- *Number of instances in which witnesses provide evidence without attending court*

Average time and expense for a witness to attend a case

Measure 4; Affordable court fees

Performance Indicator

- *Percentage of fees set at too high a level*

Measure 5; Adequate physical facilities for witness attending court

Performance Indicator

- *Adequate Witness and Litigant's waiting room (taking advantage of any unused rooms where resources do not permit additional court physical space)*

Measure 6; alternative use of judges in distant rural areas

Objective: Itinerant Judges with the capacity to adjudicate cases outside the Court Building reaching distant rural areas

Performance Indicators

- *Number of Itinerant Judges*
- *Availability of necessary transport*

Measure 7; public awareness regarding bail-related procedures

Objective: Level of Informed Citizens (and court-users in particular) on the nature, scale, and scope of bail-related procedures

Performance Indicator

- *Number of courts offering basic information on bail-related aspects in a systematic manner.*

Measure 8; Use of suspended sentences and updated fine levelsPerformance Indicators

- *Passage of empowering legislation*
- *Existing Number of cases where suspended sentences were applied*
- *Number of Cases where fine penalties were applied*

Quality of Justice**Measure 9, Timeliness of Court Proceedings**Performance indicators

- *Level of cooperation between agencies*
- *Prioritisation of old outstanding cases*
- *Number of adjournment requests granted*
- *Percentage of courts where sittings commence on time*
- *Percentage of judges whose performance is monitored*
- *Levels of consultations between judiciary and the bar*
- *Procedural rules that reduce the potential abuse of process*
- *Number of judges practicing case management*
- *Type of case management being practiced*
- *Regular-congestion exercises undertaken*
- *Regular prison visits undertaken with Human Rights NGO's and other Stakeholders*
- *Level of access to books for judicial officers*
- *Functioning Criminal Justice and other committees (including NGOs)*
-

Measure 10; Courts exercising powers within their JurisdictionPerformance Indicators

- *Number of judges/registrars trained/retrained in last year*
- *Extent to which bail jurisdiction clear and implemented*
- *Percentage of weekly court returns made and reviewed*
- *Number of court inspections*
- *Number of files called Up under powers of review*
-

Measure 11; Consistency in sentencingPerformance indicator

- *Availability of criminal records at time of sentencing*
- *Development of and compliance with sentencing guidelines*

Measure 12; Performance of individual judges

Performance Indicators

- *Percentage of cases where sits on time*
- *Backlog of cases? Going up? Down?*
- *Number of errors in procedures*
- *Number of appeals allowed against substantive judgments*
- *Conduct in court*
- *Number of public complaints*
- *Level of understanding of Code of Conduct*
- *Percentage of sentences imposed within the sentencing guidelines*
-

Measure 13; Compliance with requirements of civil process

Performance Indicators

- *Number of cases where abuse of ex parte injunctions*
- *Number of non-urgent cases heard by Vacation judges*
- *Number of instances of proceeding improperly in the absence of parties*
- *Number of chambers judgments (not given in open court).*

Measure 14; Ensuring propriety in the appointment of judges

Performance indicator

- *Level of confidence among other judges*

Measure 15; Raising level of public awareness of the judicial Code of Conduct

Performance indicators

- *Availability of Code of Conduct*
- *Number of complaints made concerning alleged breaches*
-

Public confidence in the courts

Measure 16; Public Confidence in the courts

Performance Indicators

- *Level of confidence among lawyers, Judges, litigants, court administrators, Police, general public, prisoners, and court users*
- *Number of complaints (see above);*
- *Number of inspections by ICPC*
- *Effectiveness of policies regarding formal and social contact between the judiciary and the executive*
- *Nature, scope and scale of involvement of civil society in court user committees*

Improving efficiency and effectiveness in responding to public complaints about the judicial process

Measure 17; Existence of credible complaints mechanisms

Performance Indicators

- *complaints mechanisms which comply with best practice*
- *Extent to which public are aware of and willing to use the complaints mechanisms*
- *Readiness to admit anonymous complaints in appropriate circumstances*

C. GLOBAL IMPACT (I)

The final Progress Performance Evaluation Report (PPER) is designed to evaluate the actual impact of the project.

Evaluation question I1.

Did the project strengthen the rule of law at national and sub-national levels?

Evaluation question I2.

Did the Project increase the capacity and the integrity of the justice system in Nigeria?

Evaluation question I3.

Did the Project achieve the five objectives?

Evaluation question I4

What was the impact of the Project?

Performance Indicators

- *The quality of the Federal and State level action plans, specifically with regard to the level of detail, the clear establishment of responsibilities, timeframes and the assessment of human and financial resources needed.*
- *The number and amounts of donor contributions made or pledged in support of the implementation of the action plans, both at the Federal and State level.*
- *The level of commitment in terms of allocation of resources, both human and financial, to the implementation of the single activities proposed under the Federal and State-level action plans.*
- *The impact of the single anti-corruption measures carried out within the framework of the State level action plans, specifically in terms of increased awareness of all stakeholders with regard to levels, types, locations, costs and effects of as well as remedies against judicial corruption.*
- *The amount of activities undertaken by the Judiciaries within the three pilot States in execution of the respective Action Plans developed under this project.*
- *The successful implementation of the project activities resulting in the project outputs;*
- *Six-monthly progress reports to be issued according to the outputs envisaged in the project; and*
- *Financial monitoring records of expenditures.*

D. Sustainability (S)

Sustainability measures the likelihood of actual or expected benefits from the project continuing. In general, changes arising out of projects are intended to be ongoing, however future events, despite the level of project success achieved, might be outside the control of project managers. Accordingly, results of assessing sustainability do not necessarily reflect the quality and appropriateness of the design or management of the project to date.

Factors which are commonly identified as impacting on sustainability and evaluation questions arising are:

Institutional

Evaluation question S1

To what extent are current institutional arrangements for the management, monitoring and future carriage of the project appropriate?

Indicators

- NPC and other participants' views
- Evaluator judgement

Evaluation question S2

Are any changes to current institutional arrangements envisioned?

Indicators

- National project coordinator/participants' advice
- UNODC/UNOPS advice

Evaluation question S3.

If changes are envisioned, to what extent and how, are the envisioned changes likely to impact on changes arising from the project continuing?

Indicators

- NPC and other participants' views
- Evaluator judgement

Social

Evaluation question S4

What are and to what extent are current social factors contributing to or detracting from the likelihood of benefits of the project continuing?

Indicators

- National project coordinator, participants' advice
- Evaluator judgement

Evaluation question S5

To what extent are current social factors likely to prevail in the short to medium term?

Indicator

- National project coordinator, participants' advice
- Evaluator judgement

Political

Evaluation question S6

What is the current level of political support for the project?

Indicators

- National project coordinator, other participants' advice
- Documentary evidence of support
-

Evaluation question S7

To what extent is the current level of political support for the project likely to prevail in the short to medium term?

Indicators

- National project coordinator, other participants' advice
- Evaluator judgement

Managerial

Evaluation question S8

To what extent are current managerial arrangements contributing to or detracting from the likelihood of benefits of the project continuing?

Indicators

- National project coordinator, participants' advice
- Evaluator judgement

Evaluation question S9

Are changes to the current managerial arrangements envisioned?

Indicator

- National project coordinator, UNODC, participants' advice

Evaluation question S10

If changes are envisioned, to what extent and how, are the envisioned changes likely to impact on the benefits of the project continuing?

Indicators

- NPC, other participants' advice
- Evaluator judgement

Financial viability

Evaluation question S11

Are current financial arrangements appropriate for the objectives/tasks to be maintained?

Indicators

- *National project coordinator, participants' advice*
- *Evaluator judgement*

Financial stability

Evaluation question S12

To what extent are ongoing funds guaranteed or likely?

Indicators

- *National project coordinator/IAEC/local participants' advice*
- *UNODC advice*

Annex 3. Organisations and places visited and persons met*People Met/ Organisations*

Adeyinka, Hon. Justice A F	Administrative Judge, Ikeya High Court, Lagos State
Agbasa, O A	Secretary, Implementation Committee, Delta State
Aina, Abigail	Consultant, GTZ
Akinkugbe, I O	Deputy Chief Registrar, Ikeya High Court, Lagos State
Akinseye-George, Yemi	Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the Federation
Akpositdio, Hon. Justice E	Chairman, Court Users Committee, Delta State
Aku, Ali	Senior Program Coordinator, Nigeria Rule of Law Assistance Project, National Centre for State Courts
Alabi, Hon. Justice A A	Chair, Court Users Committee, Lagos State
Amasike, Dr C J	Special Assistant to the Attorney General of the Federation
Azinge, Professor	Director of Studies, Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies
Baia, Hon. Justice T O	Pilot Court #3, Delta State
Bozimo, Hon. Justice Rosaline	Chief Judge, Delta State
Briki-Okolosi, Hon. Justice G B	Chairman, Public Awareness and Training Committee, Delta State
Dogali, A Y	Controller of Prisons, Delta State
Eliwario, Hon. Justice S A	Chairman, Rules and Standards Committee, Delta State
Garawana, Hon. Justice	Chairman, Implementation Committee, Borno State
Guobadia, Professor D A	Director-General, Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies
Iriele, Chinelo V	Welfare Secretary of the Nigerian Bar Association
Kekere-Ekun, Hon. Justice K M O	Chair, Public Complaints Committee, Lagos State
Kolo, Hon. Alhaji M	Chief Judge of Borno State
Kuoh, Manga	Snr. Public Sector Management Specialist, World Bank, Africa Region

Maagaji, Hadiza	Assistant Registrar, Maiduguri High Court, Borno State
Mustapha, Mohammed	Deputy Chief Registrar, Maiduguri High Court, Borno State
Nwakasi, Victor	Legal Consultant, GTZ
Obanor, P N	A/G Chief Registrar, Delta State
Obodo, Felicia O	Peoples Rights, Delta State
Ogunsanya, A	Member, Agege Customary Court, Lagos State
Oho, Hon. Justice F O	Chairman, Performance Monitoring Committee, Delta State
Olujinmi, Chief Akim SAN	Minister for Justice and Attorney General, Nigeria
Onyeabo, Hon. Justice G M	A/G Chair, Criminal Justice Committee, Lagos State
Pam, Ibrahim, J	Office of the Chairman, Independent Corrupt Practices Commission
Raja, Hannatu	Judicial Integrity and Capacity, Independent Corrupt Practices Commission
Salay, Paul	UNODC Country representative
Santali, Hadiza esq.	Training Coordinator, National Centre for State Courts
Taima, Mrs	Chief Registrar, Ikeya High Court, Lagos State
Ume-Ezeoke, Juliet	National Project Coordinator, UNODC
Uwais, Hon. Chief Justice M L	Chief Justice of Nigeria
Waba, JJ	Controller of Prisons, Borno State
Wright, Minnie	Democracy and Governance Officer, USAID

Places Visited

'New' Prison, Maidugure, Borno State

Maximum Security Prison, Maiduguri, Borno State

Pilot Court, Umuda, Delta State

Pilot Customary Court, Agege, Lagos State

Pilot High Court #8, Maiduguri, Borno State

Pilot Magistrates Court #1, Maiduguri, Borno State

Pilot Sharia Court #2, Maiduguri, Borno State

Supreme Court, Abuja

UNODC Field Office, Abuja

UNODC Field Office, Lagos

Annex 4. Documents included in desk review

Note: Listed by Agencies/Entities of interest, not necessarily source of documents

Aina, Abigail

Need for Training of Sharia Court Judges in Borno, Report submitted to the National Coordinator, UNODC

Borno state

Minutes, Bar and Bench, February 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, Hawul local gov't area, 14 March 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, Magumeri chapter, 14 March 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, Marte local gov't area, 7 March 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, Ngala/Kala-Balge area, (inaugural) 7 March 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, Ngala/kala-Balge area, 3 April 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, State, 21 March 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, state, 7 March 2003

Minutes, Criminal Justice System Coordination Committee, 11 November 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 1 August 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 10 March 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 20 April 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 22 April 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 26 September 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 6 October 2003

Minutes, Implementation Committee, 7 March 2003

Minutes, Jurisdictional Review Committee, Magistrates upper and lower Sharia cts, 11 November 2003

Minutes, Meeting on Judicial Integrity, 12 December 2003

Minutes, Meeting on Judicial Integrity, 12 November 2002

Minutes, Meeting UNODC/Hon. Chief Judge Mohammed Lucas, 28 October 2003

Progress report, 20 March 2003

Progress report, 9 October 2003

Report, Field Trip, Borno, 24-26 February 2003

Various Correspondence UNODC national coordinator/National Centre for State Courts

Delta state

Action Plan (updated November 2003)

Copy of Speech, 2002/2003 Judicial year, CJ Delta

Minutes, Court Users Committee, (inaugural), 20 August 2003

Minutes, Court Users Committee, 21 August 2003

Minutes, Performance Monitoring and Training Committee, (inaugural), 3 Sept 2003

Minutes, Public Awareness Committee, (inaugural), 19 August 2003

Minutes, Rules and Standards committee, 2nd meeting, 10 Oct 2003

Progress Report, period ending ??? 2003

Report of Implementation Committee, 18 November 2003

Report of meeting, UNODC/Implementation Committee, 14 March 2003

Report of Proceedings, In Housing Ethics Training of Court Employees, Ughelli Zone 17 Oct 2003

Report of Proceedings, In Housing Ethics Training, 14 Oct 2003

Report of Rapporteurs, Workshop for Court Administrators and Registrars, 23-24 June 2003

Various correspondence, UNODC national coordinator/Chief registrar

Various correspondence, UNODC national coordinator/Implementation Committee

Katsina state

Progress Report, Court Users Committee, 12 March 2003

Progress Report, Implementation Committee, 18 September 2003

Progress Report, Performance Monitoring Committee, 7 March 2003

Progress Report, Public Complaints Committee, 25 February 2003

Progress Report, Public Complaints Committee, 6 March 2003

Various Correspondence, UNODC/ Implementation Committee

Various Correspondence, UNODC/ National Centre for State Courts

Lagos state

3rd Progress report, 17 November 2003

Album of proceedings, Public Forum for Court Users, 27 June 2003

Album, Court renovations

Annual Report, 2002, Lagos State Judiciary

Civil Procedures Rules 2003, High Court of Lagos

Comments, draft action plan, Hon. Justice I A Sotumin (undated)

Communique, 2nd Federal Integrity Meeting, 18 December 2002
 Minutes, Court Users Committee, 13 May 2003
 Minutes, Court Users Committee, 18 March 2003
 Minutes, Court Users Committee, 19 February 2003
 Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, 10 March 2003
 Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, 10 March 2003
 Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, 20 February 2003
 Minutes, Criminal Justice Committee, 7 April 2003
 Minutes, Implementation Committee, 21 February 2003
 Minutes, Performance and Training Committee, 18 February 2003
 Minutes, Performance and Training Committee, 31 March 2003
 Minutes, Rules and Amendments Committee, 20 February 2003
 Minutes, Rules and Amendments Committee, 5 March 2003
 Monthly Judiciary Newsletters 1-4
 Progress report, April 2003
 Progress report, June/July 2003
 Progress report, March 2003
 Progress report, March-July 2003
 Progress report, May 2003
 Record, Meeting UNODC/Hon. Justice Sotimu 27 October 2003
 Report, 2nd Federal Integrity Meeting (undated)
 Report, Implementation Committee, 24 June 2003
 Report, One Day Court Users Forum on Judicial Reform, 13 December 2002
 Report, Public Complaints and Training Committee, March-June 2003
 Various correspondence UNODC national coordinator/Chief Judge
 Various Correspondence, UNODC national coordinator/Chief Registrar
 Video (x 3) of proceedings, Public Forum for Court Users, 27 June 2003

Minister of Justice and Attorney General of the Federation of Nigeria

Olujinmi, Chief Akinlolu SAN, 'Reforming the Justice Sector in Nigeria: My Agenda'.

Vision statement.

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999

National Centre for State Courts

Model Code of Conduct for Court Employees in the Federal Republic of Nigeria, revised draft, 22 September, 2003

National Project Coordinator

Terms Of Reference, UNODC/National SSA, 14 June 2001

National Institute of Advanced Legal Studies

(Detailed) Draft Terms of reference for contractual services, UNODC/National Research Institute

Business Survey on Justice System questionnaire

Court Users Survey on Justice System questionnaire

Draft report 13/06/2003

Revised draft report

Draft Terms of reference for contractual services, UNODC/Independent National Research Institute

Judicial Survey on Justice System questionnaire

Survey for active court staff questionnaire

Survey for lawyers (Prosecutor/Defender) questionnaire

Survey for Prisoners awaiting trial questionnaire

Survey for Retired Court Staff questionnaire

Survey on awaiting trial persons/prison survey questionnaire

National Judicial Institute

Code of Conduct for Judicial Officers of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1998

UNODC

Case review comments UNODC/ NIALS (x 2 undated)

Correspondence UNODC/NIALS dated 17 April 2003

First State Integrity Meeting in Katsina, 18-19 June 2003, report of proceedings

Measures and Impact Indicators for Assessing Judicial Integrity and Capacity, developed by the First Federal Integrity Meeting on Strengthening Judicial Integrity and Capacity in Nigeria

Mission report, 1-10 February 2003

Mission report, 14-18 June 2003

Mission report, 5-23 September 2002
Mission report, 6-16 February 2002
Progress report #1, April 2003
Progress report #2, August 2003
Project budget 12/09/03
Project document , 18/09/01
Project Progress Report, January-June 2002
Project Progress Report, January-June 2003
Project Progress Report, July-December 2001
Project Progress Report, July-December 2002
Project workplan
Revised project budget March 2003
State Integrity Meeting in Delta, 16-17 September 2002, report of proceedings
State Integrity Meeting In Lagos, report of the first State Integrity Meeting, Lagos, 12-13
September 2002.
State Integrity Meeting, 19-20 Sept 2002, Borno, report of proceedings
Strengthening Judicial Integrity and Capacity in Nigeria, Report of the First Federal Integrity
Meeting for Nigerian Chief Judges, Abuja, 26-27 October 2001

Annex 5. Summary Action Plan Progress – Lagos (November 2003)

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Measures to improve access to Justice		
1. Judges should award realistic cost to litigants		
In order to reduce delays, the operating costs of the system, judges should award realistic costs, in particular when due to adjournments, in order to make the access to justice more affordable.	9	
2. Judge to maintain the judicial decorum and protocol		
It is the responsibility of each judge to maintain the judicial decorum and protocol in his or her respective court.	8	Awaiting National Judicial Council input
3. Issuing of the Annual Law Report (ALR)		
Finishing collecting all necessary information for the law report	9	
Publish the Annual Law report	9	
Ensure its widest publication, including the public presentation at press conference	9	
4. Commissioner of Police to attend all meetings of the CJC		
Much of basic mistakes committed by the police in gathering and handling evidence could be avoided through closer collaboration with other CJ institutions, in particular (judges could involve in providing basic legal training to police officers).	8	Commissioner of Police will not attend
5. Complaints and suggestion boxes in all courts in Lagos State		
Install suggestions and complaints boxes in all Lagos State courts.	8	Cannot deploy all as insufficient transport to collect
6. Simplifying the Procedures for Granting Bail		
	8	Police still reluctant
7. Enforcement of rule that any responsible person can stand surety		
Many judicial officers and police still do not accept women standing surety	8	Police still reluctant
8. Strengthen the maintenance culture among technical court staff		
	9	
Measure to enhance Quality and Timeliness of the Court Process		
9. Efficient use of case and case flow management and ADR Process		
Re-organize Registry	8	Awaiting DFID funding
Appraisal and referral of case files	9	
Designating fast track courts	8	Under consideration by CJ
Set time frame standards for court cases	8	Awaiting new procedures and rules
Monitoring of agreed performance standards	9	
10. Amendment of Rules in Court to eliminate trial delays		
Set up Rules and Amendment Committee (RAC) – 10 members	9	
Select Chairperson, members, meeting schedule and agenda	9	
Consideration of the Committees Report	9	
Compiling and sending final draft to House of Assembly through MOJ	8	Awaiting magistrates and customary courts
Passing of the Bill into Law	8	

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
11. Use electronic recording in court proceedings		
Purchase the necessary electronic devices for recording	8	Funds only allow for four machines
Train court staff to use the devices	9	
12. Set and monitor performance standards for judges and court officials		
Based on NIAL's assessment identify baseline for court monitoring	9	
Identify performance standards for judicial officers	9	
Identify performance standards for court staff	8	National Centre for State Courts considering
Establish performance monitoring time schedule	9	
Conduct performance monitoring on a regular basis	9	
13. Improve coordination between police and DPP's office		
CoP to attend CJC meetings	8	Commissioner will not participate
in this regard it was also suggested that public prosecutors may be placed directly into Police Area Commands)	8	2 x IPOs only, placed within AS/Gs
Measures to strengthen Public Confidence in the Courts		
14. Mount a sustained campaign of public enlightenment		
Define job description and mandate for public relations officer (PRO) and select a qualified person	9	
Develop a public relations strategy	8	Report Commissioned
Identify the resources for the public awareness strategy	8	Awaiting commissioned report
Implementation Posters, Flyers, Court User manuals and other information material	8	All except Court User Manual
15. Increase public access to the Chief Judge for complaints purpose		
The CJ should be informed by the PCTC on a regular basis on complaints and allegations of corrupt practices and other forms of judicial misconduct	8	Awaiting software from UNODC (Petter)
16. Transparency of judges and court staff to be monitored by ICPC		
Propose methodology and timing of external monitoring exercise	8	Awaiting ICPC posting
Encourage the public to report incidents of corruption in the courts		
17. Immediate re-orientation of court staff		
Develop a training curriculum on professional and applied ethics for court staff	9	
Measures to strengthen Public Complaints System		
18. Establish Implementation Committee and Public Complaints and Training Committee		
Select five member of the Implementation Committee, in addition the NPC will be member of the IC	9	
First meeting of the IC to establish procedures regarding: mandate, frequency of meetings, membership, work program, reporting procedures	8	TOR still outstanding
Constitute Public Complaints and Training Committee (PCTC) Chairperson: Hon Oyeywole, Secretary: IO. Akinkugbe; Members: CRAN, UN NPC, Media Representative, NBA, court user rep First meeting of the PCTC to establish procedures regarding: mandate, frequency of meetings, membership, work program, reporting procedures	9	

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
19. Establish a credible complaint system		
PCTC to send letters to various federal and national institutions currently receiving complaints to consolidate	9	
PCTC conduct an assessment of existing complaints: number and types of complaints received, (b) Topic/judicial officer involved; (c) Received date (d) Date Action taken regarding follow up; (e) Type of action taken, (f) complainant	9	
Establish a computerized complaints data base	8	Awaiting software from UNODC (Petter)
Agree on timing and type of reports to send : (a) within the judiciary (monthly reporting). (b) to public (annual reporting).	9	
Based on assessment using the new computerized system agree on an action plan on how to improve the handling of complaints	8	Awaiting software from UNODC (Petter)
Launch implementation of Action Plan for handling complaints after endorsement by IC and CJ	8	Awaiting software from UNODC (Petter)
20. Conduct Ethics & Re-orientation Training for all staff		
Conduct a training needs assessment	8	Awaiting commissioned report
Based on training needs assessment PCTC to draw up an Ethics Training Plan to be approved by CJ	9	
Contact the National Judicial Institute and other relevant training state training institutes for support	9	
Implementation Ethics Training Plan	8	Ongoing
Assessment of the impact of the Ethics Training Plan	8	Under Consideration
21. Conduct a public awareness campaign		
Based on needs assessment, develop an public awareness campaign	8	Awaiting commissioned report
Conduct regular Media Briefings	8	CJ and CR reluctant to conduct specific briefings
PCTC to develop and distribute flyers, posters regarding citizens rights (manual and posters) and the judicial reform project.	9	
Bill boards to be established in all three pilot courts	9	
PCTC in coordination with the PRO to issue a quarterly newsletter	9	
CJ to have regular meetings/briefings with the NBA	9	
Develop a format for regular contact with schools (visit, info material)	8	Concern over school children and criminal trials
22. Establish Partnership with ICPC		
Submit proposal to the Chairman of the ICPC regarding involvement	9	
ICPC to nominate and assign expert staff to assist with judicial reform	8	Nominated, awaiting posting
ICPC to contribute, as requested, to: (a) awareness campaign; (b) design complaint system; (c) conduct ethics training, (d) enforce code of conduct	8	Awaiting posting of ICPC officer
ICPC to participate as members of: IC, PCTC, CUC	8	Awaiting posting of ICPC officer

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
23. Enforce the implementation of Code of Judicial Conduct		
Conduct training for all staff on Code of Judicial Conduct (CoJC)	8	Ongoing
Develop and conduct an introduction seminar for new staff on (CoJC)	8	Ongoing
Distribute the Code of Judicial Conduct to all staff	9	
Review the Disciplinary Enforcement Mechanism	8	Awaiting National Judicial Council
Measures to strengthen coordination across the Criminal Justice System		
24. Reconstitute, strengthen and expand the membership and the mandate of the Criminal Justice Committee and ensure consistency in representation		
Inform the Heads of the CJS institutions at the Federal level about the Judicial Integrity Project and the importance of the Committee	9	
Present the Judicial Integrity Project to the CJC at a meeting in Nov 02 to facilitate their support	9	
Share the State Integrity Proceedings Document with key representatives from the Criminal Justice System	9	
25. Conduct Quarterly Criminal Justice Round Tables		
Standard agenda items to be presented at these meetings: Updates regarding Judicial Integrity Pilot Project, (b) Updates on status of complaints received across the CJS. Invite all key stakeholders including the Bar, the NGO's and Legal aid council	9	
Share the minutes from the meetings across the CJS	9	
26. Training and Reorientation of Staff of the Criminal Justice System (CJS)		
Conduct a training needs assessment for the criminal justice staff involved in the three pilot courts	8	Awaiting ICPC posting
Based on the needs assessment develop a training and re-orientation programme for criminal justice personnel involved in the three pilots	8	Awaiting ICPC posting
Work with federal (JTI) and state training institutions of criminal justice agencies to include reform and judicial integrity issues into their curriculum	8	Awaiting ICPC posting
Judiciary, supported by ICPC and UN, to conduct on the job training of staff at federal and state judicial training institutions	8	Awaiting ICPC posting
Federal and State Training Institutions to work with PCTC, ICPC and UN to conduct reform and judicial integrity training in pilots	8	Awaiting ICPC posting
27. Provide Black Marias to all prisons		
To provide same to all prison formations across the country but start with the three pilot states	8	2 only, refurbished in Lagos, >5 extra needed
28. Request the Allocation of sufficient funding for logistics requirements for CJS institutions		
CJ to request the AG to start with the pilot states	9	
29. Provision of allowances for witnesses		
	8	Only refunded on appearance, assistance for those who cannot afford transport referred to MOJ

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
30 Coordinate transfer of investigating Police Officers across CJS	8	Commissioner of Police will not participate
31. Review the Criminal Procedures Codes and the Criminal Justice Acts	8	With the ministry of Justice
32. Strengthen Bar/Bench Fora	9	

Annex 6. Summary Action Plan – Borno (November 2003)

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Measures to improve access to Justice		
1. Public Enlightenment Strategy at the local Government level		
Conduct in close collaboration with the Local Government Councils, the local Magistrate Courts and the local Upper Sharia and Sharia Court Judges meetings within the 27 local government districts inviting Police, Prison Services, traditional rules, lawyers and civil society representatives to raise the awareness of the participants about the basic human rights, the court process and about limits of ADR powers of traditional rulers as well as to develop an action plan for raising the general public's awareness about these issue.	9	
2. Enlightenment through general educating statements and information in court		
At the next meeting of Judges of all categories encourage participants to increasingly make general informative statements to enlighten the public	9	
3. Review and eventually extend jurisdiction of lower courts		
Establish Jurisdictional Review Committee (JRC)	9	
Review current jurisdiction of Magistrate courts, Upper Sharia Courts and Sharia Courts, as appropriate with a specific focus on the powers of awarding compensation in civil and criminal matters.(4-5 meetings)	8	Bar bench forum asked to consider
Publish minutes of the meeting inviting comments	8	Awaiting bar bench forum
Develop and submit proposal for amendment of jurisdictional powers of lower courts.	8	JRC considering
Review proposal, and eventually amend rules accordingly	8	Awaiting JRC/ bar bench forum decision
4. Encourage the public to file direct complaints		
Establish the Public Complaints and Training Committee (PCTC)	9	Renamed Public Complaints, Training and Enlightenment committee
Design a public awareness campaign (TV, Radio, Mobile Announcement, posters and flyers in police stations) about filing direct complaints to the courts about the infringement of basic rights by any State Institution and produce respective materials	9	
Implement public awareness campaign	9	
5. Establish monitor limits to ADR provided by traditional rulers		
Review current practice of traditional rulers providing forms of Alternative Dispute Resolution	9	
Identify strength and weaknesses of the current practice	9	
Establish limits and standards for proving this form of ADR	8	CJC to convene forum
Organize meeting with key-traditional rulers to discuss, eventually review and agree upon limits for providing ADR (this in case could be hold in conjunction with the above mentioned meetings at the Local Government, Level)	8	ADR threatened by traditional users adjudicating serious criminal matters

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
6. Judges to monitor their staff		
Organize monthly staff meetings	9	
Advise court staff and issue warnings on inappropriate behaviours in particular on all forms of corrupt and extortive methods and the provision of informal legal services.	9	
7. Judicial officers of all categories to control their own case calendar		
Draft directive for the signature of the CJ to all Judges instructing them to personally control their case calendar in order to prevent opportunities for abuse.	9	
CJ to issue a directive		
8. Ban non-professional touts from court premises		
Ensure information of court users about the dangerous malpractice of touts and courts and where to complain.	9	
CJ to issue a general banning of touts from court premises	9	
Police to implement banning	9	
Measures to Enhance Quality and Timeliness of Justice Delivery		
9. Improve Case Flow Management		
Assess weaknesses of current case-flow-management practices	8	Committee established, report pending
Two 3 day training sessions on best practices in case-flow management.	8	Awaiting report
At the end of each training workshop, participants will establish an action plan for improving of case-flow management practices in their respective courts.	8	Awaiting training workshop
Reorganize the Registry	8	Awaiting completion of training (5 staff completed)
Establish Performance Standards and Monitoring Committee (PSMC) composed of CJ, AG, 2 Justices, CR, 1 Kadi, 1 USC judge, 1 NBA, 1 special interest group.	8	Recommendation with CJ
Set and disseminate Performance Standards	9	Using NJC standards
Monitoring Performance Standards	9	
10. Training an retraining of Judges, magistrates, prosecutors and court staff		
Identify training needs for Judges, magistrates and court staff	9	
Develop training curricula	9	
Conduct training	9	
11. Codifying Sharia Law		
Establish Committee for Sharia Law Codification (CSC) composed of USC and SC Judges, experts in Sharia Law and other resource persons as appropriate.	9	
Prepare first Draft	9	
Organize broad based meeting for reviewing of and commenting on draft and deciding on next steps	8	Awaiting legislation

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
12. Launch Use of Electronic Recording Devices		
Assess needs and potential capacity for using Automatic Court Recording Devices in Delta	9	
Install Automatic Court Recording Devices in accordance with identified needs and within availability of resources.	8	Awaiting UNODC installation
Conduct training seminars for court staff on the use of Automatic Court Recording Devices	8	Awaiting UNODC installation
Measures to Strengthen Public Confidence		
13. Enhance transparency and fairness of appointments		
Appointment of High Court Judges: candidates are nominated and forwarded to the CJ	8	Federal Attorney General's new proposal relates
In addition to the comments by the bar and bench, also the public should be invited to comment.	8	Federal Attorney-General's new proposal relates
In addition, SSS, NBA JSC should evaluate the merit of the candidate.	9	
After first selection round proposed names of supposed candidates are submitted to the NJC	9	
(NJC gives recommendations to Governor for appointment	9	
14. Regulate lawyer fees and increase financial accessibility of the system		
Establish and enforce rule for the scale of charges by lawyers	9	
Legal aid services for criminal cases should be properly funded	8	
Private lawyers should be encouraged to take at least one pro bono case annually	8	
Private lawyers should be encouraged to take state briefs	9	
15. Enhance Public Enlightenment		
Use of electronic media:	9	
(a) TV/ Radio talk show: e.g. "you and the law" (9	
b) TV court room drama, presentation in local language and aimed at educating the public about the rules and procedures of courts	8	Awaiting funding
Publish Information on Judicial Reform in Print Media	9	
Information Mobile Van	8	Awaiting funding
16. Court User Committee and Complaints Boxes		
Establish PCTC Mandate should include: (i) building confidence in the judiciary, (ii) reviewing complaints (iii) forwarding to appropriate authority.	9	

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
17. Enhance Use of Information Technology in Case Management		
Establish the Procurement and Purchasing Committee (PPC)	8	Grand Kadi appointed secretary only – not active
Establish guidelines for direct purchase Conduct needs assessment in terms of computer, software, photocopiers, verbatim voice recorder and internet access. Power generator and eventual setting up of it networks. Develop a purchasing plan and respective financial needs, the purchasing plan should also include a training needs assessment with regard to operating the above equipment.	8	Awaiting committee to sit
Submit purchasing plan to State Government for funding support.	8	Awaiting committee to sit
Purchase equipment	8	Awaiting committee to sit
Conduct training in skills needed for operating the purchased equipment	8	Ongoing
Measures to Strengthen the Public Complaint System		
18. Enforcement of Code of Conduct in the Judiciary		
Corruption cases to be referred to ICPC rather than Police	8	Abandoned
Distribute Code of Conduct booklets to all judicial officers	9	
Establish PCTC Conduct Annual seminar regarding Appropriate conduct for all new staff	9	
Refresher seminar regarding Appropriate conduct for all staff	8	Awaiting ICPC appointment
19. Upgrading Infrastructure in the three pilot courts		
Motivate judicial officers and court staff – Organize staff meetings	9	
Supervise staff, emphasize on maintenance of existing infrastructure	9	
Priority repairs; identify priority areas that need repairs	9	
Make the following basic purchases for the Pilot High Court : provision of the following: (a) benches to seat 100 people (10 benches) (b) books and law journals and basic working mat (c) security , iron bars in windows and doors (d) desk and chair for the registry (e) Blocking of leakage	8	Awaiting funding for books, journals; some requirements now obsolete
Continuing monitoring of the integrity of the procurement process	9	
20. Increase transparency and efficiency of the public's complaints system		
Streamline the public complaints system to make it more transparent to the public and to the judiciary/Criminal Justice Systems:	9	
Quarterly reporting to the judiciary on number and types of complaints, date received, action taken, date of feedback to complainant,	9	
Annual reports to the public regarding number, types, outcome and dates of feedback to the complainant	8	Awaiting 1 yrs data collection
	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments

Develop a computerized data base to register complaints	8	Awaiting UNODC software (Petter)
CR to appoint, UN to train staff to operate the complaint system	8	Awaiting UNODC software (Petter)
21. Raising Public Awareness regarding ; (a) how to make complaints (b) citizens rights (c) legal literacy		
Produce a court users manual reflecting the Code of Conduct for Judicial Officers and the appropriate conduct of non-judicial staff.	8	Committee established
Distribution of the manual to the public	8	Awaiting committee
Poster in the court rooms informing the public about their rights	9	
(Include the manual in mass literacy program	8	Awaiting manual
Include manual in secondary school syllabus	8	Awaiting manual
Organize schools to visit pilot courts	9	
Conduct 6 "town hall-meetings" meetings between the judiciary and the court users to identify generic complaints and suggestions	9	
Quarterly Briefings by the Chief Judge	9	
Quarterly report on Complaints received and follow up	9	
Annual report to the public regarding complaints	8	Awaiting 1 yrs data
Raising awareness among women in a pluralistic legal system	9	
22 Ethics Training in the Judiciary		
Elaborate proposal for ethic training curriculum	8	Awaiting GTZ to complete women
Share with NJI and develop into an ethics training programme	8	Awaiting GTZ
Conduct 16 ethics training seminars Judges 1 seminar (15 Judges) Magistrates 2 seminars (30 Magistrates) Area/Sharia courts 3 seminars (80 Judges) Support staff 10 seminars (1000 court staff)	8	Some training considered
In collaboration with GTZ organize seminars for women (poverty alleviation project)	9	
Gender sensitive Ethics training in the legal system		
23. Co-ordination within the Criminal Justice System		
Request the CJC to discuss the handling of Complaints	9	
CJC to assess reasons for currently slow legal advice by DPP's Office and make recommendation for speeding up the process	9	
24. Establish Partnership with the ICPC		
ICPC to help the Pilot States: Technical support and resources to organize seminars	8	Awaiting ICPC assignment
Technical support to the implementations Committee	8	Awaiting ICPC appointment
Technical support to the Public Complaints and Training Committee	8	Awaiting ICPC appointment

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
25. Strengthen Judicial Independence		
Strengthening judicial independence in particular regarding implementation of capital projects and the sanctioning of Judicial Officers	8	Awaiting ICPC appointment
ICPC to support the Implementation Committee in assessing the timeliness of allocated federal and state funds	8	Awaiting ICPC appointment
CJ and PCTC to send disciplinary criminal cases to the ICPC for prosecution rather than the police	8	Awaiting ICPC appointment
Measures to Increase Coordination within the Criminal Justice System		
26. Immediate Appointment of an Attorney General		
Initiate an fair and transparent appointment process for the Office of an Attorney General	9	
Select an Attorney General	9	
27. Reactivating the Criminal Justice Committee to enhance coordination and cooperation		
Establish CJC	9	
Priority Action of the CJC should include:		
Coordinate staff transfer decisions with other criminal justice sector stakeholders	8	Chief/ Commissioner of police less than enthusiastic
Early assistance by MOJ to Police in the investigation.	8	COP less than enthusiastic
OCL to pass legal know how to investigating officers.	8	COP less than enthusiastic
Introduce controls to prevent and to prevent loss of case diaries and files.	9	
28. Comptroller of Prison to Copy monthly prison returns to all stakeholders		
Create mailing list for monthly prison returns report	9	
Mail list of returns to all authorities on the mailing list	9	
29. Enhance the funding of the Judiciary		
Invite Chairman of the House of Assembly Committee on the Judiciary to attend CJC meeting.	9	
Establish priority funding needs including fair remuneration	8	CJC to consider Awaiting
Raise Awareness of the Chairman of the House of Assembly Committee on the Judiciary on financial needs of the judiciary	8	CJC deliberations Awaiting
Establish representative forum to review funding needs	8	CJC deliberations
Increase funding of the judiciary Present funding needs to the MoF to release the funds in accordance to the decision of the HoA	8	Awaiting CJC deliberations
30. Provide Federal High Court with Court Building		
Provide FHC with appropriate building so that the 2000 appointment to the bench can initiate their work and the outstanding cases can be dealt with.	9	

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
31. Provide basic working material and judicial information		
Provide: basic recording devices communication equipment (including e-mail, for fast dissemination of judicial information, in particular case law document reproduction	8	Awaiting funding
Judicial information material such as, the laws of Nigeria, the jurisprudence of the higher courts in particular the Supreme Court decisions to all Borno State Court, beginning from the High Court, the pilot courts	8	3 rd law report requires recommencement after loss of draft
32. Regular Bar-Bench Forum		
Organize regular meetings between the Bar and Bench to identify, discuss and resolve common interest issues, such as:	9	Abandoned - Rejected at workshop
(a) lawyers not appearing because fees have not been paid	9	
(b) use of cost orders against lawyers seeking unnecessary adjournments or making frivolous applications	8	
(c) lawyers coaching witnesses to tell untruths etc.	9	
33. Restore workable legal aid scheme		
Restore a functioning legal aid system for the most serious capital offences.	8	PAC established but inactive
Identify all NGO's and NBA member who are prepared to support clients in immediate need of legal aid.	8	PAC established but inactive
34. Increase information on bail		
Design and prepare targeted awareness campaign on most common errors/ abuse within the bail granting process, including that:	9	Police less than cooperative
(a) bail is free	9	
(b) all responsible persons, also women can stand surety.	9	
(c) Possibility of direct complaint to courts if police refuses	9	
(d) Launch campaign including posters in signs and words in Police Station.	8	
35. Increase transparency and fairness of the appointment and promotion process		
Increasing the fairness and transparency of appointments and promotions:	9	Federal Attorney-Generals new proposals will affect
Appreciation of good work performance	9	
Equality of treatment	9	
Fair performance appraisal – incentives and sanctions	9	

Annex 7. Summary Action Plan Progress – Delta (November 2003)

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Measures to improve access to Justice		
1. Publishing Case Lists on the Notice Board		
CJ to issue a directive to all courts in the state to publish their cause-lists of the next day by latest by 12 p.m. on the Notice Board of the respective Court	9	
(i) Each court to assure that there are Notice Boards available and if not to arrange for visible Notice Boards to be in place by 1 Nov. 2002	9	
2. Allow for Media Coverage of court proceedings		
(ii) The Chief Registrar will inform the representatives of the press attached to the courts about the availability of the cause list on the Notice Board	9	
The CR will be made responsible for informing the press on an ad-hoc basis of cases of potential interest	9	
3. Install suggestions/complaints boxes in all courts in Delta State		
The Chief Registrar will assure that suggestions/complaints boxes are being constructed in the three pilot courts in Asaba. by end Oct	9	
Establish Performance Monitoring Unit (PMU)	9	Proposal for UNODC funding prepared
The Suggestions/ complaints will be collected on a daily basis by a staff assigned to this task and forwarded to the Performance Monitoring Unit	8	Lack of transport prevents frequent collection
The analysis of the suggestions and complaints will then be made available to the Judiciary (monthly) and the Media on a regular basis (quarterly).	9	
4. Improve the daily cause- list management		
Review and eventually amend the guidelines for case prioritization	8	One CJ guideline relating to prisons only
disseminate guidelines to all courts by end of October 02	8	
Additional Measure: The implementation of the guidelines for case prioritization will be monitored the Performance Monitoring Unit	8	Awaiting CJ
5. Judges to focus more intensely on dispute resolutions – ADR		
Consider and eventually establish guidelines for dispute resolution by judges	8	Uncertainty over mandate – Department of peoples rights in MOJ already looking at ADR
A detailed review of Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in other jurisdictions, including Lagos State	8	Ditto

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
A detailed review of the current practice of informal dispute resolution mechanisms in place (e.g. community leaders)	8	Uncertainty over mandate – Department of peoples rights in MOJ already looking at ADR
Establish limits and guidelines for such dispute resolution mechanisms	8	Committee rejected as 'impractical'
Raise awareness of the public in general and community leaders in particular about limits of informal dispute resolution	8	Committee published ADR not 'final bus' and can return to court
Develop a ADR Model for Delta State. Raise necessary funding for its implementation	8	Awaiting clarification of mandate uncertainty
Launch implementation	9	Awaiting uncertainty of mandate
6. Invigorate the Bar-Bench Forum		
The Chief Judge will invite members of the NBA Delta before the end of October for a meeting with the purpose of agreeing in a regular meeting schedule for the Bar-Bench Forum	9	
Bar-Bench Forum to take base on a regular basis.	9	
Minutes from the meetings will be shared across the bar and bench	9	
Measures to Enhance the Quality and Timeliness of the Court Process		
8. Improve Case Flow Management		
Establish Public Awareness and Training Committee (PATC)	9	
Review current case flow management practices in the courts in Delta	8	Will be one of first committee considerations
Establish realistic guidelines/ standards for case management	8	Awaiting committee consideration
Conduct training in case flow management according to new standards	8	Awaiting committee consideration
9. Amend and monitor rules and performance standards		
Setting up a Rules and Standards Committee (RSC) including the CR, the DCR for Litigation, the DCR Admin.	9	
Setting of time standards for all procedural steps	8	Rejected as 'impractical'
Review organization of registry and record keeping	9	Ongoing
Re-organize registry and record keeping Develop Training Curriculum for support staff on record keeping, manual and electronic filing systems	8	Ongoing
Conduct Training on record keeping Establish Monitoring Criteria for the Use of Judicial Discretion	8	Await NJC and JSC decisions
Review lawyers' use of adjournments	9	
Establish guidelines for the awarding of realistic costs to litigants for adjournments		Only decision is that min ₦1000 penalty will apply, but will be on merits

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Monitoring of compliance of all categories of court staff with new standards	8	Only decision is that min ₦1000 penalty will apply, but will be on merits
10. Improve coordination among all criminal justice system stakeholders		
Reinvigorate and eventually expand the Criminal Justice Committee	9	
Conduct monthly meetings Publish minutes of the meeting on the Notice Board	9	Minutes not being published
11. Increase Public Awareness and Dialogue with other Criminal Justice Stakeholders and Court Users		
Bar-Bench Forum to encourage more active role of the NBA in training their members.	9	
Monthly addresses by the CJ and AG of the Bench, Bar on the ongoing judicial reform	8	Monthly considered too frequent
Quarterly address by the CJ of the Media (Electronic and Print) to be prepared by the PATC.	8	Radio lawyer provides sufficient exposure
12. Training and retraining of judges		
Identify training needs for judges, magistrates and court staff	8	Allows NJC to decide
Develop training curricula	8	Developed for CR only
Conduct training	9	For CR only
Measures to Strengthen Public Confidence in the Courts		
13. Strengthen Public Enlightenment and awareness		
Unlimited access by the public to the CJ in cases of corruption CJ to ensure that all cases of alleged corruption are directly reported to her.	8	Public Complaints and Monitoring Committee filter out less serious
Develop a complaints mechanism, ensuring prompt and thorough treatment of complaints - Establish a Public Complaints Committee (PCC)	9	
Ensure that lawyers desist from making malicious allegations against judicial officers. Inform court users about the court process	9	
14. Enhance transparency and fairness of appointment process		
Proper screening of candidates before appointment	8	No changes proposed by Delta CJ/ judiciary – current system considered fair and transparent. Federal Attorney-General's new proposal will also affect.
Merit based appointment process – Develop merit-based selection criteria	8	
Ensure transparency of appointment process – involve the public	8	
15. Strengthen Propriety of Conduct of Judges and Lawyers		
Develop behavioral guidelines based on the Code of Judicial Conduct	9	
Monitoring of Judicial behaviour in accordance with Code of Judicial Conduct.	9	
Conduct comprehensive review of Codes of Conduct for Lawyers	8	NBA is developing, judiciary has not been consulted
Develop Draft Code of Conduct for Lawyers in Delta State (including issues general behavioral standards, attitudes, adjournments,	8	NBA is developing, judiciary has not been consulted
Adopt and Monitor Code of Conduct for Lawyers	8	NBA is developing, judiciary has not been consulted

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
16. Increase use of information technology and automatic court recording systems		
Assess current need and potential capacity for using IT hardware and software in courts.	9	
Increase IT hard – and software in accordance with identified needs and within availability of resources.	8	Awaiting funding – cannot install existing PCs provided for magistrates, customary courts because of poor security
Conduct basic IT training seminars Assess needs and potential capacity for using	9	
Automatic Court Recording Devices in Delta Install Automatic Court Recording Devices in accordance with identified needs and within availability of resources.	8	Awaiting funding
Conduct training seminars for court staff on the use of Automatic Court Recording Devices	9	Too few trained to be useful
17. Review and possibly amend legislation on restitution for victims of crime		
Conduct comprehensive review of legislation of the protection of and restitution for victims	8	No explanation offered
Prepare proposal for legislative amendments	8	No explanation offered
Review and amend proposal		
Submit as legislative proposal	8	No explanation offered
Measures to Strengthen the Public Complaints System		
18. Establish a Public Complaints Committee (PCC)		
Establish a Public Complaints Committee (PCC) as a sub committee of the Implementation Committee (IC), The chairperson of the PCC will be a member of the IC	9	
Constitute Public Complaints Committee (PCC) Chairperson: PK Ogbimi, Secretary: A, Ojo, Members: Police, Attorney General, ICPC, UN NPC, NGOs, Media	9	
Conduct an assessment of existing complaints: identifying (a) number and types of complaints received; (b) judicial officer involved; (c) Date complaint received, (d) how it was received, (e) action taken by PCC/CJ, (f) status in the process, (g) final action, (h) feedback to the complainant.	9	
Install a computerized complaints system using existing equipment.	8	Awaiting UNODC software (Petter)
Based on the assessment of the handling of last years complaints, PCC to come up with an action plan on how to strengthen the complaints system	8	Awaiting 12 months data
Start implement the action plan	8	Awaiting establishment of database
19. Strengthening Public Awareness		
CJ to invite the media to quarterly media briefings	8	Instead, media invited to all proceedings (minus cameras)

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Identify the concrete needs for information by the public on their basic rights, the Code of Judicial Conduct and how to file complaints as well as other relevant information.	8	Use of posters instead of review/ study, Funding proposal for UNODC ₦1,000,000
Develop information material (flyers, posters etc) to enlighten the citizens about their rights, the Code of judicial Conduct and how they can file a complaint as well as other relevant information	8	Reliance on-provided posters
Install functional Bill Boards in all Court and Court Rooms, as appropriate for dissemination of the above material.	8	Funding proposal for UNODC ₦960,000
Issue a quarterly Newsletter	8	Funding proposal for UNODC ₦520,000
Organise a Mobile campaign in local language	8	Proposal for UNODC funding ₦6,000,000
Organise for judges to have periodic meetings with schools	8	No explanation offered
CJ to conduct regular prison visits with the police	9	Proposal for UNODC funding
20. Implement and enforce code of judicial conduct		
Distribute the Code of Judicial Conduct to all judicial officers	8	No explanation offered
Develop a training curriculum for judicial ethics, including a component for all court staff.(Code of Conduct, Judicial Reform, Management of Change).	8	No explanation offered
Organise annual ethics training for all (new) staff.	8	No explanation offered
21. Establish partnership with ICPC		
Develop proposal regarding the involvement of ICPC as a partner in the Judicial Integrity Project in Delta Chairman of PCC to draft proposal to the Chairman of the ICPC CJ to sign the letter	8	Awaiting deployment of ICPC officer
ICPC to assign staff who can work on; (a) public awareness raising, (b) design of complaints system, (c) Ethics curriculum development with federal and state training institutions.	8	Officer selected but not yet deployed
ICPC will participate as members in the following committees: (a) PCTC, (b) Court User Committee, (c) Implementation Committee, (d) CJS Coordination Committee	8	Awaiting deployment of ICPC officer
22. Enhance knowledge of Anti-Corruption legislation		
Develop training curriculum on the Anti-Corruption Act and other Anti-Corruption Legislation, its interpretation and any relevant jurisprudence.	8	Will be included in ethics training
Conduct training for judges and magistrates on the Anti-Corruption Act and other Anti-Corruption Legislation, its interpretation and any relevant jurisprudence. appropriate.	8	Will be included in ethics training, but UNODC has provided some initial training
Measures to Strengthen Coordination in the Criminal Justice System		
23. Reduce Backlogs		
Establish Back-Log and Delay Reduction Committee (BLDRC) composed of CJ, CR, OCL, DPP, NBA	8	Abandoned, Rules and Standards Committee will assume

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Inform minor offenders of the likely outcome and eventual plea options	8	No explanation offered
Reduce backlog through identification, separation and disposition of dormant cases	8	Awaiting Rules and Standards Committee consideration
Address Federal case backlog	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
review small plea options, Sections 56 and 35 of CPA	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
A-G fiat,	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
Section 23 Police Act	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
Establish Federal Courts in all States	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
Security Committee to review and ensure that Military witnesses can give evidence,	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
ensure (S/T safeguards)	8	Awaiting R+S C'tee
24. Reduce Court Delays		
Launch joint Bar/Bench/Prosecutor action on unnecessary adjournments	9	
Decentralise OC/Legal and DPP Offices	8	No explanation offered
Establish maximum time frames for various case types of the minor matters courts (3 months)	8	Rejected as 'impractical'
Monitor the compliance with such timeframes	8	abandoned
Ensure timely transfer of case files:	8	No explanation offered
Review current practice of transfer of files between various CJS institutions and identify major causes of delay.	8	No explanation offered
Develop, based on the review, recommendations for amendment of current practice.	8	No explanation offered
Establish guidelines for the transfer of cases taking into account the impact on the case, the timing, the witnesses etc.	8	No explanation offered
25. Increase public awareness and participation		
Set up a Court User Committee involving the CJ, the Media, NGO's, CR, DPP, OCL and the Bar.	9	
Establish mandate, function and meeting schedule	9	
Identify main weaknesses of the Justice System as a Service Provider	8	Committee too nascent
Develop strategy for regular dialogue of the Justice System with its users including the organization of broad based justice system roundtables and press conferences.	8	Committee too nascent
Public bulletins by DPP on DPP activities		
26. Earliest possible bail in all appropriate cases		
Develop joint guidelines/ checklist for the granting of police bail	8	Chief/ Commissioner of Police doesn't attend meetings
Develop a bail opposition checklist on police file for DPP use	8	COP doesn't attend meetings
DPP and OCL to support Police in monitoring of police pipeline caselist in accordance with Section 10 Police Act	8	COP doesn't attend meetings, DPP rarely

	Achieved in Full 9	Comments
	Not achieved 8	
Equipment/ funding to police to duplicate files for DPP		
27. Harmonize relevant laws and penalties		
Review laws and penalties for their appropriateness	8	No explanation offered
Make recommendations for amendments	8	No explanation offered
Submit recommendations to AG	8	Awaiting recommendations

Annex 8. Summary Action Plan Progress– Katsina (November 2003)

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Measures to improve access to Justice		
1. Institutionalizing the Implementation Framework		
Implementation and Coordination Committee (ICC)	9	
Public Complaints Committee, (PCC)	9	
Court User Committee, (CUC)	9	
Performance monitoring and Evaluation Committee (PMEC)	9	
Administration of Justice (or Criminal Justice Coordination Committee) (AJC)	9	
Public Awareness and Training Committee (PATC)	8	No further information available (NFIA)
Rules Amendment Committee (RAC)	8	NFIA
2. TOR and Secretariat		
All subcommittees will develop Terms of Reference distributing the tasks established under the action plan.	8	3 only
All subcommittees will appoint a secretary and establish a secretariat.	8	2 only
3. Reporting to the ICC		
All subcommittees to prepare and submit minutes latest 5 working days after the meeting (with copy to UNODC).	8	3 only
4. Reporting of the ICC		
Based on minutes submitted by the subcommittees, ICC to prepare monthly report to be submitted to CJN (with copy to UNODC).	9	
5. Select Pilot Courts		
High Court No. 1	9	
Magistrate Court No.1	9	
Sharia Court No.2	9	
Measures to Enhance Access to Justice		
6. Reduce costs of accessing the courts		
Provision of free legal aid should be among the criteria for appointing lawyers into higher offices in the Judiciary	8	NFIA
Government to offer token fees to lawyers, who take up pro bono cases	8	Awaiting funding
Corps members to assist indigent litigants as part of their community development program.	8	NFIA
Reconsider filing fees and eventually amend rules of the court	8	NFIA
Establish scale for filing fees for Sharia Courts	8	NFIA
Consider the introduction of an legal aid clinic	8	NFIA
Strengthen legal aid council	8	Property cases only
Localize legal aid need for sufficient support	8	NFIA
need to mobilize NGO's	8	NFIA
Need to employ new lawyers for the legal aid council	8	NFIA
	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments

The bar should monitor guidelines on charges for lawyers (to be raised by AJC)	8	NFIA
Publish scale for lawyer fees in all courts in Katsina	8	NFIA
7. Adoption of local languages in proceedings		
Study legal framework governing the language of the Court in the Sharia, Magistrate and High Court and prepare report.	8	NFIA
Submit report to AG including eventual proposal for amendments of the law.	8	NFIA
Depending on the findings and recommendation of the Report, CJ/ AG to develop a proposal to introduce adequate languages in the courts.	8	NFIA
Submission of proposal to the appropriate Organ	8	NFIA
Measures to Enhance Quality and Timeliness of the Court Process	8	NFIA
8. Decentralization of police investigation		
CJ, with the support of NBA, should recommend to the AG to discuss issue with CoP to keep investigations in locus of criminal offence.	8	NFIA
9. Time limit for filing charges and the providing legal advice by MoJ		
To establish by law or practice a 30 days time-limits as of receipt case diary to file charges or provide legal advice, failure upon which suspect will released on conditional bail.	8	NFIA
CJ to recommend to AG to propose bill.	8	NFIA
NBA to lobby for such a law	8	NFIA
10. Monitoring Judges for sitting on time		
CJ, Chief Magistrates to monitor and enforce the sitting on time of judges	8	NFIA
Enlighten Public on official sitting times by judges and invite complaints	8	NFIA
11. Prevent interference of magistrates and police in civil matters		
CJ to instruct Magistrates to refrain from handling civil matters for which they do not have jurisdiction.	8	NFIA
AJC to recommend to the CoP to instruct police to refrain from handling civil matters for which they do not have jurisdictions.	8	NFIA
AJC to recommend to the NBA to instruct lawyers to refrain from disguising civil matters as criminal ones with the aim of filing the case with courts that do not have jurisdiction.	8	NFIA
12. Immediate granting of bail in all minor cases		
CJ to advised all judicial officers to grant bail in all minor cases immediately, Art.341 Subsection 1 C.P.C.	8	NFIA
13. Encourage judges to sit in prisons in accordance with the Prison Act		
Comptroller of Prisons to inform Administration of Justice Committee Members of Prison Act providing for the possibility of court sitting in prison premises.	8	NFIA
Administration Justice Committee, to communicate recommendation to Divisional Committees	8	NFIA
14. Law report of High Court and Sharia Court of Appeal Decisions to be published		
Collect court decisions and publish.	8	NFIA
15. Ensure Adequate Funding of the Judiciary		
Raise need for financial independence with Federal and State Legislator	8	NFIA
	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
In the interim lobby for the judiciary to be part of	8	NFIA

the allocation decision process		
Develop comprehensive 5 years budget for the judiciary	8	NFIA
Financial Resources should be released immediately following the appropriation	8	NFIA
16. Law reform		
Establish the Rules Amendment Committee (RAC)	8	NFIA
Review:		
High Court Civil Procedure rules	8	NFIA
Magistrate and District Court rules	8	NFIA
District Court rules	8	NFIA
Criminal Procedure code	8	NFIA
RAC to review Rules and Procedure recently adopted by other Nigerian States.	8	NFIA
RAC to come up with a suggestion for eventual changes of the laws focusing on simplifying procedural law, extension of jurisdiction of lower courts, of court language, etc.	8	NFIA
CJ to recommend to the Law Reform Commission (LRC) the laws which should be amended. (Private citizens can also propose amendments to laws through elected representatives)	8	NFIA
Production First Draft	8	NFIA
Workshop on the Proposed New Rules	8	NFIA
Production of Final Draft	8	NFIA
Submission to House of Assembly	8	NFIA
17. Provide Working and Reference Materials to the Judiciary		
PATC to conduct need assessment for working and reference materials in particular of the pilot court (High Court No.1, Magistrate Court No.1 and Sharia Court No.2)	8	NFIA
Increase the availability of resources including reference materials in the lower courts and pilot courts based on the needs assessment	8	NFIA
18. Train and retrain judicial officers and court staff		
PATC to identify training needs of judicial officers and submit to CJ, UNODC, NJI and international donors.	8	NFIA
Expose judicial staff to modern trends in court and case-management.	8	NFIA
Court staff: training should include record keeping, receiving and filing of complaints, professional ethics & Code of Conduct Court staff: introduce and enforce a code of conduct for court staff	8	NFIA
19. Train Police Prosecutors		
PATC to make develop a curriculum for the training of police prosecutors.	8	NFIA
PATC to assist CoP in conducting practical training for police prosecutors,	8	NFIA
20. Improve case-management		
RAC to deploy two committee members to review case management models of Lagos , Abuja and Katsina.	8	NFIA
	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments

PATC to submit report to ICC.	8	NFIA
Establish new case-management system	8	NFIA
Measures to Enhance Public Trust in the Courts		
21. Establish Public Awareness and Training Committee and a Court User Committee		
Court Users Committee: Membership: CJ-Chair, Judges NBA, Legal Aid, Traditional, Religious, Community leaders. Trade Unions, NGOs, Women Rights Organization, A/G office, Prisons, Police.	9	NFIA
Draft TOR for Court User Committee	8	NFIA
Public Awareness Committee Membership: Min. of Justice, NGO, CJ, CR, JSC, NBA, NGOs/Donors	8	NFIA
Establish Public Relation Unit in the Judicial Divisions	8	NFIA
22. General Enlightenment/awareness campaign		
Prepare concept paper on radio/ tv program and jingles, including content, costs and select programme moderator.	9	
Record 12 30 min programmes.		Awaiting funding
Develop Reach Out Program	8	NFIA
Places of Worship	8	NFIA
Schools	8	NFIA
Debate/Quiz	8	NFIA
23. Targeted Awareness Campaign for stakeholders		
Advocacy through traditional and religious institutions and NGO's	9	
Organization of a annual the Bar, Bench and Public Forum	9	
Awareness Raising Posters to be distributed to court houses, schools and other public places	9	
Use Print Media to raise awareness, in particular to prepare regular press releases for the Newspapers	9	
Launch quarterly Newsletter	8	NFIA
24. Targeted awareness campaign for the youth		
Play and drama	8	NFIA
Civic training- develop training material for civic teaching in schools	8	NFIA
Essay competition to raise awareness about corruption	8	NFIA
Prepare in close cooperation with stakeholders a concept paper on an essay competition	8	NFIA
25. Enhance Performance Monitoring		
Establish Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Committee, (PMEC)	9	
Establish performance standard	8	NFIA
Ensure effective monitoring of standard	8	NFIA

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Measures to Enhance Public Trust in and Effectiveness of the Complaints System		
26. Establish complaints system		
Establish a broad based Public Complaints Committee (PCC) involving ICPC, Judicial Service Committee and Sharia Court Directors, NBA, NGO's	9	
Conduct Inauguration Meeting	9	
Define Terms of Reference for the adoption by the ICC and CJ	9	
Design Procedural chart for the handling of complaints	8	NFIA
Consider Decentralization of the complaints system - each zone should have their own complaints system and complaints committee,	8	NFIA
Introduction/ reinvigoration of the complaints system for court staff.	8	NFIA
Establish Computerized Complaint Registry at the High Court	8	Awaiting UNODC software (Petter)
Needs assessment regarding categories (e.g Code of Conduct, ICPC Act, Dissatisfaction with court decisions, (2) Revocation of bail; Delays in the trail process; (3) Lack of fair hearing; (4) Late sitting by judges; (5) Corruption, (6) Incompetence; (7) Abuse of discretion; (8) Nepotism; (9) others)	8	Awaiting UNODC software (Petter)
Computer program being developed	8	Awaiting UNODC software (Petter)
Install Petition and Complaints Boxes in all the courts and prisons (with locks and indication for next emptying)	8	NFIA
Consider establishment of alternative complaint mechanism e.g. by special interest groups and NGOs	8	NFIA
27. Enforce the Code Of Conduct		
Empower the Public to complain	9	
Educate the public about their rights	9	
) Explore the creation of a Whistle blower act	9	
Traditional institutions and religious bodies should be included	9	
Enhance compliance with the code of conduct Awareness raising among the judicial staff generally	9	
Know your rights radio and tv (see above)	9	
Ethics training (see below)	9	
Complaints/ suggestion boxes in court premises (see above)	9	
Complaints procedure (see above)	9	
Ethics training		
Syllabus for the training on ethics	8	Ct employees only
Three workshops have been held with the NCSC	8	NFIA
(a) Training the trainers procedure (b) 10 trainers over a three day period (c) Judges and magistrate – one day		

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
28. Review Code Of Conduct		
Code of Conduct Committee (JCCC)	8	NFIA
Preparation of Comprehensive Code of conduct for Judicial and not judicial staff	8	NFIA
Production of First Draft	8	NFIA
Workshop on the Draft Code	8	NFIA
Production of Final Copies Distribution	8	NFIA
Practice Directions	8	NFIA
Measures to Enhance Coordination across CJS		
29. Strengthen efficiency of Administration of Justice Committee (AJC)		
Minutes of meetings should be prepared & distributed to all stakeholders within 5 working days.	8	NFIA
Extract of decisions to be implemented should be forwarded to all heads of relevant stakeholders.	8	NFIA
Follow up actions to be taken by relevant officials.	8	NFIA
Feedback on the state of implementation to ICC	8	NFIA
Ensure monthly meetings of the AJC Meetings to be hosted by the AG	8	NFIA
30. Enhance collaboration between Bar and Bench		
Launch quarterly Bar Bench Forum providing a platform for exchange of common problems in the administration of justice and development of solutions.	8	NFIA
31. Enhance collaboration between DPP and Police		
Ensure DPP host monthly meeting between his office and Police.	8	NFIA
Extract of decisions to be implemented be forwarded to stakeholders. (CJ, AG and COP).	8	NFIA
AG should provide funding for hosting the meetings	8	NFIA
Restrict/ coordinate transfer of police prosecutors and IPO's who have cases pending in court	8	NFIA
CoP to explore the setting up of a special branch in DPP established solely for public prosecution	8	NFIA
32. Enhance Integrity and Effectiveness of the Police		
Police to introduce and enforce code of conduct	8	NFIA
AJC to review current professional standards governing police.	8	NFIA
Prepare a report on the current corruption and integrity challenges. and propose countermeasures including a Code of Conduct	8	NFIA
Introduce/ strengthen the complaint system	8	NFIA
Police; explore the restructuring of the command hierarchy	8	NFIA
33. Enhance Integrity and Effectiveness of the Prison Services		
Prison Services, with support of AJC committee identify needs for changes in the Prison Act.	8	NFIA
Prison Services with support of AJC and HRC to identify needs for Prison Reform	8	NFIA

	Achieved in Full 9 Not achieved 8	Comments
Prison Services to develop and enforce a code of conduct of prison staff	8	NFIA
Prison Services to introduce a complaints system within the prisons	8	NFIA

Annex 9. Qualitative ‘reasonable expectation’ measure adopted for Table 2.

This measure sought to overcome the limitations imposed by a simple absolute number of activities indicator, which were described in Outputs, PROJECT RESULTS, CHAPTER III above. It is necessarily subjective, and different evaluators might place greater or lesser weight on component elements. The components which comprise the ‘reasonable expectation’ measure are:

- Number of activities
- Significance/ importance of activities
- Degree of innovation
- Obstacles encountered and overcome
- Complexity of justice system (e.g. presence/ absence of Sharia law)

So, for example, for all three original pilot states, in the twelve months since launch, it would have been ‘reasonably expected’ that all committees would have been established and met, all committees would have determined their TOR, considered all Action Plan items, decided which could be quickly and inexpensively implemented, implemented same, developed strategies for the more complex Action Plan items, and then made progress with those strategies.

Annex 10. Summary assessment questionnaire*United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*

Project evaluation
Summary assessment questionnaire

This questionnaire is to be filled out by the evaluator or evaluation team and to be submitted to backstopping office. A copy should be provided to the Senior Evaluation Officer, Division for Operations and Analysis. A separate questionnaire should be filled out for each project encompassed by the evaluation. The information provided must be fully congruent with the contents of the evaluation report.

The purpose of the questionnaire is to provide information for UNODC's evaluation database. The information will be used to establish evaluation profiles which should give a quick and correct overview of the evaluation of individual projects and programmes. It will also be used for the purpose of analyzing results across project evaluations to obtain a systematic picture of the overall performance of the Programme.

I. NUMBER AND TITLE OF PROJECT:

FS/NIR/01/R16. "Strengthening judicial integrity and capacity".

II. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT:

1. Please provide an assessment for all categories listed (including categories constituting headings) by ticking one of the boxes ranging from 0 to 5. The ratings from 0 to 5 are based on the following standard favor-to-disfavor scale:

- 5 - Outstanding, highly appropriate, much more than planned/expected, certain to materialize
- 4 - Very good, very appropriate, more than planned/expected, highly likely to materialize
- 3 - Good, appropriate, as planned/expected, likely to materialize
- 2 - Fair, less appropriate, less than planned/expected, less likely to materialize
- 1 - Unsatisfactory, not appropriate, far below plans/expectations, unlikely to materialize
- 0 - Cannot determine, not applicable

2

2. If a category has been significant (as a cause or effect) in relation to the overall quality and/or performance of the project please tick the “S” column (if significant) or the “H” column (if highly significant).

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
OVERALL QUALITY AND PERFORMANCE OF PROJECT:						a		
I. PROJECT CONCEPT AND DESIGN:						a		
1. Project document (overall clarity, logic and coherence).		16			a			
2. Identification/analysis of problem addressed by project:								a
3. Project strategy (overall assessment):							a	
4. Crime control objective (s) (Appropriateness, obtainability):							a	
5. Immediate objective(s) (appropriateness, Obtainability):							a	
6. Achievement indicators:		17		a				
7. Base-line study/arrangements for base-line study:						a		
8. Outputs (compared to cost effective alternatives):						a		
9. Activities (compare to cost effective alternatives):						a		
10. Inputs (compared to cost effective alternatives):		18		a				
11. Executing modality and managerial arrangements:					a			
12. Identification and assessment of risks					a			
13. Prior obligations and prerequisites:							a	
14. Workplan/planned project duration:		19		a				
15. Budget:					a			

16 Workplan deficient, absence of evaluation framework

17 Generally PROCESS indicators, not IMPACT

18 Baseline study (NIALS) grossly underfunded

19 Workplan deficient, lacked sufficient detail

3

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
II. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION:						a		
1. Quality and timeliness of UNODC inputs:		²⁰			a			
2. Quality and timeliness of Government inputs:		²¹			a			
3. Quality and timeliness of inputs by third parties:			a					
4. Equipment: *inappropriate in the sense of being premature and generous						a		
5. Advisory/training services:								a
6. Project personnel:							a	
7. Sub-contracting:		²²		a				
8. Management of project:						a		
9. Project workplans:		²³			a			
10. Implementation of activities:		²⁴			a			
11. Monitoring and backstopping by UNODC HQ:		²⁵			a			
12. Monitoring and backstopping by UNODC field Office:		²⁶			a			
13. Monitoring and backstopping by Executing Agency:		²⁷			a			
14. Monitoring and backstopping by Government:		²⁸			a			
15. Government fulfilment of prerequisites:		²⁹			a			
III. PROJECT RESULTS:						a		
1. Timeliness of produced outputs;						a		
2. Quantity of produced outputs:						a		
3. Quality of produced outputs:						a		

20 NIALS baseline research activities grossly underfunded

21 At the federal level aimed to provide accommodation etc. for national project coordinator, by state, varied from excellent to poor

22 NIALS Research unsatisfactory – due as much to the lack of specificity in TOR documentation, underfunding, timeframe, as much as internal NIALS deficiencies

23 Refers to Action Plans – lacked a number of essential elements – not picked up by UNODC

24 If NIALS element excluded, would have rated 3.

25 Failure to document what backstopping could be expected, outside of ‘standard’ UNODC/UNOPS letter of agreement. Monitoring undertaken with ‘rose coloured glasses’.

26 Hampered by confusion of divisions of responsibility UNODC Vienna and field office. Reluctance of UNODC Vienna to pass any control to field office

27 As per f/n 23 above

28 Insufficient monitoring outside of formal ‘review’ meetings which were somewhat ‘celebratory’, both to maintain momentum, sense of achievement and again, viewed by UNODC Vienna through ‘rose coloured glasses’.

29 Failed to provide accommodation etc. for national project coordinator in a timely or satisfactory manner

4. Outcomes: achievement/likely achievement of immediate objective(s):		30			a			
5. Crime control impact achieved:		31			a			

4

	H	S	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. Crime control impact to be expected					a			
7. Likely sustainability of project results:						a		

3. If external factors had an impact on project performance please tick the appropriate boxes: external factors impeded: ___/ promoted: ___ project performance. The effect on project performance of this influence was significant: ___/ highly significant: _____. Please provide a short description of the nature of the external factor(s):

4. Did the evaluation recommend to:

- a) _____ abandon the project
- b) _____ continue/extend the project without modifications
- c) _____ continue/extend the project with minor modifications
- d) **a** continue/extend the project with some modifications
- e) _____ continue/extend the project with extensive modification
- f) _____ terminate the projects, as planned

(please tick the relevant category).

5. If a modification of the project was recommended did the evaluation recommend a revision of: the crime control objective(s): _____, the immediate objective(s): _____, the outputs: _____, the activities: **a** or the inputs: **a** . Please tick as appropriate.

~~It is recommended that the project be redesigned into a new project.~~

6. If the evaluation recommended that the project or significant elements of it be replicated please tick as appropriate: yes: **a** / no: _____

Silvia E. Levissianos

30 Threatened by failure of significant stakeholders (ICPC? Police) to honour commitments

31 Project can contribute to achieving objective, but will not of itself result in the objective being achieved.

Evaluation Assistant
Division for Operations and Analysis
P.O. Box 500
A-1400 Vienna, Austria
Tel. + 43 1 26060 4262
Fax. + 43 1 26060 5896
silvia.levissianos@UNODC.org