

Management Response to Mid-term Evaluation

Fiji Access to Justice Project

Recommendation	Management Response	Timeline	Responsibility
Follow up 2019			
<i>Recommendation 1: Project Board Composition</i>			
<p>1. The FA2J Project Board should approve the inclusion of three grantee CSOs (FDPF, MSP, and Empower Pacific) as representatives of end-user beneficiaries on the project board as provided in Annex 7 as soon as possible.</p> <p>a. As an alternative option, the grantee CSOs can be invited to guide the project board as a distinct advisory group representing end-user beneficiaries in FA2J efforts</p>	<p>This was rejected by the Access to Justice Project Board. It presented to the Access to Justice Project Board, as action items for decision by the Board, proposed as follows (taken from the June 2019 Project Board Minutes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expand the Project Board to include the three grantee CSOs; if full-time membership is not achievable then a distinct senior Working Group arrangement may be an option to assist with developing Output 4 targets for accompaniment, networks, and outreach materials. - Revisit and reform FA2J Project Management Structure to accommodate interests of rights holders, invigorate shared investment in delivery through defined Working Groups per model provided in Annex 7, and expand Project Assurance to include monitoring reports generated by or for each interest on the PB (duty-bearers, rights-holders, management, and senior supplier) 	<p>Actioned at Project Board Meeting Jun-04, 2019; CSO grantees to be invited to Project Board sessions in line with topical discussion</p>	<p>Access to Justice Project Board.</p>

	<p>The Project Board determined not to alter the composition of the Board.</p> <p>Instead, "The board members agreed to invite individuals to meetings as required and the invitees would be attending meetings as non-voting members." (taken from the same minutes)</p> <p>Accordingly, grantees under the Access to Justice Project may be invited as special observers on a request basis when topics under discussion require their specific expertise.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Recommendation 2: Clarification of Target Groups and M&E Framework


2.1 The FA2J Project Board should approve the clarification of target vulnerable populations as: people with disabilities, women, and the poor living in informal settlements and rural areas as soon as possible.	Agreed. The target groups have been largely identified through the Access to Justice Assessment carried out in 2018 – aptly informing the issuance of grants under the project (namely for victims of SGBV, child abuse, and access to justice for persons with physical and psychosocial disabilities). The Project continues to work with legal service providers and CSO grantees to refine and identify any vulnerabilities within vulnerabilities.	Already actioned.	UNDP & Project Partners.
2.2 Once target groups are clarified, FA2J should revise its M&E framework in partnership with duty bearers and rights holders (represented by CSOs) to both reflect a shared understanding of terminology used and to accommodate progress and challenges to date.	Agreed	End of 2019	UNDP & EU.
2.3 The M&E framework should be revisited at least annually as part of the reporting cycle.	Agreed.	Annually (timed with annual reporting)	UNDP & EU
2. The FA2J Project Board should approve the clarification of target vulnerable populations as: people with disabilities, women, and the poor living in informal settlements and rural areas as soon as possible. Once target groups are	Agreed.	End of 2019	UNDP

<p>clarified, FA2J should revise its M&E framework in partnership with duty bearers and rights holders (represented by CSOs) to both reflect a shared understanding of terminology used and to accommodate progress and challenges to date. The M&E framework should be revisited at least annually as part of the reporting cycle.</p>	<p>issuance of grants under the project (namely for victims of SGBV, child abuse, and access to justice for persons with physical and psychosocial disabilities). The Project continues to work with legal service providers and CSO grantees to refine and identify any vulnerabilities within vulnerabilities.</p> <p>In conjunction with the EU ROM mission carried out in early 2019, the project has already determined to update the M&E framework to bring it better into line with the underpinning EU Financing Agreement, and agrees to revisit it on an annual basis.</p>		
<p>Recommendation 3: Establishment of Working Groups</p>			
<p>3.1 The FA2J Project Board should approve the creation of, to start with, four Working Groups ...</p> <p>to concentrate joint resources on complex or missing elements identified by partners during the MTE as critical to progress</p> <p>3.2 Working group 1 - directed to complete the procurement and roll-out of the case management system and hotline in the LAC, to include overseeing the development of the final systems.</p> <p>3.3 Working group 2 - directed to complete the procurement and roll-out of the case management system in the Judicial Department, to include overseeing the development of the final system</p> <p>3.4 Working group 3- directed to focus on the development of strategic planning, M&E / reporting and related institutional strengthening efforts for duty-bearers engaged with FA2J</p> <p>3.5 Working group 4 - directed to focus on the development of outreach materials designed to address informational needs of specific vulnerable populations identified as targets for FA2J</p>	<p>Agreed in part. The Project has raised concerns consistently that working groups could add an additional layer of complication to moving project items forward in light of past delegations of authority which were not true delegations, resulting in duplication of work and delay in implementation. However, at least with CSOs/grantees, this could be a strong approach</p> <p>This was raised for discussion during the June 5 Access the Access Project Board meeting. Per the Project Board Minutes: The Acting Chief Justice expressed the view that working groups for ICT and institutional capacity were unnecessary and created a bureaucratic process. UNDP should meet directly with the Acting Chief Justice and/or the Chief Registrar to take necessary decisions. Further, that the method of communication between the project partners was operating effectively at present. The Acting Chief Justice noted that such working groups may be of use at a later stage.</p> <p>However, it was agreed at the Project Board that the Working Group 4 had potential – indeed demonstrated by a coordination</p>	<p>Ongoing – but already being actioned – namely the CSO working group</p>	

	meeting held with CSO grantees, Judicial Department and the Legal Aid Commission During the Project Board, The Acting Chief Justice agreed that a working group with CSOs could be useful and indeed Social Welfare could join the group for relevant discussions.		
Recommendation 4: Consider Establishment of Justice Sector Coordination Group w/Secretariat			
4.1 UNDP should assess partner support for the development of a Secretariat function to support justice sector coordination efforts and specific initiatives, The MTE identified benefits that a coordination mechanism that extends to actors engaged in these other stages of the process could provide for FA2J. Longer term, a sector coordination mechanism would align with UNDP's broader rule of law program within which FA2J is managed. In the shorter term, discrete coordination mechanisms involving FA2J and external partners, such as task forces, targeting specific shared targets within the current FA2J framework	Agreed in part. UNDP has been working with the entire justice sector on the "First Hour Procedure" under the Security Sector and Governance Project. This has formed the skeleton of a justice sector coordination group with the Former Chief Justice acting as a convening chair to bring all stakeholders together; this however, is not something that has been established formally. UNDP will broach the possibility of formalizing this with the new Acting Chief Justice, suggesting UNDP provide secretariat support. While linked to the Access to Justice Project, this would technically be a separate initiative. Beyond this, as UNDP establishes a civil society organization working group, or any other working group under the Access to Justice Project, additional external partners will be invited to participate in consultation with project partners.	Q3 & Q4 2019	UNDP, Judicial Department, Legal Aid Commission
Recommendation 5: Broaden Engagement in the Justice Sector Beyond A2J Project			
5.1 UNDP should clarify FA2J's distinct role within its rule of law portfolio and work with other agencies to invigorate the UN	Agreed.	Ongoing – next	UNDP

Pacific Regional Strategy Coordination Group and related Outcome Groups as the conduit for engagement with the FA2J Working Groups / Project Board	UNDP will continue its active role within the context of Outcome Coordination Groups 2, 5, and 6 under the UN Pacific Regional Strategy. Beyond this, UNDP is already part of a working group with UNFPA, UNICEF and UN Women that addresses gender issues and programming, and looks for areas of collaboration on gender and SGBV-related issues.	Outcome Working Group meetings and ongoing basis with fellow UN agencies.	

Signed:



Nanise Saune-Qaloewai
Effective Governance Deputy Team Leader - OIC
Effective Governance

Date:

