



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

**Changes for Justice (C4J) Mid-Term Evaluation: Is
USAID's support for justice sector reform aligned and
responsive to the reform agendas and needs of its GOI
partner institutions?**

Garry Ledbetter

Sole Evaluator, USAID/Regional Development Mission for Asia, Senior
Rule of Law and Governance Advisor

March 2012

Disclaimer:

The authors' views do not necessarily reflect the views of the United
States Agency for International Development or the United States
Government.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Acronyms and Glossary..... | 3 |
| Executive Summary..... | 4 |
| Introduction..... | 7 |
| Scope and Methodology..... | 10 |
| Analysis..... | 11 |
| 1. Are C4J activities aligned with the Supreme Court’s Reform Agenda?..... | 11 |
| 2. Are C4J activities supportive of AGO’s reform agenda?..... | 16 |
| 3. Are C4J activities supportive of the GOI national initiative to expand access to justice?..... | 19 |
| 4. What is C4J providing that is integral to the success of its partner GOI institutions’ reform agendas and that would be severely compromised in the absence of this USAID support?..... | 21 |
| 5. Given other current and planned donor assistance to the Supreme Court and AGO, is continued C4J support to these institutions nevertheless critical?..... | 21 |
| 6. Negative impact on sustainability should the project be terminated or reduced prior to its scheduled May 2014 completion date..... | 23 |
| 7. Recommendations | 24 |
| | |
| Annex 1: Scope of Work..... | 27 |
| Annex 2: List of documents for review..... | 29 |
| Annex 3: Matrix of Results..... | 30 |
| Annex 4: Interview Schedule | 31 |

ACRONYMS AND GLOSSARY

| | |
|-----------|---|
| AGO | Attorney General's Office |
| AusAid | Australian Government Overseas Aid Program |
| Bappenas | National Development Planning Agency |
| Blueprint | Blueprint for Justice Reform 2010-2035, Supreme Court |
| C4J | Changes for Justice project |
| CJE | Continuing judicial education |
| CMS | Case management system |
| COP | Chief-of-party |
| CTS | Case Tracking System being supported by C4J |
| GOI | Government of Indonesia |
| IT | Information technology |
| JRT | Judicial Reform Team |
| M&E | Monitoring and evaluation |
| MCC | Millennium Challenge Corporation |
| NGO | Non-governmental organization |
| PMP | Performance monitoring plan |
| RFP | Request for proposal |
| SC | Supreme Court |
| SOP | Standard operating procedures |
| SOW | Scope of work |
| STTA | Short-term technical assistance |
| WB | World Bank |

Executive Summary

This paper is a mid-term program evaluation of the Changes for Justice (C4J) Project to determine if USAID's support for justice sector reform is aligned and responsive to the reform agendas and needs of its GOI partner institutions. The paper will also examine if USAID support is integral and critical to the SC and AGO's efforts to reform as well as examine the effects of any unexpected decrease in funding for C4J prior to its scheduled closure date.

The C4J is a 19 million dollar four-year project focused on sustaining and deepening reforms in the Indonesian justice sector to produce a less corrupt, a more accountable and more highly performing justice system. This goal will be achieved through more efficient, credible, and transparent functioning of the Supreme Court (Component 1) and the Attorney General's Office (Component 2), including increasing the competence and integrity of judges, prosecutors and staff. Integral to meeting these goals, Component 3 is designed to meet special initiatives of the US government (USG) to further strengthen the reform process in the Indonesian justice sector.¹

C4J alignment with the reform agendas of the SC and AGO

The SC and AGO reforms are guided by the GOI Bureaucracy Reform Agenda which began in 2006 in order improve legal certainty and reduce state financial leaks; increase investment; and increase state revenue. Building upon the general GOI reforms, the SC has created and is guided by the Blueprint for Justice Reform 2010-2035 and the reform of the AGO is guided by the AGO's Bureaucracy Reform Agenda 2008.

Supreme Court

The SC, under the "one roof" policy developed through a series of laws, now serves as the top management in administration, personnel, finance, and infrastructure of four courts (General, Specialized, Religious and Military/Administrative). The new Blueprint sets forth the vision of the judicial body which is creating the Indonesian Judicial Court of Excellence. The SC's Mission hopes to achieve this new vision by maintaining independence; providing legal service that is just for justice seekers; strengthening the leadership quality; and improving credibility and transparency.² The implementation for the Vision and Mission of the SC is carried out through the following Directives: Directives on Reform of Technical Functions & Case Management; Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions; and Directives on Accountability Reform.³

¹ Changes for Justice Project Year 1 and Year 2 Workplans, Executive Summary

² Blueprint Justice Reform 2010-2035 Pages 11-12, Chapter III, Section B. Mission of Judicial Body

³ Blueprint Justice Reform 2010-2035, Pages 18-53, Chapter IV-VI

The C4J project allocates 65-70% of USAID funding to activities with the SC. Project activities are developed in cooperation with the SC as set forth in a Decision of the Chief Justice⁴ and are implemented through Working Groups that are a component of the JRT established in 2010 by a Chief Justice Decree.⁵ Once C4J and the SC agree on the activities to be implemented in the coming year that are aligned with the Blueprint, the workplan is submitted to Bappenas for approval. After the workplan is approved, project implementation is conducted with working groups from the JRT. The Working Groups that coordinate with C4J are: Human Resources and Budgeting, Public Access to Information, Case Management/Access to Justice, Case Management/Information Technology, and Education and Training.

After conducting key informant interviews and reviewing the Blueprint and relevant project documentation, it is the conclusion of the evaluator that the activities of C4J are aligned with the Blueprint of the SC. Activities that are in line include developing a case tracking system, training court personnel on how to implement such a system, building the capacity of the training center and restructuring of the human resources department. During key informant interviews at the SC, all Working Groups confirmed that C4J activities are aligned with the SC reform agenda. In fact, all working groups expressed an interest in expanding cooperation with C4J.

Although C4J activities are in line with the SC reform Agenda, there are some challenges such as negotiating to get project approval with multiple competing interests within the SC that were created under the “one roof” policy, building the capacity of the SC in light of a random rotation policy that moves reformers from pilot projects, and ensuring the C4J CTS is the only case management system used by the General Courts in light of a competing system being operated in a few courts.

Attorney General' Office

The AGO's 2008 Bureaucracy Reform Vision is “to achieve an AGO that is professional and that has integrity according to the AGO's supreme values to assure legal certainty to create good governance by 2025.”⁶ The AGO's Bureaucracy Reform Mission is to: 1. Establish and/or complete laws and regulations as a legal basis for the AGO's good governance; 2. Modernize the AGO's bureaucracy by optimizing the use of information and communication technology; 3. Develop a positive culture, work values, and behavior of the AGO staff; 4. Restructure the AGO organization (institutional); 5. Relocate and improve the quality of human resources, including a revised remuneration system; 6. Simplify the work system, procedures and mechanisms; and 7. Develop an effective supervision mechanism.⁷ Under the

⁴ Decision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Number: 143/KMA/SK/VIII/2010, Concerning the Implementation Directives for Foreign Donors operation in the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia

⁵ Decree of the Chief Justice of Supreme Court, Republic of Indonesia, Number: 116/KMA/SK/VI/2010 Concerning the establishment of Judicial Reform Team

⁶ AGO Bureaucracy Reform 2008, Chapter 1, Section E. Vision, Mission, Purpose and Goal of the AGO's Bureaucracy Reform, Vision, Subpart 1. Mission of the AGO's Bureaucracy Reform, paragraph AGO's Bureaucracy Reform Vision

⁷ *Ibid.*

reform agenda, there are two phases of reform at the AGO. The first phase focuses on quick wins that develop and use new technology to become more transparent and increase public trust in the AGO. The second phase is focused more on restructuring of the AGO to improve business processes. Although the AGO is not as far advanced into its reforms as the SC, and has less experience working with international donors, the AGO follows the same approval process as the SC for its annual workplans.

After conducting key informant interviews and reviewing the relevant documentation, it is the conclusion of the evaluator that the activities of C4J are aligned with the reforms of the AGO. Activities that are in line include training prosecutors on freedom of information laws, developing competency models for officials at AGO headquarters, and assisting with building a curriculum at the training center. During key informant interviews at the AGO, all Working groups confirmed that C4J activities are aligned with the AGO reform agenda and requested additional cooperation with C4J.

Although C4J activities are in line with the AGO reform Agenda, there are some challenges such as the rotation policy of the AGO where prosecutors are rotated every two years and some trainees never use the skills or knowledge obtained from C4J events, and occasionally, communication has been an issue.

C4J Support Integral and Critical

Given C4J activities are in line with the reform agendas of the SC and AGO, C4J is providing support that is integral to the SC and AGO. For example, C4J's assistance and support to the SC is integral to developing a case management system, automating the courts and providing training to those who will be working with the new systems. These activities are creating a more open judiciary and would not be currently moving forward at the SC without C4J support. As for the assistance to the AGO, access to international best practices through experts and the ability to include personnel from remote prosecutors' offices in trainings are integral to the success of its reforms.

Additionally, assistance to the Supreme Court and AGO is coordinated through Bappenas and ongoing discussions among the various donors such as USAID, WB, EU and AusAid. As a result, there appears to be no current duplication of activities and each donor has carved out its own niche in providing assistance to the GOI. Given this scenario, USAID support is currently critical to the Supreme Court and AGO. That being said, it is only critical until other donor funding can replace USAID support or the GOI can allocate sufficient funds from its budget to cover the gap left by USAID.

Furthermore, in general, C4J activities will be negatively impacted should USAID reduce funding to C4J or terminate the program before its scheduled completion date without sufficient planning. The degree of impact will depend on the specific project, but the larger projects will be hit the hardest, such as IT. Given the GOI as

already established its budget for 2012 and is in the process of developing its 2013 budget, programming may cease for up to two years if other funding sources cannot be found to cover an abrupt closeout by USAID.

Recommendations

Since C4J activities are in line with the reform agendas of the SC and AGO, the evaluator's recommendations focus on resource allocation and efforts to improve sustainability of project activities. These recommendations include changing indicators to better track the results of training for the SC and AGO, focusing on building the capacity of the training centers at the SC and AGO to counter the rotation policies of the GOI institutions, obtain commitment from the new Chief Justice of the SC to issue a decree to confirm the C4J CTS is the only system to be used by the general courts for case management, and a phased close out of the project that avoids any abrupt closure of project activities should USAID Indonesia no longer be able to fund C4J.

Introduction

The SC and AGO reforms are guided by the GOI Bureaucracy Reform Agenda which was developed in 2006 with the following main goals: improve legal certainty and reduce state financial leaks; increase investment; and increase state revenue. Building upon the general GOI reforms⁸, the Supreme Court has created and is guided by the Blueprint for Justice Reform 2010-2035 while the reform of the AGO is guided by the AGO's Bureaucracy Reform Agenda 2008.

Supreme Court

The SC, under the "one roof" policy developed through a series of laws, now serves as the top management in administration, personnel, finance, and infrastructure of four courts (General, Specialized, Religious and Military/Administrative).⁹ Prior to the "one roof" policy, each court was a component of separate Ministry which provided management. Once the "one roof" policy was adopted, it meant a dramatic shift in how the courts would operate and greatly increased the management burden on the SC. As a result, there was and still is a need for reform of the SC to implement the policy.

⁸ The reforms are set out in the following: Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment (Men Pan) Decree No. 15//M.Pan/7/2088, on Bureaucracy Reform General Guidelines; Republic of Indonesia Presidential Decree No. 81 of 2010, on Bureaucracy Reform Grand Design, 2010-2025; and Minister of State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucracy Reform Decree No. 20 of 2010, on Bureaucracy Roadmap, 2010-2014.

⁹ Blueprint Justice Reform 2010-2035, Page 4, Chapter I, Section A. Background and Context of Reform, specifically: "SC's responsibility as the consequence of one roof policy as stated in Law No.35 Year 1999 on Amendment to Law No.14 Year 1970 on Principle Provisions of Judiciary, and which was revised by Law No.4 Year 2004, which was then revised again by Law No.48 Year 2009 on Judicial Power. The justification is also stated in various laws, such as in: Law No.5 Year 2004 *juncto* Law No.3 Year 2009 on Supreme Court, Law No.8 Year 2004 *juncto* Law No.46 Year 2009 on General Justice, Law No.9 Year 2004 *juncto* Law No.51 Year 2009 on State Administration Court and Law No.50 Year 2009 on Religious Court."

The SC reforms began with a Blueprint for Justice Reform in 2003. The SC implemented a variety of programs from 2005-2009 focused on restructuring the organization, reducing the case backlog, establishing an education center, improving its recruiting system, and promoting information transparency. These efforts were only partially successful and in 2010 the SC adopted a new Blueprint for Justice Reform 2010-2035.

The new Blueprint sets forth the vision of the judicial body formulated by the Chairman of Supreme Court on 10 September 2009 which is "CREATING THE INDONESIAN JUDICIAL COURT OF EXCELLENCE which ... can be established as a Judicial Court that: 1. Implements the function of judicial power independently, effectively and justly; 2. Is independently supported with performance-based budget management which is allocated proportionally in the State Budget; 3. Has a proper organizational structure as well as organizational management that is clear and measurable; 4. Implements the management and administration of case processes that are simple, fast, punctual, cheap and proportional; 5. Manages means and infrastructure for the purpose of supporting a work environment that is safe, comfortable, and conducive for the implementation of judicial functions; 6. Manages and develops human resources that are competent by objective criteria in order to create judicial personnel that are integrated and professional; 7. Is supported with effective supervision ...; 8. Is oriented towards quality public service; 9. Maintains information management that guarantees accountability, credibility, and transparency; and 10. Is modern on the basis of integrated Information Technology (IT)."¹⁰

The Missions of the SC have been formulated for the purpose of achieving the vision of an Indonesian Judicial Court of Excellence. The Missions of the Judicial Body 2010 – 2035 are:

1. Maintaining independence of the judicial body;
2. Providing legal service that is just for justice seekers;
3. Strengthening the leadership quality of the judicial body; and
4. Improving the credibility and transparency of the judicial body.¹¹

The implementation for the Vision and Missions of the SC is carried out through the following Directives: Directives on Reform of Technical Functions & Case Management; Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions; and Directives on Accountability Reform.¹² Each one of these Directives establishes specific reform areas such as human resources, case management, information technology, improving access to courts, reform of education and training, and budget and asset management. These Directives establish the parameters for cooperation with C4J.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Page 11, Chapter III, Section A. Vision of Judicial Body

¹¹ *Ibid.*, Pages 11-12, Chapter III, Section B. Mission of Judicial Body

¹² *Ibid.*, Pages 18-53, Chapter IV-VI

Attorney General's Office

Bureaucracy reform in the AGO was originally launched on July 22, 2005, and resulted in a set of regulations that were adopted by the AGO in July 2007. These regulations called for reforms in recruitment, education and training, minimum standards of the attorney profession, career development, code of ethics, and supervision. Building upon these regulations, the AGO adopted the Bureaucracy Reform Program in 2008 which is now the document guiding the reform of the AGO.¹³

The AGO's 2008 Bureaucracy Reform Vision is "to achieve an AGO that is professional and that has integrity according to the AGO's supreme values, *Satya Adhi Wicaksana's (Great Loyalty to Justice)*, to assure legal certainty to create good governance by 2025."¹⁴ The AGO's Bureaucracy Reform Mission is to: 1. Establish and/or complete laws and regulations as a legal basis for the AGO's good governance; 2. Modernize the AGO's bureaucracy by optimizing the use of information and communication technology; 3. Develop a positive culture, work values, and behavior of the AGO staff; 4. Restructure the AGO organization (institutional); 5. Relocate and improve the quality of human resources, including a revised remuneration system; 6. Simplify the work system, procedures and mechanisms; and 7. Develop an effective supervision mechanism.¹⁵

In general, the AGO's bureaucratic reform goals are to change the mindset and culture, as well as its management system. In particular, the goals cover several aspects, such as:

1. **Organizational**, by establishing an AGO organization with the right functions and the right size.
2. **Organizational culture**, by establishing an AGO bureaucracy that is professional and has higher performance.
3. **Procedure**, by establishing a clear, effective, efficient, measurable system, processes and procedures in accordance with good governance principles.
4. **Regulation and deregulation**, by establishing an AGO bureaucracy that follows regulations and deregulation in order to avoid overlap and that is conducive to reform.
5. **Human resources**, by establishing an AGO human resources system that has integrity and is competent, professional, high performing, prosperous, and well-respected.¹⁶

¹³ There are other documents that have been developed such as AGO Quick Wins 2009, AGO Reformation Blue Print 2010 – 2015, and the AGO Strategic Plan 2010-2014 – Strengthening the implementation of Bureaucracy Reform, but these documents were not made available in English.

¹⁴ AGO Bureaucracy Reform 2008, Chapter 1, Section E. Vision, Mission, Purpose and Goal of the AGO's Bureaucracy Reform, Vision and Subpart 1. Mission of the AGO's Bureaucracy Reform, paragraph AGO's Bureaucracy Reform Vision

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, Subpart 3. The Goals of AGO's Bureaucracy Reform

The first phase of AGO's Reform includes quick wins to initiate bureaucratic reforms to rebuild public trust in the AGO. The selected programs are those that are key to leveraging improvements in the core business of the institution. The hope is that the changes from the quick wins program can be easily seen, and the benefit can be directly sensed by justice seekers.¹⁷

The Second Phase of AGO Reform will focus on organization restructuring; procedural restructuring; restructuring of the human resources management system; strengthening of organizational units; development of rules and regulations; internal supervision; and change management.

Changes for Justice (C4J)

The C4J project was awarded to Chemonics in May 2010 and its primary objective is to improve the performance of Indonesia's justice system.¹⁸ The project is intended to produce the following two results:

- More efficient, credible, accountable and transparent functioning of the Supreme Court and Attorney General's Office.
- Increased competence and integrity of judges, prosecutors and staff.¹⁹

"The C4J is a four-year project focused on sustaining and deepening reforms in the Indonesian justice sector to produce a less corrupt, a more accountable and more highly performing justice system. This goal will be achieved through more efficient, credible, and transparent functioning of the Supreme Court (Component 1) and the Attorney General's Office (Component 2), including increasing the competence and integrity of judges, prosecutors and staff. Integral to meeting these goals, Component 3 is designed to meet special initiatives of the US government (USG) to further strengthen the reform process in the Indonesian justice sector."²⁰ Component 3 was added to the C4J project to implement activities with additional funding remaining from a prior MCC project. C4J began implementing activities in October 2010 after a lengthy start-up period.

Scope and Methodology

As set forth in the SOW in Annex 1, USAID Indonesia is keen to ensure that its investments in support for justice sector reform are aligned with and responsive to the reform agendas and needs of its GOI partner institutions – the Supreme Court and Office of the Attorney General, as well as the overall reform agenda of the GOI. For purposes of USAID Indonesia's future planning, the goal of this evaluation is to determine the extent to which these institutions view C4J as integral to their current

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Chapter IV Quick Wins

¹⁸ USAID Contract DFD-I-00-08-00070-00, Order No. 2, Page 9, Section C, paragraph C.3 Objective

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, at paragraph C.5.2 Overview and Project Approach

²⁰ Changes for Justice Project Year 1 and Year 2 Workplans, Executive Summary

operations and future plans, as well as how responsive they feel the project's activities have been to institutional needs that they cannot meet on their own. Specifically, the valuation is meant to answer the following questions:

1. Are C4J activities aligned with the Supreme Court's December 2010 *Blue Print for Reform 2010-2035*?
2. Are C4J activities supportive of the GOI national initiative to expand access to justice?
3. Are C4J activities supportive of AGO's reform agenda?
4. What is C4J providing that is integral to the success of its partner GOI institutions' reform agendas and that would not be happening, or would be severely compromised, in the absence of this USAID support?
5. Given other current and planned donor assistance to the Supreme Court and AGO, is continued C4J support to these institutions nevertheless critical?
6. Will the sustainability of C4J activities carried out to-date be negatively impacted should the project be terminated or reduced prior to its scheduled May 2014 completion date?
7. Recommendations on continued USAID Indonesia support to the Supreme Court and AGO (changes, additions, omissions).

The evaluation was conducted March 12-22, 2012 in Jakarta Indonesia. The methodology employed by the evaluation was to review project documentation and interview key informants and stakeholders in order to get a diverse perspective. Interviews included multiple representatives from the Supreme Court, Attorney General's Office, Bappenas, and bilateral/ multilateral donors (see Annex 4). The USAID Mission in Indonesia and Chemonics were also helpful in providing additional information as well as the necessary documents for review (See Annex 2).

Analysis

The following is a discussion of the findings of the evaluation as they relate to each question from the SOW.

Are C4J activities aligned with the Supreme Court's December 2010 Blue Print for Reform 2010-2035?

The C4J project allocates 65-70% of USAID funding to activities with the SC. Project activities are developed in cooperation with the SC as set forth in a Decision of the Chief Justice²¹ of the SC and are implemented through Working Groups that are a component of the JRT established in 2010 by a Chief Justice of the SC Decree.²² Once C4J and the SC agree on the activities to be implemented in the coming year

²¹ Decision of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Number: 143/KMA/SK/VIII/2010, Concerning the Implementation Directives for Foreign Donors operation in the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia

²² Decree of the Chief Justice of Supreme Court, Republic of Indonesia, Number: 116/KMA/SK/VI/2010 Concerning the establishment of Judicial Reform Team

that are aligned with the Blueprint, the workplan is submitted to Bappenas for approval. After the workplan is approved, project implementation is conducted with working groups from the JRT (although some activities will move forward if there are no objections by Bappenas given it could take months before official approval). The working groups that work directly with C4J are Human Resources and Budgeting, Public Access to Information, Case Management/Access to Justice, Case Management/Information Technology, and Education and training.

After conducting key informant interviews and reviewing the Blueprint and relevant project documentation, it is the conclusion of the evaluator that the activities of C4J are aligned with the Blueprint of the SC. During key informant interviews at the SC, all Working groups confirmed that C4J activities are aligned with the SC reform agenda. An analysis linking C4J activities with the some of the Blueprint Directives is set forth below.²³

Chapter IV, Directives on Reform of Technical Functions and Case Management, Section A. Directives on Reform of Technical Functions

This intended reform is defined as efforts to revitalize the SC to maintain legal consistency and create a judiciary that is affordable to public through efforts that enable improvement of access to justice. In order to achieve these objectives, the main programs of the SC are: 1. Limitation of Case Cassation and Legal Review; 2. Implementation of Chamber System Consistently; 3. Simplification of Case Processing; and 4. Improving Access to the Court.”²⁴ Examples of C4J activities aligned with this Directive are as follows:

- C4J implemented a workshop on Implementation of Supreme Court’s Practice Direction on the Provision of Legal Aid (Surat Edaran Mahkamah Agung (SEMA)) no.10/2010 for personnel from 39 courts to improve access to courts.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will conduct additional national and regional workshops on SEMA to continue to improve access to the courts.

Chapter IV, Directives on Reform of Technical Functions and Case Management, Section B. Directives on Case Management Reform

The Directives on Case Management Reform are for the purpose of realizing two Supreme Court’s Missions: firstly, providing legal services that are certain and just for justice seekers; and secondly, increasing credibility and transparency of the judiciary. The agenda for improvement in case management can be divided into three main parts, as follows: 1. Modernization of case management; 2. Restructuring of the case management organization; and 3. Restructuring of the case management process.²⁵ An example of C4J activities aligned with this Directive is:

²³ See also Annex 3, a matrix created by Chemonics linking activities to Directives from the Blueprint. The Evaluator did not independently verify some information in the matrix such as the number of participants given that would have been outside the scope of the evaluation.

²⁴ Blueprint Justice Reform 2010-2035, Page 18, CHAPTER IV, Section A. Directives on Reform of Technical Functions

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Page 24, CHAPTER IV, Section B. Directives on Case Management Reform

- C4J implemented a district court-level course on case flow management and completed a Court Automation Readiness Survey (CARS) in cooperation from courts throughout Indonesia.

Chapter V, Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions, Section F. Directives on Information Technology Reform

The “objectives of IT implementation in the SC can be formulated as supporting means to attain the following: a. Improving the quality of rulings, as in the provision of access to all information relevant from inside and outside the court, including rulings, legal journals, and so on; b. Improving the judicial administration system including access to judicial activities from outside the building, such as: registration, information inquiry, and witnessing; c. Establishing efficient work processes in the judicial institution by reducing manual and clerical workload and replacing it with computer-based processes; d. Establishing a performance-based organization by using technology as a means to conduct supervision and control over performance; and e. Establishing a learning environment within the organization by providing e-learning or distance learning facilities.”²⁶ Examples of C4J activities aligned with this Directive are as follows:

- C4J provided three Courts with extensive IT Equipment (Palembang, Bandung, and Samarinda) and four Courts with a Case Tracking System (CTS Version 1 software at Palembang, Bandung, Samarinda, and Surabaya). C4J also trained court personnel on the CTS and proper use of equipment.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will install CTS Version 1 in 5 new courts while training 350 court personnel, provide three Courts with digital audio recording equipment and trainings, and develop and install CTS Version 2 in 8-12 courts with training for approximately 500 personnel.

CHAPTER V, Section C. Directives on Reform of Education and Training System

Under this Directive, the Supreme Court will develop a qualified and respectable Judicial Training Center (JTC). The SC believes that an effective training system will be realized if the SC focuses development on the following aspects: 1. Institution; 2. Means and infrastructure required; 3. Human resources; 4. Integrated and sustainable education and training program; 5. Utilization of education and training results; 6. Education and training budget, and 7. Other supporting activities (for example research and development activities).²⁷ Examples of C4J activities aligned with this Directive are as follows:

- C4J worked with the Education and Training Working Group to create a training model, syllabus and curricula on the quality of judgments/rulings, case flow management, and a code of conduct for judges including a training of trainers. These activities play a significant role in building the capacity of the judges by expanding knowledge and improving integrity.
- C4J held a convention on CJE I focusing on Case flow Management and a pilot Training of Trainers Convention on CJE focusing on the Quality of Judgments.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Page 42, CHAPTER V, Section F. Directives on Information Technology Reform

²⁷ *Ibid.*, Page 35, CHAPTER V, Section C. Directives on Reform of Education and Training System

- C4J developed a Master's Degree Program and the first of three semesters was completed with 20 judges.

Chapter VI, Directives on Accountability Reform, Section B. Directives on Reform of Information Transparency System

The prioritized measures that will be implemented by the SC under this Directive are: 1. Establishing a culture of transparency in the court; 2. Creating an information access mechanism that is simple, quick, punctual and cheap; 3. Developing organizational structure and establishing supporting policies; 4. Creating a mechanism of supervision and monitoring, complaint and resolution, as well as incentives and disincentives in the implementation of information service; and 5. Increasing public awareness of the use and needs for judicial information. Examples of C4J activities aligned with this Directive are as follows:

- C4J supported the design, layout and provided equipment for the creation of three Public Information Desks (Palembang, Bandung, and Samarinda), trained court personnel on Transparency & Public Information Access and supported a study tour to Singapore. C4J also supported a series of Supreme Court talk shows on TV One with the SC.
- C4J continues to provide technical assistance on SOPs that cover procedures for media coverage, dissemination of info and how to create and release articles.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will develop guidelines for journalists in understanding the Indonesian legal system and reporting on the courts.

Chapter V, Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions, Section B. Directives on Reform in Human Resources Management

The SC will develop and implement the Competency-based HR Management System (CBHRM). The most important activity in the CBHRM is the preparation of the official position's competency profiles. The competency profile will be used as the minimal requirements for certain official positions and it will be a basis for the development of a system applied to all HR pillars. Once a system is in place, the following can be developed: 1. Competency-based selection and recruitment; 2. Competency-based training and development including rotation and promotion; 3. Competency-based performance assessment; 4. Competency-based remuneration; and 5. Competency-based career patterns.²⁸ Examples of C4J activities aligned with this Directive are as follows:

- C4J completed an assessment to set priorities of reform for Human Resources.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will develop competency profiles for case management, train staff on competency profiles, obtain SC acceptance of the competency profile system, and conduct approximately 100 individual assessments.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, Page 32-33, CHAPTER V, Section B. Directives on Reform in Human Resources Management

Challenges

Although C4J activities are aligned with the Blueprint as discussed above, some challenges were found during the key informant and donor interviews.

One of the challenges facing C4J is the rotation policy of the SC.²⁹ There is not a public version available of this policy and rotations or promotions seem to occur randomly. Such a policy creates problems in building the capacity of the judiciary as those who are trained may not continue in the same role at their next post. The rotation policy also creates additional challenges to implementing reforms if a “reformer” is transferred from a position of influence or decision making and is replaced by someone who does not share the same vision. For example, Chemonics is monitoring the situation at one of its pilot courts in Palembang that is implementing the new CTS as the Chief Judge of the court has been transferred to another post. It is uncertain if his replacement will share the same vision. There may also be a larger problem with the CTS in that there is no Decree from the Chief Justice of the SC confirming that the CTS is to be the case tracking system for the SC. The Chief Justice that supported the CTS has been replaced and there is no indication as of yet if the new Chief Justice will continue the support for CTS. Given there is a competing case tracking system being utilized in a few courts that was developed based upon a successful system installed in the religious courts, this could become a critical issue for the C4J.

There can be positives; however, to a rotation system if court personnel are continuing in the same position with similar responsibilities following the transfer. They can utilize the skills and knowledge obtained through the prior partnership with C4J and spread any new techniques or approaches to the new office or court. This is true at the Chief Judge level at local and regional courts when a “reformer” moves to another post and begins replicating successful C4J activities. It is too early in the C4J project to determine if such an effect will occur on a consistent basis.

It has been only 8 years since the “one-roof” policy has consolidated the General courts, Religious courts, Military courts and the Specialized courts under the management of the SC.³⁰ Given this recent event, there are still competing interests and many interested parties within the SC on any given reform measure despite the creation of the JRT. As a result, communication can be a barrier to program implementation if buy-in is not obtained from all interested parties.

In terms of creating buy-in, one criticism of the C4J project was that the project has a reputation for “forcing” what it would prefer to implement onto its GOI partners

²⁹ The Evaluator was unable to determine the official rotation policy of the SC as the policy has not been made public.

³⁰ Law No. 35 of 1999, on application of One Roof System under Supreme Court, effective September 2004.

instead of creating a workplan that meets the requests of the courts.³¹ Although this can be problematic, it should be noted that there are always negotiations to determine the appropriate activities to be included in any workplan when working with a government institution or even a non-governmental organization. These negotiations attempt to reconcile the gap between identified needs and the requests of the target partner. Hopefully, in the end, a workplan is created that will meet a reform agenda. It should be noted that in all meetings, the representatives from the SC agreed that C4J activities are aligned with the Blueprint and requested additional cooperation with C4J.

Are C4J activities supportive of AGO's reform agenda?

The AGO is not as far advanced into its reforms as the SC and has less experience working with international donors. Nevertheless, C4J follows the same process in developing a workplan with the AGO as it does with the SC. When developing activities to implement in cooperation with the AGO, C4J has discussions with AGO leadership and members of the AGO Reform Team (AGO also has a reform team similar to the SC established by a Decree of the Attorney General).³² Once an agreement is reached, a workplan is developed and then submitted to Bappenas for approval. Once Bappenas approves the workplan, C4J begins implementation of project activities (although some activities will move forward if there are no objections by Bappenas given it could take months before official approval) with the following Working Groups: Public access to Information, Human Resources, and Education and Training

The guiding document for negotiations on cooperation is the 2008 AGO Bureaucracy Reform discussed in the Background section. Under this guiding document, there are two phase of reform at the AGO. The first phase focuses on quick wins that develop and use technology to improve accountability and transparency of the AGO. The second phase focuses more on restructuring of the AGO.

After conducting key informant interviews and reviewing the relevant documentation, it is the conclusion of the evaluator that the activities of C4J are aligned with the reforms of the AGO. During key informant interviews at the AGO, all Working Groups confirmed that C4J activities are aligned with the AGO reform agenda. An analysis linking C4J activities to components of the AGO Reform Agenda follows.

AGO Bureaucratic Reform Agenda 2008; Phase One: AGO Quick Wins Program

The quick wins program that is designed to increase public trust to be implemented by the AGO is as follows: acceleration of case handling to deliver excellent service to

³¹ This issue was raised by the EU, WB, AusAid and Bappenas. It is worth noting that donors do take different approaches to building the capacity of government institutions. Some donors focus on the request of target institutions while others donors will take a mixed approach that blends requests and identified needs.

³² Decree of Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia Number:KEP-086/A/J.A/08/2008 Concerning Establishment of Bureaucracy Reform Team

the public in relation to law enforcement; application of an information technology system (online) to manage corruption and other criminal cases (starting from investigation to execution, tracking the number of corruption cases, restitution of state loss, the date and amount of transfers to the state treasury, etc.); application of an information technology system (online) in the management of complaints relating to attorneys who receive discipline/punishments; and updating of the AGO's website so that the public can have access to information on case management and public complaints.³³ Examples of C4J activities aligned with Phase One that focus on preparing personnel to implement new systems are as follows:³⁴

- Public information managers (who are prosecutors) from district prosecutor offices in 5 provinces (West Java, South Sumatera, South Sulawesi, East Nusa Tenggara, and Maluku) received training on handling public information requests.
- Heads of district prosecutor offices attended the introductory session of the training to socialize/disseminate the Freedom of Information Act and the AGO's Decree on Public Information Services.
- Production of 1000 copies of a compilation of laws and rules on public information access.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will support training on public information requests to district prosecutors' offices heads and others, will design curriculum for training staff on website development; and will provide basic and advanced technical assistance in journalism for AGO's website administrators.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will continue to disseminate the compilation of laws and rules to 33 Provincial Prosecutor's Office and 400 District Prosecutor's Office
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will support a public speaking training to be provided to information desk officers at district prosecutors' offices.

AGO Bureaucratic Reform Agenda 2008; Phase Two: Restructuring of the human resources management system

The activities envisioned by the AGO to restructure the human resources management system are as follows: 1) Individual competency assessment of prosecutors and staff/expert staff; 2) Development of a performance evaluation system; 3) Development of a procurement and selection system; 4) Development of a research and development system; 5) Strengthening of the rotation, transfer (to new place), and promotion system; 6) Strengthening of career development; and 7) Development/strengthening of a personnel database. Examples of C4J activities aligned with this component of Phase Two are as follows:

- Personnel Bureau Leadership Forums implemented to provide examples of best practices on human resource management from other Ministries to leadership of AGO.

³³ AGO Bureaucracy Reform March 2008, Chapter IV Quick Wins

³⁴ See also Annex 3, a matrix created by Chemonics linking activities to Directives from the Blueprint. The Evaluator did not independently verify some information in the matrix such as the number of participants given that would have been outside the scope of the evaluation.

- Developed the Competency Model for Echelon II officials at the AGO Headquarters.
- C4J-supported Competency Model used as the basis for Echelon III Individual Competency Assessments that were also supported by C4J.
- C4J-supported Competency Model was also used in assessments conducted directly by the AGO.
- In FY2012-2013, C4J will conduct a workforce analysis and is planning to develop a system to forecast needs, plan for, and place human resources more efficiently. C4J will also assist the AGO in developing Talent Management based on competencies adoption to better match officials' skills with position requirements.
- In FY2012-2013, completion of 10 sessions of the Personnel Bureau Leadership Forum and support a Human Resources-Leadership Training and send staff to a Certified Human Resources Professional Program.

Challenges

Although C4J activities are aligned with the 2008 Bureaucracy Reform Agenda as discussed above, some challenges were found during the key informant and donor interviews.

One of the challenges facing C4J is the rotation policy of the AGO where prosecutors are rotated, on average, every couple of years. This policy creates problems in building the capacity of the AGO as those who are trained may not continue in the same role at their next post and utilize the skills/knowledge gained through participating in C4J activities. The rotation policy also creates additional challenges to implementing reforms if a “reformer” is transferred from a position of influence or decision making and is replaced by someone who does not share the same vision as discussed in the Challenges section of the SC. The problem is so severe in the AGO, that AusAid no longer will provide training to staff of the AGO. Even during meeting with the Public Access to Information Working Group, they concurred that those attending C4J trainings may never use the skills or knowledge obtained during some trainings because of the rotation policy.

As discussed earlier, there are some benefits to a rotation policy if a reformer is able to effect change at the next posting. The AGO Human Resources Working Group also believes that those who are promoted to higher positions need to have knowledge of all areas so by participating in a range of trainings they will be better prepared for management positions. Given the large number of prosecutors and the small number of potential promotions, this argument does not justify training numerous AGO personnel that will be constantly rotated to new positions as it is not possible to determine which prosecutors will be promoted and who then should receive which type of training.

In the first year of C4J, there were communication issues with the AGO that slowed down implementation of the project.³⁵ This could be attributed to a lack of communication internally within the AGO as leadership does not appear to be always engaging staff at the lower levels when developing activities for the workplan, common in militarized institutions; some members of the Working Groups were blocking communications; and C4J, at times, has not been communicating the ongoing status of activities to all interested parties within the AGO. For example, a training on public speaking was part of the C4J Year One Workplan and was to take place in the fall of 2011. According to Chemonics, after discussions with the Human Resources Bureau and Pusenkom, this training was rescheduled for February 2012 but eventually cancelled and replaced by a pilot training that just includes modules on public speaking scheduled for July 2012. According to the AGO Public Access to Information Working Group (original target of the training), they were not informed of the reason for the cancellation nor did they have an idea if the activity was going to take place during the remainder of the year. This case highlights where the AGO leadership or other Working Groups are not communicating with each other and Chemonics may not be engaging all levels within the AGO.³⁶

Are C4J activities supportive of the GOI national initiative to expand access to justice?

The Indonesian National Strategy on Access to Justice was developed by UNDP in cooperation with Bappenas as part of the Legal Empowerment and Assistance to Disadvantaged Project (LEAD). According to a fact sheet describing the project, “Access to justice in the Indonesian context refers to a condition and process whereby the State guarantees the fulfillment of citizens’ basic rights afforded by the 1945 Indonesian Constitution as well as the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and guarantees that each citizen (claim holder) is able to acquire the necessary knowledge, understanding, awareness and ability to exercise those rights through formal as well as informal institutions, supported by accessible and responsive public complaints mechanisms, so as to obtain optimal benefits in order to improve their livelihoods. This definition emphasizes that access to justice aims at supporting and strengthening the prevention and alleviation of poverty, the prevention of corruption and the upholding, protecting and fulfilling of human rights through legal empowerment of the people.

The National Strategy on Access to Justice aims to create a framework for policies and regulations that are inclusive of poor and marginalized people and afford them access to justice so that they can utilize their resources to overcome poverty. It covers eight sectors, including: (1) legal and judicial reform; (2) legal aid; (3) local governance; (4) land and natural resources; (5) women; (6) children; (7) labor; and (8) poor and disadvantaged groups.”

Additionally, according to the fact sheet, the relevant policy recommendations for legal and judicial reform include strengthening the reform agenda for justice

³⁵ Interviews with Pak Feri, Chemonics, donors, and Bappenas.

³⁶ It was also the opinion of Bappenas that C4J needs to engage all levels in discussion; not just the leadership.

institutions, including supervisory commissions, to improve professionalism and ethics in the police, public prosecutors and courts. As part of the project, detailed action plans were to be developed by justice sector institutions. However, at the time of this report, no such action plans had been developed for the SC and AGO.³⁷ Thus, the National Initiative has only been included in the Main National Development Targets of the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) of 2010-2014 and is only implicitly included in the development targets such as “that attained atmosphere of justice through enforcement of the rule of law and the maintenance of public law and order.” Although there is a lack of criteria and clear details of the specific access to justice goals in legal and judicial reform, C4J activities are and have contributed to improving access to justice in Indonesia.

Supreme Court

The C4J activities being implemented in cooperation with the SC are supportive of access to justice in Indonesia. For example, the support for a case management system (equipment, software and training) is building transparency and accountability by making information available to the public on current cases and activities of the courts in pilot regions. The automation of the courts is improving the time it takes a case to move through the system thereby providing quicker justice to citizens seeking redress through the courts. C4J also held a workshop on Implementation of Supreme Court’s Practice Direction on the Provision of Legal Aid for 39 courts and is increasing the competency of judges through training that will give the judiciary the necessary tools to adjudicate cases effectively and competently.

Attorney General’s Office

The C4J activities being implemented in cooperation with the AGO are contributing to improving access to justice in Indonesia. C4J is building the capacity of the AGO to better respond to citizen requests for information through the following activities: training for public information managers from district prosecutor offices in 5 provinces on handling public information requests; training heads of district prosecutor offices to socialize/disseminate the Freedom of Information Act and the AGO’s Decree on Public Information Services; producing 1000 copies of a compilation of laws and rules on public information access; training on public information requests to district prosecutors’ offices heads and others; designing curriculum for training staff on website development; and providing basic and advanced technical assistance in journalism for AGO’s website administrators. All of these activities should improve transparency and accountability of the AGO which should lead to greater access to justice for citizens of Indonesia.

³⁷ According to USAID Indonesia, no action plans have been developed, and neither the AGO or SC made mention of such a plan.

What is C4J providing that is integral to the success of its partner GOI institutions' reform agendas and that would not be happening, or would be severely compromised, in the absence of this USAID support?

C4J is providing support that is integral to the reform agendas of the SC and AGO. For example, C4J's assistance and support to the SC is integral to developing a case management system, automating the courts and providing training to those who will be working with the new systems. Without this support, the progress on case management will be severely delayed if not come to a halt for a one to two year period until other donor funding can be located or the SC allocates funding from its own budget. Such a delay would not only hamper the shift from a manual system to an automated system but a gap in funding could create an opening for a competing system that is being implemented in a few courts. A delay also could slow any momentum in changing the culture of the SC to being a more open and transparent body.

Additionally, C4J programing on reforming human resources is a catalyst and is accelerating reforms by providing access to international best practices through experts that the SC cannot afford under its current budget. Also, the assistance to the Access to Information Working Group from the JRT is improving the quality and expanding the reach of the trainings to more SC staff to expedite socialization of reforms. Thus, without C4J support, the reform of human resources would slow and the quality of reforms may suffer without exposure to international best practices.

Finally, C4J's ability to provide international best practices is integral to the success of AGO reforms. To date, C4J has only assisted the Public Access to Information Working Group to conduct trainings in 4 of its 31 prosecutors' offices. The AGO may not be able to find the funding to bring international experts to Indonesia and invite personnel from all remaining 27 offices, especially more remote offices, in the short term as the AGO does not have access to the same level of donor funding as the SC. In the long term, the AGO was not confident if funds would be available from its own budget to ensure quality and depth of trainings for personnel at all 31 prosecutors' offices. Thus, if USAID would discontinue funding under C4J for the AGO, the quality and depth of trainings would suffer thereby slowing the pace of reform. However, the strategy for providing international best practices should take into account the challenges presented by the AGO rotation policy.

Given other current and planned donor assistance to the Supreme Court and AGO, is continued C4J support to these institutions nevertheless critical?

Donor assistance to the SC and AGO is coordinated through Bappenas and ongoing discussions among the various donors such as USAID, WB, EU and AusAid. As a result, there appears to be no current duplication of activities and each donor has carved out its own niche in providing assistance to the GOI. Given this scenario,

USAID support is **currently** critical to the SC and critical in some areas to the AGO.

Supreme Court

C4J is **currently** critical to the SC's effort at reforming the judiciary. C4J is providing integral support as just discussed to develop a case management system, automate the courts and providing training to those who will be working with the new systems. The SC is already operating under its 2012 budget and is in the process of planning for 2013. As a result, the SC would not be able to allocate funding to replace USAID assistance until the 2014 budget. Although the SC will be able to carry out basic activities, such as training, there would not be funding to continue to replicate the C4J CTS in other courts.

Additionally, the ability of donors to step in is limited until late 2013. The WB does not have sufficient funding to step in for USAID and AusAid will not be able to adjust its current programming, which will last for another 4 years. The EU can fill any gap left by USAID beginning in late 2013 as they will start a new 16 million Euro project with the judiciary. The new EU project will work in the following areas that are similar to C4J's objectives: human resources, education and training, case management, and supervision. The EU project will have the flexibility to develop activities after the project has been awarded to the contractor. Given sufficient time to plan, the SC and EU should be able to implement many aspects of the Blueprint without USAID support. If a phased out approach is not utilized, however, there may be a gap in programming for one or two years and reforms may move at a much slower pace.

Attorney General's Office

The WB, AusAid and KOICA are also providing funding to the AGO but support to the AGO from international donors does not match the support to the SC. As a result, the assistance provided by C4J is critical in some areas such as building the capacity of the training center. The status of the training center has now been raised to the level of an agency and is in need of assistance to strengthen management and business processes. If C4J is able to continue support, building the capacity of this institution will be key in building the capacity of the AGO as a whole.

Additionally, C4J support for bringing international experts to provide best practices is critical as well as the support to bring AGO personnel from more remote regions to training events. If such support was not present, the pace of reform would slow even though the AGO has money to continue many of the reform programs on its own. Again, an appropriate strategy to provide international best practices is needed to overcome the challenge of AGO's rotation policy.

Will the sustainability of C4J activities carried out to-date be negatively impacted should the project be terminated or reduced prior to its scheduled May 2014 completion date?

In general, the negative impact on the sustainability of C4J activities, should USAID terminate the project or reduce funding prior to the scheduled end date, will depend on the size and scope of the intervention. The sustainability of activities that require a greater financial investment or technology will be impacted more than activities that build capacity through one-time events.

Supreme Court

Given the GOI as already established its budget for 2012 and is in the process of developing its 2013 budget, programming may cease for up to two years if other funding sources cannot be found to cover an abrupt closeout by USAID. Although the smaller projects, such as creating training modules, appear to be sustainable, the larger activities such as the CTS could be in jeopardy given the investment required by the courts in equipment and its limited understanding of how to implement the CTS across more than 300 General Courts. The SC has does not have a sufficient plan to cover the costs of equipment and ongoing maintenance of the CTS. As a result, the automation of the courts may take several more years without donor assistance or the courts could decide not to implement the CTS. This is a real risk as the previous Chief Justice of the SC did not sign a decree declaring the C4J CTS to be the only system to be adopted by all of the General Courts and there is a competing case tracking system being implemented in a few courts.

Attorney General's Office

The C4J cooperation with the AGO has centered on training AGO staff to obtain quick wins, supporting the training center, and assisting the AGO with restructuring its human resources management system. Given this assistance has not included the introduction of a new software system or equipment for a nationwide roll-out, there should not be a negative effect on the sustainability of the C4J activities should USAID reduce funding or terminate C4J prior to its scheduled end date. The AGO is expected to continue to move forward on reforms regardless of donor assistance. That being said, if the AGO does not have access to USAID funding, the AGO may not have the funds to hire international experts nor bring AGO personnel to trainings from more remote areas of Indonesia. This will decrease the quality and depth of trainings thereby slowing reforms.

Recommendations on continued USAID Indonesia support to the Supreme Court and AGO (changes, additions, omissions).

Given C4J is aligned with the reform agendas of the SC and AGO, the following recommendations are more focused on potential resource allocation and efforts to improve sustainability of activities.

1. It has been only 8 years since the “one-roof” policy has consolidated the general courts, religious courts, military courts and the specialized courts under the management of the SC. As a result, there are still competing interests and many interested parties within the SC on any given reform measure despite the creation of the JRT. Thus, buy-in from all parties is critical to ensure successful program implementation. This is especially true for large scale activities that will be implemented across the country, such as the CTS. So far, C4J has buy-in from the SC on implementing the CTS in more than 300 General Courts. Given there are competing interests and another viable software option to create a case tracking system, the C4J should continue to work with the SC to ensure the Chief Justice issues a decree to all courts adopting the C4J sponsored case tracking system. Without such a decree, the courts have the flexibility to go their own direction creating a risk of multiple case tracking systems being used by the courts.
2. It is common for courts in transitioning nations to struggle with comprehending the necessary investment in personnel and ongoing maintenance associated with supporting a nation-wide case tracking system. Indonesia is no different and C4J needs to continue to work with the SC to determine the appropriate budget requirements for maintaining and supporting the case tracking system beyond the life of C4J. The courts currently are not confident they have budgeted the correct amount of resources to maintain or support the system being developed in cooperation with C4J.
3. As discussed earlier in the evaluation, rotation of staff, especially within the AGO, creates capacity building issues. Those who receive specific training may or may not continue to have the same job responsibilities due to a rotation system. As a result, it is questionable whether C4J is building the capacity of the SC and AGO in some instances. In order to lessen this effect and better utilize project resources, C4J should continue to focus on building training modules and curriculum at the training centers as well as conducting training of trainers to ensure sustainability. C4J should limit one-time training events unless assurances can be provided that the trainee will continue to work in the same role for an acceptable specified time period.
4. C4J should strengthen activities aimed at reforming the transfer systems in the SC and AGO. According to the reform agenda of the AGO, strengthening

the rotation, transfer and promotion system is a component of Phase Two of reform which should provide an opening for C4J.

5. According to the PMP from September 2010, the project is using indicators 1.3 and 2.3 that measure satisfaction by training attendees with a given training. This type of indicator is misleading as it is common for at least 80 % of trainees to express satisfaction with donor-funded training. This indicator has even less meaning in the Indonesian context given the rotation policies of the AGO and SC. Given the problems associated with the rotation policies of partner GOI institutions, this indicator should be removed and replaced or at least supplemented by a new indicator that measures how many of the trainees actually use the knowledge or skill obtained in training over a specified timeframe. This will provide a clearer picture of the capacity building of the GOI partners.
6. C4J support to the courts is currently critical and an abrupt halt to programing would jeopardize work in some areas such as support for the case tracking system. Any reduction in funding or closeout of the project should be done in an orderly manner so that the courts and other donors have sufficient time to plan for the exodus. For example, the courts need a one to two year lead time to insert project activities into their budget and the new EU project will not be operational until late 2013.
7. The AGO is well behind the SC in terms of reform and USAID and AusAid are the only significant donors currently supporting the AGO. Although the AGO is discussing donor support for developing case management systems with the WB and KOICA, if USAID Indonesia needs to make a decision on resource allocation, it is recommended that the Mission explore expanding its cooperation with the AGO, especially given the amount of funding the EU will be providing to the courts in the same program areas as C4J. Such a focus may present ongoing challenges given the AGO's stage of reform and lack of experience working with international donors, but only reforming one of the pillars of justice (courts) will slow overall progress in the justice sector.
8. Although not explicit in the Blueprint, the court would like to move forward with assistance on a gender program. The first level courts have more of a gender balance but women have not been elevated to higher positions within the judiciary.³⁸ C4J should explore this window of opportunity.
9. C4J should ensure that all working levels in the AGO are aware of the status of workplan activities to avoid confusion and mistrust regardless of the cause of any communication issues. C4J should set up regular scheduled meetings with all of its working partners within the AGO to ensure there are no misunderstandings and to further build trust.

³⁸ Request by Pak Paulus during meeting on March 12, 2012

10. C4J should explore options using a texting system of reporting or similar system to the one utilized by the religious courts where there is 100% compliance under an AusAid program. This is especially relevant in the remote areas where electricity is a problem and the lack of Internet will possibly prevent the CTS from being utilized by the courts in those areas.
11. During a meeting with Bappenas, Ibu Dhani expressed interest in being included earlier in the discussions during workplan development. Given Bappenas needs to approve the workplan prior to its execution, C4J should make efforts to include Bappenas earlier in the workplan development process to facilitate faster approval of the workplan.

ANNEX 1: Scope of Work for the Evaluation

C4J MID-TERM EVALUATION OVERVIEW

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The primary objective of the C4J is to improve the performance of Indonesia's justice system, a prerequisite for good governance and sustained economic growth. Assuming the leadership of the Supreme Court and Attorney General's Office (AGO) continue to demonstrate commitment to reform, support will be provided to the Supreme Court and the AGO to assist with their institutional reform and capacity building. The goal of C4J is a justice system that is transparent and predictable, one in which judges, prosecutors and court personnel support the fight against corruption, rather than conduct corrupt practices themselves. C4J focuses specifically on transforming behavior and mindsets from a culture of impunity to a culture of accountability.

The principal results of this project will be:

- More efficient, credible, and transparent functioning of the Supreme Court and Attorney General's Office.
- Increased competence and integrity of judges, prosecutors and staff.

II. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

USAID Indonesia is keen to ensure that its investments in support for justice sector reform are aligned with and responsive to the reform agendas and needs of its GOI partner institutions – the Supreme Court and Office of the Attorney General, as well as the overall reform agenda of the GOI. For purposes of USAID Indonesia's future planning, it will be useful to determine the extent to which these institutions view C4J as integral to their current operations and future plans, as well as how responsive they feel the project's activities have been to institutional needs that they cannot meet on their own. In addition, we want to gauge the quality and appropriateness of our partner GOI institutions' reform agendas.

III. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

8. Are C4J activities aligned with the Supreme Court's December 2010 *Blue Print for Reform 2010-2035*?
9. Are C4J activities supportive of the GOI national initiative to expand access to justice?
10. Are C4J activities supportive of AGO's reform agenda?
11. What is C4J providing that is integral to the success of its partner GOI institutions' reform agendas and that would not be happening, or would be severely compromised, in the absence of this USAID support?
12. Given other current and planned donor assistance to the Supreme Court and AGO, is continued C4J support to these institutions nevertheless critical?
13. Will the sustainability of C4J activities carried out to-date be negatively impacted should the project be terminated or reduced prior to its scheduled May 2014 completion date?

14. Recommendations on continued USAID Indonesia support to the Supreme Court and AGO (changes, additions, omissions).

IV. BRIEFINGS

USAID Indonesia would like both an initial briefing by the Evaluator and a pre-departure briefing for comments and requests prior to final drafting of the evaluation.

V. PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Two weeks prior to travel – delivery of preliminary documents to Evaluator, to include C4J SOW, existing official reform agendas of Supreme Court and AGO, C4J Project work plans and reporting, final proposed list of interviewees with preliminary schedule of interviews.
2. Two weeks of in-country fieldwork – preliminary briefing; interviews with C4J Project staff, representatives of Supreme Court and AGO, other donor and stakeholder representatives; de-briefing.
3. Two weeks following completion of fieldwork – submission of final draft report to USAID Indonesia.

VI. KEY PERSONNEL

Due to the relatively limited scope of the evaluation, and the fact that this is a mid-term evaluation with the purpose of informing current and future USAID/Indonesia rule of law programming, rather than producing a generalized overview of C4J Project effectiveness, the evaluation will be carried out entirely by **RDMA Senior Rule of Law Advisor Garry Ledbetter**.

While not an outside consultant, the evaluator has played no role in the development of the C4J Project or its management. We therefore believe there is not a conflict of interest in USAID conducting this internal evaluation.

The USAID/Indonesia Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and the Chemonics project team will provide support for this assessment, including helping to arrange meetings, hotel, and transportation as well as translation/interpretation assistance. The Evaluator will review key documentation prior to conducting field work (e.g. SOWs, Work Plans, Annual Performance reports, relevant GOI documents, etc.). Field Work will include a site visit to Jakarta where interviews will be conducted with the following persons/institutions: see Annex 2.

VII. DELIVERABLES

The final document will be a 25-30 page evaluation that summarizes findings and outlines recommendations on continued USAID Indonesia support to the Supreme Court and AGO, with proposed changes, additions, and/or omissions. The document will be submitted to the USAID/Indonesia DG Director for review and comment prior to finalization. The first draft of the document will be completed no later than two weeks following the conclusion of field work.

Annex 2

List of Documents for Review

1. C4J Mid-term Evaluation Overview.docx
2. C4J Task Order (signed) (C4J CHEMONICS - DFD-I-02-08-00070-001.pdf)
3. Year 1 Work Plan (C4J Y1 Work Plan Final_English.pdf)
4. Year 1 GANTT Timeline (Copy of Bappenas Matrix 11 29 10.xls)
5. Year 2 Work Plan (C4J Y2 Workplan.pdf)
6. Year 2 GANTT Timeline Supreme Court (Component 1) (C4J Y2 WP Annex A GANTT TIMELINE_Final to Ray.pdf)
7. Year 2 GANTT Timeline AGO (Component 2) (C4J Y2 WP Annex B GANTT TIMELINE_Final to Ray.pdf)
8. Greg Alling describes Task order SOW activity naming and organization to current KRA format (Greg on TO SOW to KRAs.docx)
9. C4J PMP Submitted to USAID Sept 21 2010.pdf (revision of PMP is in process)
10. Comparison of Key Results Areas in Year 1 and 2 Final 18Nov2011 (2).docx
11. Letter_434.pdf
12. Letter_434_English.docx
13. Results Activities Indicators Comparison Oct 14 - NA 181010 (2) tisch (2).pdf
14. Donor Manual SK 143_2010 English Version (fm).pdf
15. CHIEF JUSTICE DECREE OF SUPREME COURT.docx
16. Supreme Court's 25-year reform plan (Judicial Reform Blueprint - English Version.pdf)
17. National Strategy on Access to Justice – LEAD Fact Sheet (UNDP)

| Supreme Court Blue Print 2010-2035 | C4J: May 2010 - May 2014 | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | Year 2 Sub-KRAs | Results through Dec 2011 | FY 2012 - FY 2013 Results in Pipeline |
| Chapter IV, Directives on Reform of Technical Functions and Case Management. Section A. Directives on Reform of Technical Functions. | 1.3.3. Access to Justice | Workshop on Implementation of Supreme Court's Practice Direction on the Provision of Legal Aid [Surat Edaran Mahkamah Agung (SEMA) no.10/2010 with 64 participants, 55 male and 9 female from 39 courts. | National and Regional Workshops on SEMA no.10/2010. |
| Chapter IV, Directives on Reform of Technical Functions and Case Management. Section B. Directives on Case Management Reform. | 1.1.3. Case Management | District court-level course on caseload management with 174 participants, 117 male and 57 female. Court Automation Readiness Survey (CARS) completed with more than 90% response from 807 courts throughout Indonesia. | Case Information Management Summit (CIMS) - - Approximately 70 trained Business process reengineering on case management |
| Chapter V, Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions. Section B. Directives on Reform in Human Resources Management. | 1.1.1. Human Resources | HR Reform Priorities Established | Competency Profiles for Case Management 50 Staff Trained on Competency Profiles SC Acceptance of Competency Profile System Approximately 100 individual assessments |
| Chapter V, Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions. Section C. Directives on Reform of Education and Training System. | 1.2.1. Continuing Judicial Education (CJE) II | 3 CJE II courses developed in Caseload Management, Quality of Judgments, and Ethics: Pilot Training of Trainers Convention on CJE II - Caseload Management with 21 judge participants, 19 male and 2 female. Pilot Training of Trainers Convention on CJE II - Quality of Judgments with 32 judge participants, 22 male and 10 female | Pilot Training of Trainers Convention on CJE II - Ethics with 23 judge participants, 12 male and 11 female CJE II Training: Makassar -- Approximately 100 judges trained, including TOT and roll-out Roll-out to Padang (West Indonesia) and Ciawi (Central Indonesia -- Approximately 200 judges trained |
| | 1.2.2 Fellowship Programs | Master's Degree Program developed and first of three semesters completed with 20 judges enrolled. Technical assistance on US study tour for Supreme Court leaders, 11 judge participants, 8 male and 3 female. | 20 judges receive Master's Degree after first quarter of C4J Y3 |
| | 1.2.3 Additional Courses | Agreement with Supreme Court on developing courses on 1) State Financing in Relation to Anti Corruption Law and 2) Legal Reasoning | Pilot trainings in September 2012; selective training in C4J Y3 |

| Supreme Court Blue Print 2010-2035 | C4J: May 2010 - May 2014 | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| | Year 2 Sub-KRAs | Results through Dec 2011 | FY 2012 - FY 2013 Results in Pipeline |
| | 1.2.4 Non-Judge | | CJE II courses adopted for non-judge staff; selective training in C4J Y3 |
| | 1.2.5 E-Learning | Comparative studies of e-learning procedures begun. | Comparative studies of 5 institutions conducting e-learning in Indonesia presented to Supreme Court Draft outline for e-learning blueprint and roadmap to be agreed upon by end of Y2 and pilot course on Caseflow Management (CJE II) to be implemented in Y3 |
| Chapter V, Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions. Section D. Directives on Budget Management Reform. | 1.1.2. Budget and Finance | 134 budget personnel, 88 male and 46 female, from high courts were trained on in Strategic Budgeting on October 3-9, in partnership with the Ministry of Finance | Support for budgetary independence; additional training and procedural improvements TBD, to support achievement of unqualified audit opinion |
| Chapter V, Directives on Reform of Supporting Functions. Section F. Directives on Information Technology Reform. | 1.1.4 Information Technology | 3 Courts provided with extensive IT Equipment (Palembang, Bandung, Samarinda) 4 Courts provided with Case Tracking System) CTS Version 1 software (Palembang, Bandung, Samarinda, Surabaya) 254 people, 165 male and 89 female, trained in CTS and Equipment | CTS Version 1 in 5 new courts -- Approx 350 trainees 3 Courts Providing Digital Audio Recording (DAR) Equipment and Trainings - Approx 80 trainees CTS Version 2 Developed and Installed (with Training) in 8-12 courts -- Approx 500 trainees -- in Y2/Y3 |
| Chapter VI, Directives on Accountability Reform. Section B. Directives on Reform of Information Transparency System. | 1.3.1. Public Information | 22 judges and non-judge staff, 18 male and 4 female, study tour to Singapore. 3 Public Information Desks (Palembang, Bandung, Samarinda) 22 people, 12 male and 10 female, trained in Transparency & Public Information Access | 2 Public Information Desks (Denpasar, Makassar) Approximately 20 Trained Ongoing technical assistance; improvement of Standard Operating Procedures |
| | 1.3.2. Media Relations | A series of Supreme Court talk shows were conducted on TV One with Supreme Court high officials as resource persons | Development of guidelines for journalists in understanding Indonesian legal system and reporting on court. |

List of Contacts for C4J Mid-Term Evaluation

Updated as of 12 March 2012

| Institution | Day/Date | Time | Place | Contact Person | Name | Position (Bahasa/English) | Other Postions | Address | Email | Mobile Phone | Office / Fax | Related Project topic | Related C4J technical staff | Remark | | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------|--|---|---------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|------|
| C4J | CIMs | Monday, 12Mar'12 | Morning | Aryaduta Hotel Jl. Prapatan 44-48 Jakarta Pusat | Rian: 081288714451/ Yolin: 08119702566 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supreme Court | Courtesy Meeting for Overview of Visit | Tuesday, 13 Mar'12 | 09:00 - 09:50 | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. Phone: (021) 3457661 ext 317 Pak Paulus's Room 2nd fl Blok D | Eriza: 08161655123 (assistant) | 1 | Widayatno Sastrohardjono, S.H., M.Sc (as Head of Development, invited to all Supreme Court groups) | Ketua Muda Pembinaan MARI | RI SC Junior Chief of Advancement | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | tuada_pembinaan@yahoo.com | Eriza: 08161655123 (assistant) | Telp : (021) 3457661 ext 317 /344 6842 | Strategic/overall | | Done |
| | | | | | | 2 | Profesor Dr. Paulus Effendi Lotulung, S.H. (as Head of Reform Team, invited to all Supreme Court groups) | Ketua Muda Urusan Lingkungan Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara MA RI/Koordinator Tim Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI | RI SC Junior Chief of State Administrative Courts/Coordinator of RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team | Coordinator Judicial Reform (Koordinator Reformasi Kehakiman) | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | paulus_el@yahoo.com ; yevnifitri@yahoo.com | Yevni: 081384877264 (Assistant) | Telp : (021) 3810350 ext 333/ 3457569 | Strategic/overall, Human Resources. Access to Justice. | Yudit Yuhana (HR Specialist), Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist) | Done |
| Supreme Court | Human Resources and Budgeting | Tuesday, 13 Mar'12 | 10:15 - 11:15 | Aryaduta Hotel Jl. Prapatan 44-48 Jakarta Pusat | Rian: 081288714451/ Yolin: 08119702566 | 1 | Dr. Aco Nur, S.H., M.H. | Kepala Badan Urusan Administrasi MA RI | RI SC Head of Administrative Affairs Agency | n/a | SUPREME COURT (BUA/Administrative Affairs Agency) Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | bua@mahkamahagung.go.id atau weniw@yahoo.com | Weni: 08129495745 (assistant) | Telp : (021) 3810350 ext 347/ 381 0361 | Human Resource | Yudit Yuhana (HR Specialist) | Done |
| | | | | | | 2 | Aria Suyudi, S.H., LLM | Tim Asistensi Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI (Koordinator) | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team (Coordinator) | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | ariass@gmail.com | 08161917569, | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Strategic/overall, Human Resources; Access to Justice, case management | Yudit (HR Specialist), Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist) | Done |
| | | | | | | 3 | Yudit Yuhana, S.H. | Member | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team | RI SC Assistance Team (also employe of C4J) | | yuhana@chemonics.com | 0811 967 692 | 0811 967 692 | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Yudit Yuhana (HR Specialist) | Done |
| Attorney General's Office | Courtesy Visit | Tuesday, 13 Mar'12 | 12:00 - 13:00 | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. Pak Feri's Room: Main Building 3rd fl | Loli : 0817 776 628 (assistant) | 1 | Feri Wibisono, S.H., M.H., C.N. | Kepala Biro Perencanaan Kejaksaan Agung RI | Head of Planning Bureau AGO RI | Sekretaris Tim Reformasi Birokrasi/ Secretary of Bureaucratic Reform Team | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | loly@kejaksaan.go.id | Loli : 0817 776 628 (assistant), fwibisono@hotmail.com | Telp: (021) 7395324/ 7247613 | Human Resources | Kristina Dewi, Theodora Putri | Done |

| Institution | Day/Date | Time | Place | Contact Person | Name | Position (Bahasa/English) | Other Postions | Address | Email | Mobile Phone | Office / Fax | Related Project topic | Related CAJ technical staff | Remark | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Attorney General's Office | Public Access to Information Group I | Wednesday, 14 Mar'12 | 08:00 - 09:00 | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | 1 | Widoyoko, S.H., M.Hum | Kepala Bagian Penyuluhan Hukum & Penerangan Hukum | Head of Legal Socialization & Information Section | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | n/a | Telp : (021) 723 6510 | AGO Public Access and Engagement | Bahrul Wijaksana (Communications Manager) | Done | | |
| Attorney General's Office | Public Access to Information Group I | Friday, 16 Mar'12 | 14:00 - 15:30 | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | 2 | Chaerudin Sipahutar, S.H. | Kepala Bagian Hubungan Masyarakat dan Media | Head of Section Public and Media Relation | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | n/a | Telp : (021) 723 6510 | AGO Public Access and Engagement | Bahrul Wijaksana (Communications Manager) | Done | | |
| Supreme Court | Education and Training | Wednesday, 14 Mar'12 | 10:00 - 11:00 | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. Phone: (021) 3457661 ext 382 | 08111921277 | 1 | Dr.Mohammad Saleh, S.H., M.H. | Ketua Muda Perdata Khusus MA RI | Deputy Chief Justice for Special Civil Affairs | Ketua Kelompok Kerja Pendidikan dan latihan Tim Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI/ Chairman of Working Group for Education and Training Judicial Reform Team SC-RI | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | n/a | 08111921277 | Tlp : (021) 3811152 ext 382 / 3811152 | CJE II, Fellowship Program. | Dian Cahayani (Training Specialist), Ana Rusmanawaty (Judicial Training Expert) | Done |
| | | | | | | 2 | I.G Agung Sumanatha, S.H., M.H. | Hakim Yustisial/Kepala Pusdiklat Teknis Peradilan Badan Litbang Diklat Hukum dan Peradilan MA RI | Functional Judge/Head of Judiciary Techniques Training Center of RI SC Legal & Judiciary Training Research & Development Agency | n/a | SUPREME COURT (PUSDIKLAT HUKUM & PERADILAN/Legal & Judiciary Training Center). Jl. Cikopo Selatan, Desa Sukamaju, Kec. Mega Mendung Kab. Bogor Jawa Barat | pusdiklatteknis@litbangdiklatkumdil.net | 08128436444 | Telp: (0251) 824 9520/24/48/ (0251) 824 9532 | CJE II | Ana Rusmanawaty (Judicial Training Expert) | Done |
| | | | | | | 4 | Fifiek Mulyana, S.H., LLM | Tim Asistensi Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | fifiek279@yahoo.com | 0811 967 692 | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Human Resources | Yudit Yuhana (HR Specialist) | Not attend |
| Supreme Court | Case Management/ Access to Justice | Wednesday, 14 Mar'12 | 12:00 - 13:00 | Aryaduta Hotel Jl. Prapatan 44-48 Jakarta Pusat | Rian: 081288714451/ Yollin: 08119702566 | 1 | H. Atja Sondjaja, S.H. | Ketua Muda Perdata MA RI / Ketua Kelompok Kerja Manajemen Perkara Tim Pembaruan | RI SC Junior Chief of Civil Cases / Head of Case Management Working Group in the Assistance Team | Chairman of SC WG Case Management, CJE II Curriculum Team Coordinator | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | edypramono@gmail.com , deenov@gmail.com | Dian: 081317281062 (assistant) | Telp : (021) 384 6605 ext. 380 / 384 6605 | CJE II, Case Management, Access to Justice, Information and Technology. | Ariyo Bimo (Court Administration Specialist), Ana Rusmanawaty (Judicial Training Expert), Akhmad Bakhril (IT Expert) | Former schedule: Wed, 14Mar'12 at 10:30 - 12:00 |
| | | | | | | 2 | H. Cicut Sutiarso, S.H., M. Hum | Dirjen Badan Peradilan Umum MA RI | RI SC Directorate General (DG) of General Courts | n/a | SUPREME COURT (BADILUM/General Courts) : RI SC Sekretariat, Jl. Jend. A. Yani kav. 58 By Pass, Cempaka Putih | n/a | Basari: 081387111212 (assistant) | Tlp : (021) 2907 9176/ 2907 9196 | Fellowship Program, Access to Justice. | Dian Cahayani (Training Specialist) | |
| | | | | | | 3 | Aria Suyudi, S.H., LLM | Tim Asistensi Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI (Koordinator) | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team (Coordinator) | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | ariasss@gmail.com | 08161917569, | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Strategic/overall, Human Resources; Access to Justice, case management | Yudit (HR Specialist), Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist) | |
| | | | | | | 4 | Desita Sari, S.H., MKn | Tim Asistensi Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | desita.sari@gmail.com or desitamail@gmail.com | 08128077398 | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Strategic/overall, Human Resources; Access to Justice, case management | Yudit (HR Specialist), Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist) | |

| Institution | Day/Date | Time | Place | Contact Person | Name | Position (Bahasa/English) | Other Postions | Address | Email | Mobile Phone | Office / Fax | Related Project topic | Related CAJ technical staff | Remark | | | |
|---------------|---|----------------------|---------------|---|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------------|---|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Supreme Court | Case Management/ Information Technology | Wednesday, 14 Mar'12 | 13:00 - 14:00 | Aryaduta Hotel Jl. Prapatan 44-48 Jakarta Pusat | Rian: 081288714451/ Yolin: 08119702566 | 1 | Drs. Wahyudin, M.Si | Direktur Pembinaan Administrasi Peradilan Umum Ditjen Badilum | Director of Administrative Advancement of the DG of General Courts | n/a | SUPREME COURT (BADILUM/General Courts) : RI SC Secretariat, Jl. Jend. A. Yani kav. 58 By Pass, Cempaka Putih Timur, Jakarta Pusat 13011 | n/a | Mimin : 081384558020 (assistant) | Tlp : (021) 2907 9176 ext 1521/ 2907 9201 | Case Management, Access to Justice | Ariyo Bimo (Court Administration Specialist), Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist), Akhmad Bakhril (IT Expert) | Former schedule: Wed, 14 Mar'12 at 14:00 - 15:30 |
| | | | | | | 2 | Joko Upoyo Pribadi, S.H. | Kepala Bagian Pemeliharaan Sarana Informatika, Biro Hukum dan Humas, Badan Urusan Administrasi MA RI | Head of Information Facilities Maintenance, RI SC Administrative Affairs Agency | n/a | SUPREME COURT (HUKUM & HUMAS/Legal & Public Relations Bureau) Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | bag_hubla@yahoo.com | n/a | Telp : (021) 3457661 ext 477/ 352 0863 | Case Management, Information and Technology | Akhmad Bakhril (IT Expert), Ariyo Bimo (Court Administration Specialist) | |
| | | | | | | 3 | Haemiwan Fathoni, S.Kom F (Iwan) | Tim Asistensi Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | iwanzf@gmail.com | 0818 164 150 | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Access to Justice, Case Management, Information and Technology | Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist), Akhmad Bakhril (IT Expert) | Confirm |
| Supreme Court | Public Access to Information Group I | Wednesday, 14 Mar'12 | 15:30 - 17:00 | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. Phone: (021) 3457661 ext 325 | Nadia: 08126612746 | 1 | Prof Dr. Takdir Rahmadi, S.H., LL.M | Hakim Agung/Wakil Koordinator Tim Pembaruan MA RI | Justice/Deputy Coordinator of RI SC Reform Team | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | n/a | 08126612746 | Tlp: (021) 384 3348 ext. 325/ 384 6605 | | | Confirm |
| | | | | | | 2 | Nurhadi S.H., M.H | Sekretaris MA RI | Secretary of RI Supreme Court | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. Tlp : 021 - 384 3557/384 3348 | jumadi_asw@yahoo.co.id | Jumadi :08164813604 (assistant) | Telp : (021) 384 3624/ 345 3553 | Public Information | Eric Sasono (Communication Expert) | cannot attend |
| | | | | | | 3 | David MT. Simanjuntak, S.E | Kepala Bagian Hubungan antar Lembaga | Head of Inter-agency Relations Section | n/a | SUPREME COURT (HUKUM & HUMAS/Legal & Public Relations Bureau) Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | bag_hubla@yahoo.com | n/a | Telp: (021) 3457661 ext 599/ 344 6962 | Public Information | Eric Sasono (Communication Expert) | Confirm |
| | | | | | | 4 | Haemiwan Fathoni, S.Kom F (Iwan) | Tim Asistensi Pembaruan Peradilan MA RI | RI SC Judicial Reform Assistance Team | n/a | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | iwanzf@gmail.com | 0818 164 150 | Telp: (021) 3457661 /3459892 | Access to Justice, Case Management, Information and Technology | Dewi Novirianti (Access to Justice Specialist), Akhmad Bakhril (IT Expert) | Confirm |

| Institution | Day/Date | Time | Place | Contact Person | Name | Position (Bahasa/English) | Other Postions | Address | Email | Mobile Phone | Office / Fax | Related Project topic | Related CAJ technical staff | Remark | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|---|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--------------|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| Supreme Court | Public Access to Information Group II | Thursday, 15 Mar'12 | 9:00 - 10:30 | SUPREME COURT : Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. Phone: (021) 3457661 ext 407 | Indah: 081905264886 | 1 | Dr. H. Ridwan Mansyur, S.H., M.H | Lama: KPN Palembang, Baru: Kahumas MA RI | Previous: Chief Judge of Palembang District Court, Current: Head of SC RI Public Relations | n/a | Palembang District Court: Jalan Kapten A Rivai No 16. Palembang | n/a | Indah: 081905264886 | Telp: (021) 3457661 ext 407/ 344 6962 | Eric Sasono (Communication Expert) | Confirm | |
| | | | | | | 2 | Andri T.Sutisna, S.H, M.H | Subbag. Hubungan Organisasi Kemasyarakatan dan Organisasi Profesi | Social and Professional Organizations Relations Sub-Section | n/a | SUPREME COURT (HUKUM & HUMAS/Legal & Public Relations Bureau) Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | bag_hubla@yahoo.com | n/a | Telp: (021) 3457661 / 344 6962 | Public Information | Eric Sasono (Communication Expert) | Confirm |
| | | | | | | 3 | Ifah Arthur Kurniati, AMD | Staf di Bagian Hubungan Antar Lembaga Biro Hukum dan Humas MA RI | Staf at External relations dept. Legal and Public Affairs, Supreme Court of Indonesia | n/a | SUPREME COURT (HUKUM & HUMAS/Legal & Public Relations Bureau) Jl. Medan Merdeka Utara No. 9-13, Jakarta Pusat. | n/a | n/a | Telp: (021) 3457661 / 344 6962 | Public Information | Eric Sasono (Communication Expert) | Confirm |
| Bappenas | Courtesy Meeting | Thursday, 15 Mar'12 | 15:00 - 16:00 | BAPPENAS : Jl. Taman Suropati No. 2, Jakarta Pusat 10310. | | 1 | Diani Sadiawati, S.H., LLM | Direktur Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia, BAPPENAS | Director of Legal and Human Rights, National Development Agency (BAPPENAS) | n/a | BAPPENAS : Jl. Taman Suropati No. 2, Jakarta Pusat 10310. | diani@bappenas. | 0816 182 2614 | Telp : (021) 3193 4723; ext 3201/ 3193 4723 | | Confirm | |
| Attorney General's Office | Public Access to Information Group II | Friday, 16 Mar'12 | 09:00 - 10:00 | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | | 1 | Justinus Soesilo, S.H., M.H. | Direktur IV, General Crime / Direktur IV Tindak Pidana Umum | Team Leader, Public Information Service Training | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | | 08125684825 | Telp : (021) 723 6510 | AGO Public Access and Engagement | Theodora Putri, Bahrul Wijaksana | Confirm |
| | | | | | | 2 | Priharto Budi Santoso, S.H.,M.H. | Anti-Corruption Task Force | Former Staff of Puspenkum, Trainer for Public Information Service | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | | 081539220482 | Telp : (021) 723 6510 | AGO Public Access and Engagement | Theodora Putri, Bahrul Wijaksana | Confirm |
| | | | | | | 3 | Suhendri | Website Coordinator | Public and Media Relation | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | opung16@yahoo.com | 085369239121 | Telp : (021) 723 6510 / 021-7221269 | AGO Public Access and Engagement | Theodora Putri, Bahrul Wijaksana | Confirm |

| Institution | Day/Date | Time | Place | Contact Person | Name | Position (Bahasa/English) | Other Postions | Address | Email | Mobile Phone | Office / Fax | Related Project topic | Related C4J technical staff | Remark | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|--|--------------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|-------|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|---------|
| Donor Coordination Meeting | World Bank | Monday, 19 Mar'12 | 9:00 | C4J Office Plaza UOB 34th floor. Jln MH Thamrin Kav 8-9 Jakarta. Phone: 021 29937334 | | 1 Amien Sunaryadi | Senior Operations Officer, Governance and Anti Corruption – OSU | Senior Operations Officer, Governance and Anti Corruption – OSU- World Bank | n/a | World Bank: Gedung Bursa Efek Jakarta Tower 2 Lt 12. Jln Jend Sudirman kav 32-35. Jakarta | 0811161029 | Telp: (021) 52993000/ 52993111 | | tbc | | |
| | Australia Aid | | 12:00 | | | 2 Emily Rainey | Law and Justice Program | Law and Justice Program | n/a | AUSAID: Jalan HR Rasuna Sahid Kav C 16-16. Jakarta Selatan 12940 | Emily.Rainey@ausaid.gov.au | 0811102846 | Telp: (021) 2550 5573/ 2550 5582 | | tbc | |
| | European Union | | 12:00 | | | 3 Simona Palma | | | n/a | Intiland Tower, 16th floor Jl Jend Sudirman 32 Jakarta 10220 | simona.palma@eas.europa.eu | simona.palma@eas.europa.eu | Tel: + 62 21 2554 6200 | | tbc | |
| | OPDAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | tbc |
| C4J | CIMs | Monday, 19 Mar'12 | 13:00 | C4J Office Plaza UOB 34th floor. Jln MH Thamrin Kav 8-9 Jakarta. Phone: 021 29937334 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| District Courts | Palembang or Bandung District Court | Tuesday, 20 Mar'12 | All day | Palembang | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Attorney General's Office | Human Resources | Wednesday, 21 Mar'12 | 09:00 - 10:30 | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | Ibu Aryani: 0818 825 309 | 1 Dra. Aryani Sihombing | Kepala Bagian Umum | Head of General Affairs | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | 0818 825 309, | Telp: (021) 7395324/ 7243595 | Human Resources | Kristina Dewi, Theodora Putri | Confirm | |
| | | | | | | 2 Danang Suryo, S.H., LLM | Kepala Sub Bagian Jenjang Karir | Head of Career Advancement Sub-Section | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | n/a | 0812-84777-777 | Telp: (021) 7243595 / 7203062 ext.10275/10276 | Human Resources | Kristina Dewi (AGO HR Specialist), Theodora Putri (Prosecutorial Specialist) | Confirm |
| | | | | | | 3 Indro Sugianto, S.H., M.H | Anggota Tim Pembaruan | AGO RI Reform Team | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | indrosugianto@yahoo.com | 0815 943 4228 | Telp: (021) 739 3889/ 723 0899 | Strategic, overall | Theodora Putri (Prosecutorial Specialist) | Confirm |
| Attorney General's Office | Education and Training | Wednesday, 21 Mar'12 | 10:30 - 12:00 | Pusdiklat Kejaksaan Agung: Jln Jl. RM. Harsono No. 94 Pasar Minggu | Nova: 082122207654 (Assistant) | 1 Mahfud Manan, S.H., M.H. | Kepala Badan Pelatihan & Pendidikan | Head of AGO Education and Training Agency | | Pusdiklat Kejaksaan Agung: Jln Jl. RM. Harsono No. 94 Pasar Minggu | n/a | Nova:0821-22207654 (Assistant) | Telp: (021) 780 6861/780 6004 | | Sari Seruni (Training Specialist) | tbc |
| | | | | | | 2 Neva Sari Susanti MH, Mhum | Kepala Sub Bagian Diklat Teknis Fungsional | Head of Functional Technical Education and Training Sub-Section | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | nevarindu@yahoo.com | 08161154570 | Telp: (021) 7395324 FAX: 021-7806004 | AGO Training Center (Badiklat) | Sari Seruni (Training Specialist) | tbc |
| | | | | | | 3 Sukma Violetta, SH. LLM | Ketua Tim Pembaruan | AGO RI Reform Team Coordinator | n/a | AGO : Jl. Sultan Hasanuddin No. 1, Jakarta Selatan 12160. | violettasukma@yahoo.com | 0812 134 6419 | Telp: (021) 739 3889/ 723 0889 Biro Perencanaan: 021-724-7613 | Strategic, overall | Sari Seruni Theodora Putri | tbc |