



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# FINAL REPORT, July 2012

Rule of Law Stabilization Program – Informal Component (RLS-I)

Contract Number: DFD-I-00-04-00170-00

Task Order: DFD-I-05-04-00170



An elder discusses the importance of working together to resolve long-standing disputes at an RLS-I sponsored District Network Meeting in Shahjoy district of Zabul province, May 2012.

14 August 2012

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Checchi and Consulting Company.



# Final Report, July 2012

## Rule of Law Stabilization Program – Informal Component

Contract Number: DFD-I-00-04-00170-00

Task Order: DFD-I-05-04-00170

Submitted 14 August 2012 by:

Michael Sinclair

Chief of Party

USAID/Afghanistan Rule of Law Stabilization Program – Informal Component

4<sup>th</sup> District, Ansari Square

2<sup>nd</sup> Street, House No. 149

Kabul

[msinclair@chechiconsulting.com](mailto:msinclair@chechiconsulting.com)

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



# CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background .....	1
Achievements .....	2
Lessons learned.....	3
Recommendations.....	4
 <b>STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES .....</b>	 <b>6</b>
 <b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	 <b>7</b>
Project components.....	7
Project approach.....	8
 <b>CHALLENGES.....</b>	 <b>10</b>
 <b>ACTIVITIES .....</b>	 <b>11</b>
District assessments.....	11
Network meetings .....	12
Workshops .....	14
Discussion sessions.....	17
Coordination meetings.....	18
Formation of <i>shirka</i> groups .....	20
Establishment of peace committees .....	21
Outreach and communication.....	21
Furnishing <i>jirga</i> halls.....	22
Gender mainstreaming.....	23
 <b>OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS.....</b>	 <b>23</b>
Monitoring and evaluation strategy .....	23
Performance data .....	25
District graduation .....	30
Overview of impact evaluation findings.....	34
 <b>LESSONS LEARNED .....</b>	 <b>37</b>
Lessons learned are derived from participant feedback, RLS-I staff members’ observations, and trends in RLS-I monitoring and evaluation data.....	37
Objectives .....	37
Approach.....	37
Selection of participants .....	37
Sustainability.....	38
Programming and activities.....	38
Research.....	38
Network meetings.....	38



Workshops..... 38  
 Discussion sessions..... 39  
 Coordination..... 40  
 Outreach..... 40  
 Monitoring and evaluation ..... 40

**RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 40**

District selection ..... 40  
 Participant selection..... 41  
 Sustainability..... 42  
 Communications and external relations ..... 42  
 Research ..... 43  
 Programming..... 44  
 Network meetings ..... 44  
 Workshops ..... 44  
 Materials..... 45  
 Methodology ..... 46  
 Trainers ..... 46  
 Discussion sessions ..... 46  
 Coordination meetings..... 47  
*Spinsary* groups..... 48  
 Outreach ..... 48  
 Monitoring and evaluation and reporting..... 49  
 District graduation ..... 49  
 Internal management ..... 49

**ANNEXES ..... 51**

1. Additional performance and other data ..... 51  
 Activity and participant totals ..... 51  
 Program activities by district..... 53  
 2. List of deliverables ..... 65

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Background

Over 30 years of war has left Afghanistan's informal and formal justice institutions weakened and, in the case of formal justice, contracted, limiting access to equitable justice and dispute resolution mechanisms. Nonetheless, traditional dispute resolution (TDR) mechanisms remain the primary venue for the public's dispute resolution needs with TDR actors (*jirga* and *shura* members, other elders, *malikan*, *mullayan*, *ulema*, community council members, *khanan*, etc.) handling most cases either by direct disputant request or by referral from district authorities who often lack the capacity to efficiently process cases and effectively reconcile disputant parties. This state-TDR collaboration, however, is usually minimally structured with limited understanding of and compliance with jurisdiction under Afghan statutory law. TDR reliance on local customary law and misconceptions about that the compliance of customary law with *Shari'ah*, at times results in unjust, un-Islamic, illegal, and, ultimately, unsustainable TDR decisions. The killing or marginalization of respected elders and their replacement with externally imposed practitioners has diminished TDR in the eyes of some disputants, reducing its stature as a dispute resolution forum. Finally, though most elders are regarded as honest and unbiased, corruption and tribal and socio-economic discrimination by some practitioners undermines confidence in TDR. All of these factors diminish equitable justice overall, contributing to the prevalence and prolongation of instability.

In light of these challenges, and building on the experience of RLS-I Phase I (April 2010 to August 2011), during the contract period from September 2011 to July 2012 (Phase 2) RLS-I adopted the primary objectives of (1) strengthening and improving TDR mechanisms, (2) strengthening linkages between the formal and informal justice sectors, and (3) developing approaches to address long-standing intractable disputes. These objectives follow the development hypothesis that efforts at improving and strengthening the TDR system will increase stability in the project districts where stability is indicated by perceptions of increased access to justice, increased confidence in TDR mechanisms, and a decrease in long-standing, intractable disputes.

RLS-I Phase 2 commenced in late September 2011 with a full review of Phase I approaches and activities and concurrent initiation of a robust monitoring and evaluation component consisting of a performance monitoring plan (PMP) and impact evaluation. The program work plan, PMP plan, and impact evaluation plan reflect this planning in line with the Task Order. Work plan development included a core program consisting of a minimum number of each activity type systematized for cumulative effect and implementable within the contract period. Activity content, including workshop materials and agendas for most activity types, were reviewed and improved. This included, for example, establishment of a core curriculum of six legal education workshops, development of essential content or Key Themes, for each workshop type, and revision of network meeting agendas to promote more deliberate, results-oriented, discussions.

## Achievements

A rigorous calendar of activities resulted in successful completion of the core program in all program districts<sup>1</sup>. In total, RLS-I reached 37,583 participants<sup>2</sup>, excluding approximately 1,500 members of 70 peace councils (60 male, 10 female) facilitated by RLS-I in the North, who received conflict management training and on-going legal mentoring. As in Phase I, RLS-I assessed the dispute and dispute resolution context, dispute types and causes, and dispute resolution actors and their relationships to develop an understanding of need from which to frame programming and customize activities. RLS-I completed introductory and follow-on or “capstone” district network meetings for all district groups, as determined by refined program participant selection criteria emphasizing tribal and geographical representation and legitimacy as a TDR practitioner. In total 3,391 men attended 28 district network meetings and 2,549 women attended 26 separate district network meetings.

RLS-I designed and executed regional network meetings on long-standing intractable disputes in the South and East for 303 influential tribal elders and 14 women (South only) from every district of each region, and a regional network meeting in the North for 43 elders from the three target districts in that region. The South and East events resulted in lists of prioritized disputes (16 for the South, 13 for the East) and rosters of volunteer elders (63 for the South, 61 for the East) to collaborate in tackling those disputes. To date, RLS-I program elders have contributed to resolving 11 long-standing intractable disputes, defined as those which are or could become destabilizing.



**Male elders participate in a RLS-I sponsored property law workshop on in Chora district (Uruzgan province), April 2012**

RLS-I completed its full set of newly-defined core curriculum of six educational workshops in every program district, reaching 11,479 male participants in 246 activities and 6,184 women in 137 events. Participants praised the workshops for the knowledge gained and pledged to use the information in their decisions and share it with other elders and villagers. Similarly, every newly-defined state-TDR working group in the South and East completed a minimum of three discussion sessions based on challenges and solutions for a total of 49 events for 1,783 male participants. Results included pledges to cease, for example, *baad*, or the use of girls as compensation in serious criminal cases, as a harmful, un-Islamic and illegal practice often resulting in unsustainable TDR outcomes.

Women-specific discussion sessions totalled 90 for 2,609 participants. The topic, establishment of women's dispute resolution groups, or *spinsary* groups, resulted in the establishment of 25 such groups, which have resolved 486 disputes to date.

<sup>1</sup> This includes some activities conducted in Phase I, which are not reported here. Therefore, total counts in some cases do not appear to fulfill the minimum number of activities to complete the core program.

<sup>2</sup> In many cases, the number of "participants" includes individuals who attended multiple activities.

All state-TDR working groups also completed at least the minimum of two coordination meetings, with most agreeing to collaborate in resolving disputes while respecting jurisdiction, and to use common referral, recording, and registration mechanisms, or decision and authority letters. In total, 1,592 male elders and officials attended 47 coordination meetings. RLS-I distributed 1,450 decision and 1,450 authority books of 50 letters (forms) each. As a result of RLS-I interventions, elders have registered 613 TDR decisions with state justice sector actors.

In the South and East, RLS-I furnished 15 *jirga* halls as neutral venues for male and female TDR practitioners to conduct *jirgee* and for RLS-I and other partners to hold activities.

In the North, RLS-I conducted workshops for approximately 721 men and 984 women and established 60 male and ten female village peace councils of 20-25 members each, who all received conflict management skills training.

RLS-I's outreach component distributed 485,000 printed legal awareness pamphlets and illustrated booklets throughout 164 villages during three campaigns in a single district in each of the three regions. This allowed a population-appropriate distribution in each district while not compromising nearby impact evaluation comparison districts. In addition, RLS-I conducted a more limited outreach campaign in 20 villages in the three targeted districts in the North, distributing 500 copies of printed materials and broadcasting more than 110 hours of radio programming on various topics related to the rule of law, the court system, individual rights, the concept of justice, etc.

Together these achievements resulted in the graduation of 25 of the 27 Phase 1 and 2 districts from core to maintenance activities in accordance with the application of RLS-I's graduation criteria, as discussed below.

## Lessons learned

While the efficacy of the primary objectives, approaches, and activities of RLS-I Phase 2, as detailed in the Work Plan and summarized in this report, was affirmed during Phase 2, RLS-I notes the following lessons learned.

First, the dispute context and dispute resolution systems, particularly within a given region, are roughly 70%-80 similar across districts in the region. Therefore, many of the Phase 2 district assessments repeated much of what had been found in Phase 1 assessments. This duplication consumed time and resources which could have been refocused on program activities.

Second, although RLS-I Phase 2 focused on providing training necessary to help elders improve TDR decisions in relatively specific areas of need – as exemplified by the development of Key Themes and use of Knowledge Questions as teaching tools during Phase 2 – participant



Children receive RLS-I sponsored outreach materials in Puli Khumri district (Baghlan province), February 2012

feedback, staff observations, and initial impact evaluation outcomes indicate that even this volume of information was overwhelming for some of the audience. While RLS-I's use of respected *Shari'ah* and Afghan statutory law scholars and experts has proven central to garnering participant buy-in, these experts may, in some cases, have been unable or unwilling to tailor their presentations to RLS-I's one-day workshop schedule. They instead attempted to convey large amounts of information in one day, which hindered comprehension and retention for many participants.

Other important areas for consideration also stand out. Whether program interventions have achieved critical mass, or the point at which sufficient numbers of beneficiaries have been reached with sufficient programming to prevent reversal of gains (which can only be determined through long-term monitoring and evaluation), in all program districts is yet to be determined. Most beneficiaries queried recommend continuing programming in Phase 1 and 2 districts for current and additional participants. Furthermore, security and accessibility in some areas significantly challenged achievement of critical mass by limiting participation. In addition, the aggressive Phase 2 timeline limited the program's ability to implement improvements and staff capacity building to some degree.

## Recommendations

To address these issues as well as continue building on program successes, RLS-I offers several recommendations aimed at further refining RLS-I Phase 2 approaches and activities as detailed in the Work Plan and summarized below.

First, RLS-I recommends streamlining the district assessment process to identify and report deviations from the common regional patterns identified in 27 district assessments to date. The first step should be drafting regional (North, East, and South) TDR reference documents as syntheses of all previous district assessments in those regions. These cumulative reports would continue to inform the core program and



**A male elder presents the results of break-out group discussions at a coordination meeting in Shinwar district of Nangarhar province, October 2011.**

training curriculum. New district assessments should be streamlined, which may involve reducing the number of male and female interviews and focus groups and revising tools (interview guides) to identify district-specific anomalies, which may require customization of the core program and curriculum. Senior research staff should provide additional training for program field staff on the modifications and a general refresher on research methodology and ethics. The district assessment reports

and action plans could be limited to identifying anomalies and highlighting needed modifications of the core program and curriculum within two to five pages.

RLS-I recommends reviewing and revising workshop training methodologies and materials with assistance from an adult education specialist in collaboration with RLS-I's current university trainers.



Potential changes could include development of simplified illustrated handouts highlighting essential information (Key Themes) to supplement the existing detailed text materials. Other examples include audio-visual lecture aids and handouts. This collaborative review and revision process will ensure the best solutions are captured while winning buy-in from trainers. To facilitate adult learning training methodologies, most workshops should be extended to two or even three days in one or two cases. This will allow for inclusion of participatory learning exercises such as role playing to reinforce lecture content, which would be restricted to no more than about half the workshop period compared to about 80% currently.

Assuming a longer intervention period, other core program components should also be extended and refined. The minimum number of coordination meetings should be increased from two to three or four, with the addition of enforcement or resolving long-standing disputes as themes. Discussion sessions should be increased to a minimum of four topics. A follow-on regional network meeting on long-standing disputes should be added to facilitate follow through on prioritized disputes. The optional Phase 2 national network meeting on comparative TDR methodology should be conducted for members of the volunteer rosters established in the regional network meetings. Periodic maintenance activities should be continued in Phase 2 districts to meet remaining needs and offset local perceptions of abandonment. Similarly, monitoring and evaluation should continue over an extended period in districts graduated from the core program to determine achievement of critical mass and sustainability. If significant needs remain, or impacts are determined to have stagnated or reversed, RLS-I should consider re-engaging, including expanding the number of beneficiaries if necessary. To promote compliance with program selection criteria, RLS-I should implement a participant vetting tool to determine participants' legitimacy as TDR practitioners and their commitment to participation prior to enrolment. Youth apprentice mediators should be considered for participation to promote sustainability and to offset other destabilizing social influences. Additional village-level religious leaders should be invited to counter ingrained local misconceptions of local customary law as compliant with *Shari'ah*. Agenda review and revisions should continue where they were not completed in Phase 2, with a focus on systematizing activities to foster holistic understandings of challenges and collective agreement on and commitment to practical solutions. Finally, the program activity pace should be reduced roughly 20%-30% compared to Phase 2 to ensure quality enhancements in program design and implementation and allow RLS-I to provide additional capacity building for local field staff.

## STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

RLS-I addressed several USG rule of law and stabilization objectives, including USAID/Afghanistan's overarching Assistance Objective (AO) for Democracy and Governance of "Improved performance and accountability of governance" of which the first intermediate result is:

IR 1.1: Increased public confidence in the Rule of Law system

This Intermediate Result comprises five sub-IRs:

- I.1.1: Formal Rule of Law system improved
- I.1.2: Availability of quality legal education expanded
- I.1.3: Citizen awareness of legal rights and legal processes of judicial system increased
- I.1.4: Strengthened traditional dispute resolution and justice in contested areas
- I.1.5: Enhanced implementation of national anti-corruption

RLS-I focused on the sub-IR 1.1.4 while indirectly touching on the others.

Finally, RLS-I addressed the USAID administrator's guidance on Afghanistan, which emphasizes that "USAID's assistance should create incentives for the peaceful resolution of conflict and away from violence and insurgency. In governance, core investments include expanding access to justice and dispute resolution by working with formal and traditional entities at the provincial and district level, and supporting pluralistic and inclusive governance by state and local institutions that

addresses drivers of conflict and sources of instability."

The project's first phase between April 2010 and August 2011, conducted in 15 districts or municipal sub-districts in Nangarhar, Laghman, Kandahar and Zabul provinces, focused on strengthening the TDR mechanism and facilitating linkages between informal and formal justice sector actors. The bulk of RLS-I activities in Phase I comprised male and female network meetings to facilitate elder collaboration on disputes, including long-standing disputes; legal education workshops to raise elders' knowledge in areas of the law relevant to local disputes; and formal-informal justice sector discussion sessions on addressing challenges to both institutions and developing alternatives to harmful practices. Through public outreach, RLS-I Phase I also worked to raise public awareness of and demand for women's and other rights in justice outcomes as well as increase support for women's access to formal and informal justice institutions.



**Male elders participate in an anti-corruption discussion session in Chora district (Uruzgan province), April 2012**

## INTRODUCTION

### Project components

RLS-I Phase 2 built on and refined its complementary networking, education and legal awareness, formal-informal linkage, women's, and outreach activities. As outlined in the RLS-I Work Plan, each activity focused on specific program objectives, but all contributed to each to some degree. Approximately 60% of the effort and resources were dedicated to Objective 1, strengthening and improving TDR mechanisms; 30% to Objective 2, strengthening linkages between the formal and informal justice sectors; and 10% to Objective 3, developing approaches to address long-standing, intractable disputes. RLS-I Phase 2 added 12 new districts, including three in the North.

District-specific approaches continued to be guided by district assessments, the focus and methods of which were further refined. Using Phase I experience, RLS-I created and implemented a set of core legal awareness workshops – criminal, property, deeds, family, inheritance, and Constitutional law. RLS-I updated its legal education materials to promote consistency and accuracy. Discussion sessions were divided into state-TDR discussion sessions intended to address and create solutions to challenges identified in workshops and network meetings and coordination meetings between the same actors on agreeing to procedures and mechanisms for collaboration on disputes. While continuing as forums for networking and sharing of lessons learned, network meetings were divided into district-specific introductory and follow-on, or capstone, sessions and regional network meetings dedicated to purposeful collaboration on long-standing, destabilizing disputes. Several agenda revisions were completed to promote focused discussion and encourage practical activity outcomes. In the North, RLS-I added village peace councils to a variation of its broad-based mass education approach. Parallel women's programming continued with network meetings, a selection of workshops and discussion sessions, and women's dispute resolution, or *spinsary* ("white hair") groups. Public outreach activities, though somewhat scaled down from Phase I, supplemented these interventions in one impact evaluation treatment district in each region. These included illustrated pamphlets on women's access to justice and *baad*.

To initiate Phase 2, RLS-I created a core program comprising its primary components. Specific topics and agendas within those components were flexible, based on district needs as determined by the district assessments and participant requests. The core program consisted of a minimum of all six legal awareness workshops targeted to the entire district group; three discussion sessions and two coordination meetings for the state-TDR working group; two district network meetings and one regional network meeting, two *spinsary* group discussion sessions, and distribution of authority and decision letters.



**Male elders discuss long-standing disputes during a capstone district network meeting in Kandahar city of Kandahar province, June 2012.**



All districts completed their core programs, with some surpassing the minimum number of activities. In any subsequent phase of RLS-I, additional sessions should be held during follow-on or maintenance programming, based on remaining district needs including where security threats reduced attendance. This not only addresses remaining needs but demonstrates a commitment to the district which will build trust in the program in those and potential future districts.

RLS-I increased monitoring and evaluation with a performance monitoring plan (PMP) and robust impact evaluation, described below. This included developing district graduation criteria to determine when a given district has reached desired goals. To achieve all this in a short timeframe and account for varied stages of implementation between Phase 1 and Phase 2 districts, RLS-I developed district-specific work plans to complete the newly developed core program within each district. This step also promoted rational sequencing to ensure complementarity among project components and cumulative impact.

## Project approach

Recognizing the positive attributes and centrality of traditional dispute resolution institutions in promoting stability, RLS-I adapted a “do no harm” approach to its interventions. As a result, the project facilitated the furtherance of existing practices (e.g., elder networking and state-TDR collaboration on disputes) while addressing TDR shortcomings (harmful, rights-violating and potentially destabilizing practices such as *baad* and property rights infringements) through provision of resonant information (*Shari’ah*) as a “low-input, high-impact” beneficiary self-correction tool in achieving improved TDR processes and outcomes. This added value to the otherwise effective indigenous institution, rather than attempting to fundamentally change it. These activities aimed to increase the legality, fairness, and durability of TDR outcomes and bolster the effectiveness of and trust in TDR practitioners while preserving TDR’s positive reconciliatory approach. To determine which activities would most accurately and appropriately address gaps in beneficiaries’ understanding of the guiding norms of *Shari’ah* and Afghan statutory law, RLS-I assessed the dispute and justice context of each new district.

Recognizing the need for a grass-roots initiative for both program effectiveness and sustainability, RLS-I continued an Afghan-led, Afghan-owned, and Afghan-sustained approach to its programming. In the interest of promoting beneficiary receptivity and sustainability, the project encouraged its Afghan staff to take a lead in guiding its development and implementation. All events were conducted exclusively by Afghan staff. Furthermore, the project used expert Afghan law and *Shari’ah* faculty and justice officials (“Afghan means”) explaining *Shari’ah* and Afghan statutory law (“Afghan messages”) as bridging mechanisms to acceptable TDR practice. RLS-I’s local partners – Coalition for Peace and Unity (CPAU), its implementing partner for the North, and the Organization for Sustainable Development (OSDR) and Eureka Research, its partners for impact evaluation data collection – furthered the project’s “Afghanization”.

This Afghan-owned approach contributed directly to another RLS-I priority, sustainability, which promotes self-initiative over incentives such as salaries or payment for participation. RLS-I minimized the creation of dependent institutions by, for example, facilitating meetings of women’s dispute resolution groups only as a catalyst for ongoing dispute resolution activities by their members. RLS-I’s elected



peace councils in the North received no financial compensation, which promotes self-sustained continuation after completion of RLS-I support. Similarly, material assistance in furnishing *jirga* halls was designed as a one-time, cost-effective symbolic boost to community elders while winning their commitment to provide equitable ethnic, tribal, and women's access to the venues. RLS-I provided commodities at minimal or no continuing costs. RLS-I also held initial discussions on possible vehicles for maintaining ongoing access to legal education for elders including a continuing education model managed by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) in collaboration with university law and political science and *Shari'ah* faculties. Perhaps most important, the skills, knowledge, and contacts acquired during RLS-I's interventions will continue adding value (e.g., improved legality) to the existing TDR institutions long after that intervention has ended.

Gender equity in access to and outcomes of TDR was a project priority considered in all activities. RLS-I therefore conducted a parallel women's program of education, networking, discussion sessions, and support to women as justice providers. Furthermore, as indicated in the program descriptions, gender equity in justice processes was a central component of many male program activities, including women's rights under *Shari'ah* and Afghan statutory law, and women's access to justice. Depending on local context and actors, RLS-I was careful to broach the often-sensitive issue of women's roles in TDR in a locally acceptable manner, which proved effective in winning support from elders and officials for engaging with women. Where cultural and security restrictions hindered women's ability to participate, RLS-I developed and implemented a village-based training program conducted by female RLS-I staff trained in program content by RLS-I's university instructors.

In close consultation with USAID and relevant Afghan and international stakeholders, RLS-I selected 12 new Phase 2 program districts: four in the East, five in the South, and three in the North. Opposition from the Kandahar provincial governor, however, prevented program implementation in Maywand district (Kandahar province). In consultation with Platform East, RLS-I replaced it with Puli Alam in Logar province. The 27 program districts during Phase 2 were as follows (red = new; black = carryover from Phase I):

RLS-I districts					
South		East		North	
Province	District	Province	District	Province	District
<b>Uruzgan</b>	Chora	<b>Nangarhar</b>	Dara-I-Nur	<b>Baghlan</b>	Dahana-I-Ghuri
	Dihrawud		Jalalabad municipality, nahiya 4 and 5		Puli Khumri
	Tirin Kot		Bati Kot	<b>Faryab</b>	Pashtun Kot
<b>Kandahar</b>	Arghandab		Bihsud		
	Daman		Kama		
	Dand		Kuz Kunar		
	Kandahar municipality,		Rodat		

RLS-I districts					
South		East		North	
	sub-district 9				
	Spin Boldak		Shinwar		
			Surkh Rod		
<b>Zabul</b>	<b>Shahjoy</b>	<b>Laghman</b>	<b>Mihtarlam</b>		
	Qalat		Qarghayi		
	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	<b>Kunar</b>	<b>Nurgal</b>		
		<b>Logar</b>	<b>Puli Alam</b>		

Following RLS-I's participant selection criteria and to promote community confidence in and ownership of the project, RLS-I invited geographically, ethnically, and tribally representative groups of the most respected TDR practitioners from each village or cluster. Deliberate attention was given to identifying genuinely respected elders versus those perceived as externally imposed. Participants, including *malikan*, village *mullayan* and *Ulema*, were selected through initial contacts with district officials and *shura* members and confirmed through RLS-I's own research. RLS-I invited these large district groups (80 to 120 members) to an introductory district network meeting and encouraged its members to attend its complete set of legal education workshops and follow-on district network meeting. A representative sub-set of the most active district group members (approximately 25 to 40) was invited to form a state-TDR working group with district officials and formal justice sector actors to participate in issues-based discussion sessions and coordination meetings to facilitate mutual substantive and jurisdictional legal understandings, thus promoting value-added collaboration in dispute resolution. This working group shared the outcomes of these activities with the larger district group in the follow-up, or capstone, district network meeting. RLS-I also invited the most influential elders from all districts (both those engaged in the RLS-I program as well as those that were not) of the South and East regions to regional network meetings on long-standing, intractable disputes; only elders from participating RLS-I program districts were invited to the North regional network meeting.

## CHALLENGES

Several challenges affected programming during Phase 2. Security in several districts of the South hindered participation. In Shahjoy district (Zabul province), for example, Taliban threats against elders traveling to the district government center suppressed attendance. Similarly, elders from remote areas of districts faced security and logistical challenges in moving to events in district centers. To varying degrees, this hindered RLS-I's achievement of its objective of geographical representation and of district graduation targets. Taliban threats also hindered RLS-I's ability to involve female participants in its activities, as any organization seen as violating local cultural prohibitions on women's movements outside the home could face increased threats. Opposition by certain provincial officials hindered the project's ability to expand to Maywand, the proposed new district for Kandahar province. The same opposition forced RLS-I to conduct its South regional network meeting in Kabul rather than in Kandahar municipality. Similarly, while generally very supportive of the project and state-TDR collaboration, a few

district officials engaged only to a limited extent in linkage activities. In the North, natural phenomena, especially flooding, posed the most significant challenge to RLS-I's activities by restricting movement of program staff and participants. Finally, the ambitious timeline established to complete the core project mandated a rigorous schedule of activities. Implementation of this schedule hindered RLS-I's ability to maintain ideal sequencing of activities at all times. Most significantly, completion of final drafts of district assessments was delayed. RLS-I was, however, able to incorporate initial findings during its analysis of district data in several district action and work plans in a time-effective manner. Also due to the tight timeline, RLS-I reduced the priority and postponed the previously planned conflict management skills workshop in the East and South. Varying degrees of literacy of the participants made balancing materials with approach challenging – many participants were unable to understand and retain all workshop topics within a mostly lecture format.

## ACTIVITIES

### District assessments

To ensure the relevance of program content and means by developing an awareness of the local justice context, RLS-I conducted assessments of the traditional justice system and its relationship with the formal justice sector in new Phase 2 program districts. Prior to commencing field research, RLS-I reviewed and refined its respondent selection criteria and interview guides to ensure geographical and tribal representativeness and data quality. Senior Kabul staff then conducted refresher qualitative research training for the field teams. The field research included two male and two female focus groups and 25 individual interviews of a representative sample of male and female elders and district justice officials, including (where present) the *Huqooq*, district governor, judge, prosecutor, and IDLG justice subcommittee representative. Disputes were described by type and root causes. Perceptions of formal and informal justice and the relationship between the two were described. TDR principles, processes, and practices were described and analyzed to determine strengths and weaknesses which impact disputant satisfaction with and adherence to TDR outcomes. Women's roles as dispute resolvers were examined to determine how women can or do positively influence dispute prevention, de-escalation, and resolution. In addition, gender and socio-economic equity were considered in terms of access and outcomes. The roles of third parties, including the Taliban, in dispute resolution and justice issues was examined to determine whether and why district citizens choose third-party justice. RLS-I senior staff reviewed, analyzed, and reported the qualitative data. From these findings, RLS-I adjusted its core program (described below) to



**Influential male elders from Helmand, Kandahar, Uruzgan, and Zabul provinces participate in the South Regional Network Meeting in Kabul municipality, June 2012**

address the most pressing TDR knowledge, practical, and government-linkage needs in each district. RLS-I completed one assessment and action plan for each of the 12 new Phase 2 districts.

## Network meetings

RLS-I continued men’s and women’s network meetings to provide a forum to introduce the project, facilitate a discussion of local challenges to achieving a just and equitable TDR mechanism and ways elders may collaborate to resolve those challenges, to share lessons learned and best practices in TDR, and to promote collaboration between tribally diverse elders on long-standing disputes. As part of its program restructuring and refinement, RLS-I designated the first district network meeting as the introductory event for the district target group. The second district network meeting served as the final capstone event for the district group members to reconvene to reflect on what they had learned throughout the core project, whether and how they had applied those lessons, and future steps. Elders and officials from the state-TDR working group shared with the full district group measures, such as alternatives to *baad* and agreements on jurisdiction, they had developed during discussion sessions and coordination meetings. Members of the state-TDR working group also facilitated breakout groups on each program component. In total, RLS-I held 28 district network meetings for 3,391 men and 26 meetings for 2,549 women. In the North, approximately 287 men participated in three male district network meetings and 358 women participated in three women's meetings. RLS-I's district network meetings in the North coincided with state-TDR coordination meetings.

“RLS-I is the only program,” explained Abdul Baqqi, who participated in the follow-up network meeting in Puli Alam district (Logar province) “which gathers elders, scholars, religious leaders, government representatives and other influential people to jointly find solutions to problems in our community. The workshops and discussion groups are very informative. We share everything we have learned at the [follow-up district] network meetings with other elders of different villages.”

RLS-I sponsored a follow-up **network meeting** for male elders of Dand district (Kandahar province) on 16 June 2012. After discussing lessons learned and actions taken through participation in RLS-I, the 75 participants pledged to 1) register TDR decisions with the government, 2) prepare deeds for properties in their communities, 3) work together to strengthen linkages and increase communication between the formal and informal justice sectors, 4) prohibit giving girls in *baad*, and 5) share information gained through RLS-I sponsored activities with their communities. Participants also asserted their commitment to resolving long-standing disputes, and establishing a district-level volunteer committee of 11 influential elders willing to lend support in difficult TDR cases in other communities. “The meeting was so successful,” explained one elder, “because all Dand district tribal elders were present ... so fundamental issues could be negotiated.”

A newly-added regional network meeting served as the primary activity under Objective 3 for addressing long-standing, intractable disputes. The effort built on participant initiative demonstrated in the conflict resolution commissions (CRC) established in Phase I, but in



**Women attend a legal awareness workshop on criminal law in Kandahar municipality, October 2011**



accordance with USAID guidance, limited RLS-I involvement to facilitating networking on long-standing disputes as opposed to sponsoring *jjirgee* or CRCs on specific disputes. In preparation for the regional meetings, in consultation with district and provincial officials and through its own research, RLS-I invited several of the most influential tribal elders from each district (program and non-program) in the South and East regions; for the North regional network meeting only elders from RLS-I targeted districts were invited to attend. Event agendas involved group analysis of the challenge of long-standing disputes and their destabilizing impacts, and identification and prioritization by destabilizing impact of specific long-standing disputes. Participants then explored and documented ways to tackle such disputes, including establishment of volunteer rosters to assist one other in any area of their region. One hundred fifty-four elders participated in the East regional meeting, identifying 13 priority disputes for action. Sixty-one prominent elders volunteered for the East regional roster. One hundred thirty-five men and 20 women participated in the South regional meeting, prioritizing 16 disputes. Sixty-three elders volunteered for the South region TDR roster. Forty-three male elders participated in the North regional network meeting. The South and East regional network meetings took place too late in the project period to allow RLS-I to monitor how many of these disputes the volunteer elders resolved. However, RLS-I participants have contributed to resolving 11 other long-standing disputes. RLS-I's intensive training of peace council members in the North in conflict management skills will increase the likelihood of successful resolution of challenging disputes generally.

## Workshops

To mitigate unsustainable violations of Afghan statutory law and *Shari'ah* in TDR outcomes, which tend to exacerbate or prolong conflicts, RLS-I Phase 2 continued its legal awareness workshops for male and female elders and state justice actors in Phase 1 districts while expanding its training to Phase 2 districts. Based on its Phase 1 experience, RLS-I developed a core curriculum comprising criminal law, family law, property law, deeds, inheritance law, and Constitutional law. A lower priority conflict management skills workshop was cancelled in the South and East due to time constraints. As an existing and integrated part of its core program, however, RLS-I implemented conflict management skills training in the North. As indicated above, RLS-I highlighted women's rights and socio-economic equity throughout the legal awareness workshops. RLS-I continued its work with respected university professors and other qualified formal justice sector actors - including a full review and revision of all core workshop materials - to ensure compliance with Afghan statutory law and *Shari'ah* while addressing targeted areas of need. Due to the influence *Shari'ah* and its scholars hold in most sectors of Afghan society, subject matter was framed from the perspective of *Shari'ah* and Afghan statutory law by university scholars to resonate with elders unfamiliar with the requirements of Afghan statutory law and sometimes unfamiliar even with *Shari'ah*. This step also helped dispel the common misconception that the local customary law is fully consistent with *Shari'ah* while demonstrating the consistency of Afghan statutory law with *Shari'ah*. As always, RLS-I encouraged participants to share workshop material with other elders and their fellow villagers generally.

In the North, RLS-I consolidated the workshops into groups called "broad-based education" events conducted over several consecutive days. These were often combined with discussion sessions.

From RLS-I's cumulative awareness of the most common dispute resolution needs and to better focus program content on these needs, RLS-I developed "Key Themes" for each of its core workshops. These were discussed with and agreed to by program instructors and used in materials revisions. In addition, RLS-I shared Knowledge Questions from the impact evaluation elder baseline survey to be used as teaching tools, if desired.

RLS-I hosted an **inheritance law workshop** for 50 women in Jalalabad municipality (Nangarhar province) on 23 November 2012. Participants explored various aspects of inheritance law under *Islamic* and Afghan statutory law relevant to common disputes. "These workshops," explained participant Bas Noora, "are the most beneficial and informative trainings I have ever attended." Concluding the meeting, the participants pledged to share what they had learned with other women in their communities. During follow-up RLS-I monitoring and evaluation data collection, another participant, Gul Andam, described how she had used the knowledge gained during the training to resolve a dispute in her community: "My cousin had a dispute with her brother. Their parents had died and my cousin's brother said that she had no right to any inheritance. However, I had attended the RLS-I legal awareness training so I went to her and explained her rights. She took this information to the local elders and the dispute was resolved legally."

### RLS-I core curriculum



Workshop topic	Key themes
Constitutional law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Jurisdiction</li><li>• Role of government</li><li>• Citizen rights and responsibilities</li><li>• Equal protection</li><li>• Relationship between Afghan statutory law, <i>Shari'ah</i>, and human rights norms</li></ul>
Criminal law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Jurisdiction</li><li>• Types of crime</li><li>• Detention</li><li>• Sentencing</li><li>• Rights of the accused</li><li>• Role of defense lawyers</li><li>• Traffic law</li><li>• Accidental killing</li><li>• Common disputes involving crimes</li><li>• Resolving disputes involving crimes</li></ul>
Family law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Marriage engagement rights</li><li>• Dowry</li><li>• Marriage expenses</li><li>• Rights of the husband and wife in marriage</li><li>• Divorce</li><li>• Forbidden relationships</li><li>• Common family-related disputes</li></ul>
Property law, property deeds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Property rights</li><li>• Types of property</li><li>• Leasehold and freehold</li><li>• Pre-emption, right of first refusal</li><li>• Seizure</li><li>• Access rights</li><li>• Types of deeds</li><li>• Validity of deeds</li><li>• Common property and property deed disputes</li></ul>

RLS-I core curriculum	
Workshop topic	Key themes
Inheritance law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inheritance rules under Afghan statutory law and <i>Shari'ah</i></li> <li>• Division and shares of property</li> <li>• Women's and men's rights to inheritance</li> <li>• Common inheritance disputes</li> </ul>

In the South and East, RLS-I completed the entire core curriculum for all Phase 2 districts in 246 workshops for 11,479 male participants and 137 workshops for 6,184 women. In the North, RLS-I grouped workshop topics and discussion sessions into multi-day activities, holding nine multi-day workshop and discussion sessions for 721 male participants and nine multi-day events for 984 female participants. Participants praised RLS-I workshops for the *Shari'ah* and statutory law information they provided. After one women's inheritance law workshop, a participant said "We had only heard about inheritance before but did not have enough knowledge. We were thinking that if our brothers do not give our portions of inheritance, we cannot claim it. But we realized today that Almighty Allah has given rights to us women in inheritance so we should ask for them."

One *malik* from Shinwar district (Nangarhar province) said of his family law workshop, "A few months ago there was a family-related dispute referred to us. Someone had divorced his wife three times but he was denying [it]. His wife insisted that her husband had [divorced her] and that she was not ready to marry him again. We were confused about resolving this kind of dispute but, fortunately, we were invited by RLS-I to a family law workshop. In the workshop we learned that if someone repeats "divorce" to his wife three times, he cannot marry that woman again .... When we came back from the workshop, we conducted a *jirga* and decided that the man cannot marry this woman again; the woman has the right to marry anyone she wants except this man. The woman was happy and satisfied with our decision, but the man and his family did not agree .... They went to Jalalabad and presented their petition to Family Court. Our decision was confirmed by the Court. This was a big change in dispute resolution, which was brought by RLS-I."

## Discussion sessions

To address weaknesses in TDR highlighted by legal awareness workshops and challenges faced by TDR and state justice sector actors in dispute resolution, RLS-I facilitated issues-based discussion sessions in each district. The sessions provided members of the state-TDR working group an opportunity to develop strategies for reducing and developing alternatives to harmful, illegal or un-Islamic, and unsustainable TDR practices such as *baad* and the corruptible and potentially biasing enforcement mechanism of disputant deposits, or *machalgha*. Similarly, other discussion sessions allowed participants an opportunity to address challenges faced by both the TDR and formal justice sectors, including the biasing influence of powerbrokers on justice processes and corruption in both systems. While flexible depending on need, the topics available for discussion sessions included alternatives to *baad*, dispute prevention for children and neighbors, anti-corruption, women's participation in and access to justice, addressing the influence of powerbrokers, addressing long-standing disputes, establishment of *spinsary* groups, promoting *spinsary* sustainability, and (in the North only) alternative dispute resolution. As part of the RLS-I core program, discussion sessions in each district covered at least three of these topics, chosen according to district needs and participants' requests.

RLS-I hosted an anti-corruption **discussion session** in Puli Alam district (Logar province) on 12 June 2012 for 40 influential male community members. Participants included elders and district government representatives involved in dispute resolution. Participants discussed methods of preventing corruption in formal and informal justice mechanisms. Daud Mailma, a tribal elder, asserted "We have to wipe out corruption among ourselves, before we ask others to eliminate these bad practices .... Our problem is that we talk but take no action." Judge Zargai responded that "... it seems that there is dire need of cooperation between the elders and the government officials to end corruption.... We need to join hands." As the discussion session concluded, participants agreed that "We will form a group of ten tribal elders to prevent corruption, and we will no longer use [disputant] deposits" which are designed to ensure disputant compliance with *jirga* decisions but are susceptible to misuse by TDR practitioners.

In most districts, elders and officials agreed on measures to address challenges on most issues and create viable alternatives to harmful practices.

A common example was creating alternatives to *baad*, including financial or material compensation in serious cases. One example involved program participants convincing their non-program peers to use alternatives to *baad*. In another, program elders in Shahjoy district (Zabul province) boycotted a *jirga* when they were unable to convince their colleagues to do the same. In most cases, elders and officials pledged to forgo corrupt practices, and, in a few, agreed to mutual accountability.

In sum, in the East and the South RLS-I conducted 49 discussion sessions for 1,783 male participants and 90 discussion sessions for 2,609 women.

In the North, RLS-I conducted two male and two female discussion sessions in each of the three target districts for a total of 12 discussion sessions for approximately 478 male and 639 female participants. The first discussion session in the North combined alternative dispute resolution, the influence of wealthy and powerful actors on TDR processes, and corruption. The second discussion session



addressed women's access to justice, women as justice sector actors, and how to avoid the use of harmful practices such as *baad*.

One female participant from the East explained the impact of a discussion session on prevention of disputes among neighbors. “Indeed it was one of the most important programs of RLS-I. We became aware of neighbors’ rights and learned how to treat our neighbors. Before attending this program I was very aggressive if someone fought me – I was also fighting her. But now I learned that we should be humble and kind to our neighbors. And I am sure that all the women are thinking about the change they want to bring in themselves. I request your office to arrange this kind of program in every district – it would be very good.”

## Coordination meetings

Coordination meetings of the state-TDR working group were designed to promote greater understanding of and agreement on state justice sector and TDR roles and responsibilities in jointly resolving disputes – a common practice in most districts. The initial meeting provided an opportunity to allow elders and state and formal justice sector officials to discuss the issues and to clarify the roles of each under the law, in line with the jurisdictional boundaries outlined in criminal and Constitutional law workshops. In most cases, elders and officials agreed and pledged that criminal cases involving *haq-ullah*<sup>3</sup> that could require punitive action should be referred to the formal justice sector. Recognizing the strengths of TDR and their own need for assistance in reconciling a large number of disputants, most state justice sector actors agreed to continue referring civil cases to TDR. The second coordination meeting confirmed initial agreements reached in the first and introduced decision letters as mechanisms for recording and registering TDR decisions with the state justice sector. The use of standard authority letters, under which disputants grant elders authority to resolve their disputes, including disputes that state justice sector actors have referred to elders was also introduced in the second coordination meeting. RLS-I monitoring staff have confirmed that this formalized documentation enhances mutual confidence in collaboration, thereby increasing the likelihood of ongoing voluntary referrals, support and the legality and legitimacy of TDR outcomes, resulting in more durable solutions to disputes.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Haq-ullah* is a *Shari’ah* concept that refers to the rights of society; i.e., issues that have the potential to disrupt the peace within the community and for which it is the duty of the state to issue and implement legislation. This is distinguished from *haq-ul abd*, a concept of *Shari’ah* similar to the notion of civil law and that refers to the rights of person; i.e., those rights that private individuals hold vis-à-vis each other and that can be forfeited by the individual. The Liaison Office, *Linkages between State and Non-State Justice Systems in Eastern Afghanistan – Evidence from Jalalabad, Nangarhar and Ahmad Aba, Paktia* (2009), p. 2.

On 9 February 2012, 35 tribal elders and government representatives attended an RLS-I sponsored **coordination meeting** in Dand district (Kandahar province) where participants discussed the importance of and roles in informal-formal justice sector collaboration in resolving disputes. During a follow-up coordination meeting on 12 May the groups got down to specifics in strengthening informal-formal justice sector linkages. Haji Mohammad Ayoub, a respected religious leader, said that “the gap that exists between tribal elders and government authorities should be mitigated ...” and assured other participants that in his community TDR “... decisions are registered with the government so no one can ignore them.” Anwar Khan, the district director of the *Huqooq* (MoJ), praised the elders for their ability “to resolve disputes perfectly”. In conclusion, the elders agreed to refer all criminal cases to the government and to register TDR decisions. Participants also expressed their commitment to eradicating corruption in both systems.

RLS-I expects that over time the normative and practical collaboration initiated as a result of the coordination meetings will benefit both the formal and informal justice systems, thereby improving justice overall. Informal sector decisions will gain legitimacy with state review for legality (where the requisite capacity exists), endorsement, and, potentially, enforcement. Formal sector justice will benefit from TDR assistance with an overwhelming caseload and unsustainable prison population, and by increased public legitimacy from working with and endorsing the popular TDR mechanism. For example, joint state-informal justice sector action in some criminal cases facilitates the state's responsibility to enforce the law while addressing cases beyond elders' ability to manage. At the same time, elders address underlying hostilities and formulate alternative reconciliatory solutions, which the state is frequently unable to deliver. Structured collaboration on disputes also allows state

justice sector actors to determine which types of TDR decisions (i.e., civil vs. criminal) the government will endorse, thereby encouraging TDR practitioners to refer criminal cases to the formal justice system prior to playing any role in their resolution.

In the South and East, RLS-I held at least two coordination meetings in each program district for a total of 47 meetings involving 1,592 state and TDR participants. In the North, RLS-I held one male and one female coordination meeting, concurrent with network meetings in each district, for 287 men and 358 women. RLS-I distributed 1,450 decision and 1,450 authority books of 50 letters (forms) each. TDR actors in RLS-I program districts have registered 613 decisions with state justice sector actors using these and other forms.

Of coordination meetings in his district, one elder from the East said, "The best thing was that we sat with the state actors and rooted out all our misconceptions and misunderstandings .... This was a very useful meeting." Ahmad, a tribal elder from Puli Alam district (Logar province) said that government representatives in a coordination meeting in his district “... were very constructive, which makes me think that there are still honest and patriotic people working in the administration



**Male elders and government representatives explore ways of strengthening formal-informal linkages during a coordination meeting in Daman district (Kandahar province), May 2012**

On 9 January 2012, 39 women in Daman district (Kandahar province) discussed the aims and benefits of women's dispute resolution (*spinsary*) groups, receiving the idea positively. One of the participants, Bibi Gullah, said that "... women are not granted permission to participate in dispute resolution. But with this support we believe that women will also have access to dispute resolution and [we] will be able to defend other women, too." On 14 January RLS-I hosted a follow-up meeting for 32 women who elected 10 women *spinsary* to resolve primarily women's and children's disputes in their community. Many of the participants expressed their commitment to peaceful dispute resolution. Pacha Gullah, a midwife elected to the *spinsary* group, asserted that "... we are influential women. We can leave our homes, so we should go to other women and accept responsibility for resolving their disputes." Tamamah added that "... we must make fair decisions ..." and Niabo said that "I will work as hard as I can, but if the *spinsary* cannot resolve the dispute, we will refer the issue to the [male] elders."

who understand the people's problems." The elders in that meeting invited officials to participate in TDR to ensure legal principles are upheld.

## Formation of *spinsary* groups

To promote women's access to and involvement in TDR, RLS-I continued to support women's network meeting participants in forming village-level women's dispute resolution, or *spinsary*, groups to tackle community and family-oriented conflicts. Defusing these disputes is often vital in de-escalating potentially violent conflicts, resulting in more stable communities. To build the women's dispute resolution skills, offset potential sensitivities to working with women, and encourage male support for women's roles in TDR, RLS-I in some cases invited expert male mediators to train the women in basic dispute resolution methodologies and the principles and practices of the *jirga* system. In the East, RLS-I also

initiated a third *spinsary* group discussion session on promoting the sustainability of *spinsary* groups.

In total, RLS-I facilitated the formation of 25 *spinsary* groups of approximately 15-25 women each, which went on to resolve 486 disputes to date.

In the North, RLS-I facilitated the election of members of 10 women's peace committees applying the same principles and providing the same training described in the section below on the establishment of male peace committees.

Participants praised the *spinsary* group effort, describing new confidence in collaborating with other women to resolve and de-escalate disputes proactively, before they become more serious and contributing to resolving larger women-related disputes. Several participants noted that communicating with a diverse set of women helped them to recognize and correct their roles as contributors to conflict.

"In the past," explained one *spinsary* group member from the East, "we didn't know how to resolve disputes. We just saw the fight or conflict and enjoyed it. But now, through such women's discussion sessions, we learned a lot and I am sure that every one of us feels responsible and we are able to resolve women-related problems." "This program" explained another "gave me such courage, prestige and personality. Before I was thinking that we women are nothing but housewives and should stay inside. Today I learned that we have bigger responsibilities, the same as our men, and can do more for

dispute prevention than our men .... We should take care of our family, children and neighbors. In case they quarrel and fight over something, we have to intervene. It is our direct responsibility to resolve and prevent it from escalating and converting to a big conflict. It was a good opportunity for us to share our ideas and learn methods for preventing a small dispute from turning into a major dispute."

## Establishment of peace committees

In the North, RLS-I conducted its stand-alone program component – to establish 60 peace committees in 20 target villages in each of the three program districts. RLS-I was also able to establish 10 women's peace committees, for a total of 70. Within these villages, mobilization took place with the selection of prominent members of the communities. These individuals then elected 20-25 members to their peace committee. The elected individuals underwent a five-day training session on peace building, mediation, negotiation, and conflict resolution, with a total of approximately 1,500 individuals trained. Following establishment of the peace committees, ongoing support and follow-up training were conducted by RLS-I justice support workers. This included assistance and guidance in what legal frameworks should be used in resolving disputes, and assistance in informal-formal justice sector linkage activities. The follow-up training also included subjects such as how the formal and informal justice systems are organized and function, women's rights, and leadership and grievance resolution.

## Outreach and communication

In order to help shape the local context to facilitate changes in elders' decisions away from reliance on customary law and toward Afghan statutory law and Shari'ah, and to create public demand for improved dispute resolution systems, RLS-I conducted outreach campaigns involving distribution of printed material in five districts: one each in the South and the East, and three in the North.

RLS-I reached significant numbers of citizens with the wide distribution of 469,800 pamphlets and illustrated booklets in three districts (one in each of the East, South, and North regions) and the distribution of an additional 500 copies of printed materials to mosques in 20 villages in the three targeted districts in the North.

RLS-I distributed three different illustrated booklets as well as eight types of pamphlets. These were broadly distributed to reach a target of approximately one unit of outreach material for every five residents in each target district. The illustrated booklets, aimed at a largely illiterate audience, covered alternatives to *baad*, women's participation in dispute resolution by a *jirga*, and children and forced marriage. The pamphlets distributed in all three regions covered final decisions of the courts, the rights of an accused upon arrest, the right to a defense lawyer, and women's rights to equal treatment under the law. The pamphlets distributed only in the North covered the rights



School children in Puli Khumri district (Baghlan province) receive RLS-I sponsored outreach materials, February 2012

of the individual, the structure of the court system and the law in Afghanistan, an introduction to peace councils and their position in relation to the formal justice system, sources of law, the concept of justice, and the importance of law in resolving conflicts.

RLS-I implemented three waves of outreach campaigns in three districts. In the first campaign, in the first wave, RLS-I distributed 44,100 copies of illustrated booklets and an equal number of pamphlets in 63 villages of Nurgal district (Kunar province); 56,700 comic books and the same number of pamphlets in 81 villages in Chora district (Uruzgan province); and 14,000 illustrated booklets and 14,000 pamphlets in 20 villages in Puli Khumri district (Baghlan province). In the subsequent two waves, RLS-I distributed only illustrated booklets, in the same numbers the first campaign. In addition, RLS-I distributed 10,600 copies of the illustrated booklets and pamphlets to provincial and district government departments, PRTs, and other interested parties. The 500 additional copies of printed materials distributed to mosques in 20 villages in the North were intended to serve as a common resource for the local population.

In addition, RLS-I prepared and facilitated the broadcast of more than 110 hours of radio programming covering the three target districts in the North on the topics of the rights of the individual, the court system and the law in Afghanistan, an introduction to peace councils and their place in the justice system, the concept of justice, and the importance of law in resolving conflicts.

## **Furnishing *jirga* halls**

In addition to state-TDR strategy and discussion sessions on reducing biasing and corrupting influences on and practices of TDR actors detailed above, RLS-I assisted communities in establishing a symbolic number of neutral facilities in which to hold *jirgee*. RLS-I supported the one-time provision of inexpensive facility refurbishments and basic commodities for *jirga* halls as necessary in select locations. RLS-I refurbished a total of 15 *jirga* halls in the East and South.

The halls help to reduce potential bias arising from a disputant hosting a *jirga*. In some cases, RLS-I used the refurbished *jirga* halls as venues for its activities. The halls provide a neutral setting for deliberation on disputes and diminish incentives elders may have for requesting disputant provision of accommodation and meals. The halls also provide a symbolic boost to respected local elders in the eyes of the community. In addition, a prerequisite for the one-time provision is a Memorandum of Understanding between community elders and RLS-I that ensures adequate access to the *jirga* hall by women's *spinsary* groups to provide them with a neutral forum and imbue *spinsary* group members with added stature in the community. In addition to serving as venues for program activities (in some locations), the halls provide ideal locations for state-TDR working group meetings, which will remain available at little to no cost for continued



**Elders use the *jirga* hall refurbished by RLS-I in Dara-I-Nur district (Nangarhar province), June 2012**



meetings after program completion.

Of the effort, one district governor in the East said, "RLS-I has done unique work in furnishing *jirga* halls .... Now elders can conduct *jirgee* in a neutral place, where they don't have to convene the *jirga* in a well-to-do disputant's house, which has always undermined the quality of the decision ...." An elder explained that "We will conduct our *jirgee* in this place in all seasons because it is the neutral place." Another thanked RLS-I for the hall as improving women's access to justice. The halls provide *spinsary* groups "a place where they can comfortably discuss their immediate issues," he said.

## Gender mainstreaming

As indicated in the technical approach section, above, women's activities were integrated throughout the project, paralleling the men's network, workshop, and discussion session agenda to the greatest extent possible. Women's rights under Afghan statutory law, *Shari'ah*, and, in some cases, international law were discussed in legal awareness workshops for both men and women. RLS-I also invited select influential women to men's events to offer input on issues such as women's access to TDR and alternatives to *baad*.

RLS-I hired a senior-level gender advisor to develop several short-term initiatives to complement program activities as well as a long-term strategy for addressing discrimination against women. The gender advisor explored how gender inequality affects rural and urban Afghan women by conducting interviews with women who participated in RLS-I activities and met with representatives of national and international organizations engaged in promoting women's rights in Afghanistan. After the mapping stage was complete, several RLS-I programs were developed to promote women's rights including discussion sessions on abuse in marriage and women's rights in the family. The RLS-I gender advisor also designed a gender work plan that outlined a strategy for implementing activities aimed specifically at women.

## OUTCOMES AND IMPACTS

### Monitoring and evaluation strategy

RLS-I Phase 2 activities included a discrete package of activities and inputs designed to bring about knowledge, attitudinal, and behavioral changes among a representative cross-section of informal justice providers in each target district. RLS-I's monitoring and evaluation strategy focused in large part on measuring changes effected by these inputs.

Each program input had a dedicated data capture tool, with data typically captured initially in Excel and then migrated to an Access database for storage and later analysis. Proper application, storage, analysis, and reporting of program input data allowed for the reporting of management and process metrics such as the typical level of input that generates a given outcome-level result (for example, *spinsary* group meetings and spontaneous formation of women's groups supporting dispute resolution in their communities; or the persistence of dialogue and its relation to the resolution of long-standing disputes).



		Data collection tool								
		Decision book distribution tracker	Spinsary group rosters	Longstanding disputes tracker	Event reports	Workshop evaluation	Key informant interview	Disputant assessment	Perception study	Database
<b>Program Objective 1: Strengthened TDR systems</b>										
1.1	# of districts graduating from RLS-I	x	x	x	x	x		x		
1.2	# of public advocacy campaigns on human rights supported by USG									
<b>Program Objective 1: Strengthened TDR systems</b>										
1.3	# of spinsary groups established		x							
1.4	# of disputes resolved by spinsary groups		x							
1.5	# of peace councils established				x					
<b>Program Objective 2: Strengthened linkages between formal and informal sectors</b>										
2.1	# of resolutions registered with district institution	x								
<b>Program Objective 3: Develop approaches that successfully resolve long-term disputes</b>										
3.1	# of long-standing and intractable disputes identified			x			x			
3.2	# of long-standing and intractable disputes resolved			x			x			
<b>District graduation</b>										
4.1	Full spectrum of training implemented									x
4.2	Written protocols with formal sector established				x					
4.3	Consistent recording of decisions on recording forms	x								
4.4	Consistent registering of recorded decisions by district court or <i>Huqooq</i>	x								
4.5	Demonstrated collaboration between formal and informal	x			x					
4.6	Benchmarks of disputant perceptions met in 80% of disputant cases					x		x		
<b>District graduation</b>										
4.7	Demonstrated involvement of women in TDR processes		x		x	x				
4.8	Attempts to find alternatives to <i>baad</i> in resolution of cases					x	x	x	x	

		Data collection tool								
		Decision book distribution tracker	Spinsary group rosters	Longstanding disputes tracker	Event reports	Workshop evaluation	Key informant interview	Disputant assessment	Perception study	Database
4.9	Lack of evidence of use of <i>baad</i> as a resolution of cases					x	x	x	x	
4.10	Lack of evidence of woman rights violations in resolution of cases					x	x	x	x	
4.11	Lack of evidence of human rights violations in resolution of cases					x	x	x	x	
4.12	Reduced propensity to resort to violence in resolving disputes					x		x		
<b>Impact evaluation</b>										
5.1	Improved knowledge/ attitudes of program participants, citizens						x		x	
5.2	Improved adjudication of disputes						x	x		
5.3	Improved disputant perception of process and outcome							x	x	

Additional data collection tools developed later in Phase 2 include the *spinsary* group interview and formal-informal justice linkages assessments, both adapted from impact evaluation tools.

## Performance data

The following table presents program goals, objectives, and approved performance indicators under the Performance Management Plan for RLS-I Phase 2. Each indicator had a quarterly performance target and an overall life-of-project target. Narrative explanations of any variances between planned and actual performance follow in the next section.

<b>SO:</b>	Improved performance and accountability of governance									
<b>IR I:</b>	Increased public confidence in the rule of law system									
<b>Sub-IR:</b>	1.14 Strengthened traditional dispute resolution and justice in contested areas									
		Unit	Oct – Dec 2011		Jan – Mar 2012		Apr – Jun 2012		Life of project	
			Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
<b>Program objective 1: Strengthened TDR systems</b>										
<b>1.1</b>	No. of districts graduating from RLS-I	#	0	0	2	0	2	13	4	13
<b>1.2</b>	No. of public advocacy campaigns on human rights supported by USG	#	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3
<b>1.3</b>	No. of women’s dispute resolution ( <i>spinsary</i> ) groups established	#	10	0	10	13	5	12	25	25
<b>1.4</b>	No. of disputes resolved by <i>spinsary</i> groups	#	130	67 <sup>4</sup>	230	210	330	209	690	486
<b>1.5</b>	No. of peace councils established	#	20	0	40	60	0	0	60	70
<b>Program Objective 2: Strengthened linkages between formal and informal sectors</b>										
<b>2.1</b>	No. of TDR resolutions registered with district institution	#	150	299	240	133	277	181	677	613
<b>Program Objective 3: Develop approaches that successfully resolve long-term intractable disputes</b>										
<b>3.1</b>	No. of long-standing and intractable disputes identified and taken before TDR actors for resolution	#	2	0	4	14 <sup>5</sup>	4	9	10	23
<b>3.2</b>	No. of long-standing and intractable disputes resolved in RLS-I intervention districts by TDR	#	1	0	1	4 <sup>6</sup>	2	7	4	11

The following describes achievement of RLS-I target over the life of the project (20 September 2011 – 15 July 2012) and an analysis of any variance between each target and actual achievement.

### Program Objective I – Strengthen/improve TDR mechanisms

*Indicator 1.1:* Number of districts graduating from RLS-I

<sup>4</sup> This was reported as 15 in the Oct-Dec quarterly performance report, but is updated here to reflect additional data that came in after the Oct-Dec reporting period.

<sup>5, 6</sup> The RLS-I Q2/FY12 performance management report listed 27 and 20 long-standing disputes identified and resolved by RLS-I actors, respectively. The Q2/FY12 figures in this final report are revised to reflect additional review of the data according to the indicator definitions.



Life of Project Target: 4  
Life of Project Actual: 13

**Variance:** Exceeded target. State-TDR coordination meetings and the distribution of decision books and authority letters has accomplished the desired linkages between formal and informal dispute resolution, and has been backed up by rigorous sampling of elders to determine whether they are in fact documenting and registering disputes. The impact evaluation baseline and endline data, complemented with data from the *spinsary* group interview, provides an imperfect window on women’s role in *jirga* and harmful practices, knowledge, and attitudes, which is complemented by expert assessment and other data sources. Progress of the district cohorts (district participant groups) through the five core curriculum workshops is not as consistent as desired across all districts, due largely to security constraints. Where workshop attendance targets have been achieved, formal-informal linkages established, and no evidence of any increase in harmful practices exists, the district can be said to have graduated from RLS-I core programming.

**Indicator 1.2:** Number of public advocacy campaigns on human rights supported by USG  
Life of Project Target: 3  
Life of Project Actual: 3

**Variance:** None. Outreach in five districts began in February and completed in June, for a total of three outreach campaigns in three districts (one in each of the East, South, and North regions) on women’s access to *jirgee*, women and children, and forced marriage, as well as a more limited outreach campaign in 20 villages in the three targeted districts in the North. Impact evaluation data suggests a 6% gain in citizen knowledge of Afghan statutory law as a direct result of receiving RLS-I outreach materials.



Indicator 1.3: Number of *spinsary* groups established  
Life of Project Target: 25  
Life of Project Actual: 25

Variance: Met target.

Indicator 1.4: Number of disputes resolved by *spinsary* groups  
Life of Project Target: 690  
Life of Project Actual: 486

Variance: Below target. RLS-I does not consider the gap in data to reflect any real deficit in the programmatic effect of *spinsary* groups. Rather, there are two constraints affecting RLS-I's ability to report disputes resolved. The first is a simple staffing issue of how often and to what extent *spinsary* groups are queried for examples of disputes they resolve. The second is the nature of disputes that *spinsary* groups resolve, which are typically within-family disputes, and quite often may be characterized as the de-escalation of minor disturbances so that they do not become larger disputes within families, between families, or village-wide. Thus, when RLS-I staff query *spinsary* groups for disputes they help resolve, the response is invariably "very many". However, RLS-I staff have difficulty documenting minor disturbances that are "de-escalated", and *spinsary* group members themselves are often not able to enunciate specific disputes resolved or disturbances de-escalated. A final consideration is that the initial targets formed at the beginning of RLS-I Phase 2 were based on Phase 1 performance, which in some cases was generated according to more flexible definitions and would therefore cause inflated targets for Phase 2 based on Phase 1 performance data. Under RLS-I Phase 2, self-reported number of disputes resolved is not accepted – only disputes that are documented with a minimum of detail and narrative are accepted. As a result, RLS-I did not meet its life of project target for documenting disputes that *spinsary* groups resolved, but remains confident in the positive benefits that *spinsary* groups bring, namely in the area of providing a forum for female disputants to both resolve and de-escalate disputes that occur within and between families. It has been further observed that *spinsary* groups seem to be more active in the East region than in South. For example, in the final quarter, 92 disputes were resolved in the South region (13 Uruzgan, 13 Zabul, 46 Kandahar) while 137 disputes were resolved by *spinsary* groups in the East region (Nangarhar, Laghman, Kunar).

Indicator 1.5: Number of peace councils established  
Life of Project Target: 60  
Life of Project Actual: 70



**Variance:** Exceeded target. RLS-I established 60 male peace councils in the North (one in each of 20 villages in each of the three RLS-I target districts in the North), and also established 10 female peace committees.

### **Program Objective 2 – Strengthened linkages between formal and informal sectors**

**Indicator 2.1:** Number of decisions registered with district institution

**Life of Project Target:** 677

**Life of Project Actual:** 613

**Variance:** Slightly below target for life of project. The primary reason for lower reported totals during the reporting period is the gradual dissolution of district *shuragan* funded by the ASOP program. RLS-I staff report that the elders who were once members of these bodies still meet and are active, but that there has been a definite drop-off in activity compared to when the ASOP *shura* program was still being funded, and that the drop-off is continuing. The bulk of *jirga* decisions had previously been registered or stored with district *shuras*, but this is no longer happening to the same extent. Other factors include insecurity in remote villages, high illiteracy rates among *jirga* members and factors related to the design of the book itself (users report that its large size reportedly discourages transport between villages and that written impressions sometimes fail to form on duplicate and triplicate forms).

### **Program Objective 3 – Develop approaches addressing long-term intractable disputes**

**Indicator 3.1:** Number of longstanding and intractable disputes identified and taken before TDR actors for resolution

**Life of Project Target:** 10

**Life of Project Actual:** 23

**Variance:** Exceeded target for life of project. However, the figure reported is more a reflection of disputes whose depth and scope are district-wide and are addressed by district-wide actors such as PRTs and well-known tribal figures, and less a reflection of direct RLS-I identification of such disputes through its programming. On the other hand, RLS-I plays a supporting role in identifying such disputes and contributes to their resolution through the participation of well-known TDR and formal judicial sector actors in RLS-I workshops and other events.

**Indicator 3.2:** Number of longstanding and intractable disputes resolved in intervention districts by TDR actors

**Life of Project Target:** 4

**Life of Project Actual:** 11

**Variance:** Exceeded target. However, as mentioned above, the reported figure is not directly attributable to RLS-I facilitation efforts although RLS-I played a contributory role. Of 23 long-standing disputes identified in RLS-I program districts over the life of project, 17 were eventually resolved, in some cases after years of attempts. Of the 17 long-standing disputes resolved in RLS-I program districts, 11 (65%) were resolved with some involvement by RLS-I program participants. There is anecdotal reporting from RLS-I participants that they felt emboldened to renew attempts at resolution and took steps of their own accord to do so. RLS-I expects that additional long-standing disputes identified by regional network meeting participants late in Phase 2 will be resolved with time and continued effort.

## District graduation

RLS-I Phase 2 conceptualized district graduation criteria along two dimensions. The first set of criteria emphasized program outputs: for example, has a critical mass of program participants passed through the full curriculum of RLS-I training? Have village-level informal dispute resolution processes been linked with available district formal justice sector actors (*Huqooq*, courts, district governor, etc.)? Are elders participating in networking meetings to collaborate on legacy disputes and share experiences?

The second set of criteria focused on evidence of program impact or outcomes, in the form of changes in adjudication and associated reduction in harmful practices. Here, the key measures were reduction in harmful practices and other rights violations, reduced influence of local power dynamics that may subvert the integrity of the TDR system, and progress towards perceptual benchmarks on measures such as the proper relation between the formal and informal justice sectors and the desirability of certain standards of adjudication and outcomes produced by the informal justice sector. RLS-I Phase 2 graduation criteria are summarized as follows:

Criterion	Threshold
Benchmarks of disputant perceptions met in 80% of disputant cases	To be determined by impact evaluation baseline data
Demonstrated involvement of women in TDR processes	Minimum one instance per district
Lack of evidence of use of <i>baad</i> as a resolution of cases	Reduction in frequencies of reported <i>baad</i>
Lack of evidence of woman rights violations in resolution of cases	Reduced incidence of found violations
Lack of evidence of human rights violations in resolution of cases	Reduced incidence of found violations
Reduced propensity to resort to violence in resolving disputes	Reduction in number of cases that are the result of previously unresolved disputes



As of the end of RLS-I Phase 2, the status of RLS-I Phase 1 and Phase 2 district graduation, based on program outputs, is as follows:

### Program objective I – Strengthen/improve TDR mechanisms

- Criterion:** Full spectrum of RLS-I core curriculum delivered to district cohorts
- Threshold:** Minimum four elders each in six villages per district
- Status:** Cohorts in 14 of 27 (48%) districts exceed a total of 24 elders attending all five core curriculum workshops<sup>7</sup>. Cohorts in 16 of 27 (59%) districts passed through four out of five core curriculum workshops. It should be noted that the data for all Phase 1 districts are underestimates, given that program data for Phase 1 is unable to accurately track the progress of dedicated cohorts through the core curriculum. It must also be considered that graduation criteria under Phase 1 was based on a mass outreach implementation model; Phase 1 districts are evaluated according to that model, while Phase 2 districts are evaluated against the size of the cohort passing through the core curriculum.
- Criterion:** Attempts to find alternatives to *baad* in resolution of cases
- Threshold:** Qualitative judgment from RLS-I based on pre-assessment, ongoing monitoring, and post-assessment
- Status:** Preliminary anecdotal data from discussion group sessions and district assessments show no evidence of any increase in the practice of *baad* or intent to apply such practice within program communities. Anecdotal evidence, including more structured interviews with *spinsary* group members, suggest both that (a) *baad* remains a feature of dispute resolution in Afghan communities, and (b) the incidence of *baad* may be on a slow downward trajectory as alternatives are suggested by respected elders and social pressure is occasionally brought to bear against the practice.
- Criterion:** Increased participation of women in informal justice, such as *jirga* members, witnesses, and disputants
- Threshold:** Qualitative judgment from RLS-I based on pre-assessment, ongoing monitoring, and post-assessment
- Status:** Preliminary anecdotal data from discussion group sessions and district assessments highlight the elusive nature of this objective. Impact evaluation data suggests no change, but are also not considered fully valid measurements. The primary input for women's participation in and access to justice are *spinsary* groups, which are formed in all districts with varying levels of involvement.

---

<sup>7</sup> The data for Arghandab show 22 participants passed through the core curriculum, but given the margin of error for Phase 1 data Arghandab is designated as having passed through the requisite number of participants.

## **Program Objective 2 – Strengthened linkages between formal and informal sectors**

- Criterion:** Written protocols with formal sector established
- Threshold:** Minimum two main villages per district
- Status:** Written protocols do not exist between communities and district government. Though there are varying degrees of collaboration and support between village *jirgee* and district bodies, written protocols such as a memorandum of understanding or even an exchange of letters remains a more sensitive topic due to the unsettled jurisdictional boundaries between the formal and informal justice systems. However, the two TDR-State coordination meetings that take place in each district are considered to establish a practical working relationship even in the absence of any written protocol. In all but a few cases, the state coordination meetings result in verbal agreements to cooperate that implemented in practice.
- Criterion:** Consistent recording of TDR decisions on RLS-I decision books; registration of decisions with district government
- Threshold:** Minimum two main villages per district
- Status:** The most recent sample of the RLS-I decision books distribution establishes that elders from eleven program districts, or 41% of all Phase 1 and Phase 2 districts, document their disputes in RLS-I decision books, while elders from six program districts, or 22% of all Phase 1 and Phase 2 districts, register their disputes. This is in addition to the general protocols for documentation and registration established in all program districts. Also note that not all districts could be sampled to document whether decisions were recorded and/or registered. In districts where there was no sampling, program staff report that the agreements on jurisdiction, referral, documentation, and registration are still in place and functioning.

### **Initial determinations of district graduation**

RLS-I's current conceptualization of graduation follows a two-tier approach in which elders first pass through the core program of network meetings, learning workshops, discussion groups, and state coordination meetings, followed by a period of maintenance programming. After a review of quantitative, qualitative, and anecdotal data supplemented by expert assessments, and allowing for a range of quality among available data sources, RLS-I's initial assessment is that 25 of 27 Phase 1 and Phase 2 districts are considered to have graduated from the core program, and are ready to assume maintenance programming. The districts of Pashtun Kot (Faryab province) and Dahana-I-Ghuri (Baghlan province) in the North region will require further programming before they can be considered to have graduated from the core program.

Data alone are insufficient to determine whether a district has graduated. Rather, graduation is a mix of quantitative and qualitative assessments along with evaluations based on the expert knowledge of RLS-I

local staff members and stakeholders such as PRTs and on-site monitors. Based on experience with both Phase 1 and Phase 2 districts, however, RLS-I now believes that passage by a specified cohort of local elders through the core curriculum and establishment of linkages between the formal and informal justice sectors in the district are enough to that a given district has made substantial progress in achieving RLS-I program objectives, but also that continued low-level programming will still be needed to fill known gaps, consolidate gains, and support the diffusion of the core program among other elders in the district.

The following table shows each Phase 1 and Phase 2 district's graduation status and indicates the general level of maintenance programming needed for each district:

Region	Province	District	RLS-I Phase	Graduated from core program	Maintenance programming needs
East	Kunar	Nurgal	2	Yes	Minimal
East	Laghman	Mihtarlam	2	Yes	Minimal
East	Laghman	Qarghayi	1	Yes	Moderate
East	Logar	Puli Alam	2	Yes	Moderate
East	Nangarhar	Bati Kot	1	Yes	Moderate to high
East	Nangarhar	Bihsud	1	Yes	Minimal
East	Nangarhar	Dara-I-Nur	2	Yes	Moderate
East	Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2	Yes	Moderate to high
East	Nangarhar	Kama	1	Yes	Moderate to high
East	Nangarhar	Kuz Kunar	1	Yes	Moderate to high
East	Nangarhar	Rodat	1	Yes	Moderate to high
East	Nangarhar	Shinwar	1	Yes	Moderate to high
East	Nangarhar	Surkh Rod	1	Yes	Minimal
South	Kandahar	Arghandab	1	Yes	Minimal
South	Kandahar	Daman	1	Yes	Minimal
South	Kandahar	Dand	1	Yes	Minimal

Region	Province	District	RLS-I Phase	Graduated from core program	Maintenance programming needs
South	Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	1	Yes	Moderate
South	Kandahar	Spin Boldak	1	Yes	Moderate
South	Uruzgan	Chora	2	Yes	Minimal
South	Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2	Yes	Minimal
South	Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2	Yes	Minimal
South	Zabul	Qalat district center	1	Yes	Minimal
South	Zabul	Shahjoy	2	Yes	Moderate
South	Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	1	Yes	Moderate
North	Baghlan	Dahana-I-Ghuri	2	No	Moderate
North	Baghlan	Puli Khumri	2	Yes	Moderate
North	Faryab	Pashtun Kot	2	No	Moderate

## Overview of impact evaluation findings

While RLS-I Phase 1 was considered a pilot project consisting of both research and program activities, RLS-I Phase 2 included the development of a strong program M&E system as well as validating the development hypothesis that knowledge- and skills-building of informal justice providers improves citizen access to justice. The development of the RLS-I M&E system took place in the context of current Agency-wide attention to measuring, reporting, and learning from USAID programming. For example, USAID’s evaluation policy, instituted in January 2011, calls for an impact evaluation of at least one large program per operating unit, as well as for any activity involving untested hypotheses that are being considered for potential scale-up. The USAID evaluation policy defines impact evaluations as models of cause and effect requiring a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change. While not formally applying this policy, the RLS-I impact evaluation reflects its intent.

In terms of learning for development effectiveness, some of the insights provided to date include evidence of a dynamic interaction between formal and informal dispute resolution practices, with the

level of state justice services affecting the practice of informal justice, and also how disputant perception tends to shift according to socio-economic status and distance from a district center.

The RLS-I impact evaluation system tested the overall development hypothesis – that skills- and knowledge-building of informal justice providers improved citizen access to justice – through a village and district panel design in which a cross-section of elders, disputants, and citizens were surveyed at program inception (baseline, or time one) and again at conclusion (endline, or time two). Impact was then defined as the difference in mean scores on various measures from time one to time two.

In terms of validating the development hypothesis, major considerations that must be taken into account in any estimate of treatment effect is that, due to the vagaries of RLS-I baseline and endline data collection, the two sets of data over time are not considered comparable. Furthermore, as discussed in the RLS-I Phase 2 impact evaluation plan, statistically significant findings of social or cultural change were not expected within the very short RLS-I Phase 2 intervention timeframe. Subject to those important caveats, the impact evaluation summary findings according to each of four development hypotheses are as follows:

*Hypothesis 1:* The intervention will result in TDR decisions that better reflect and are based in Afghan statutory law, *Shari'ah*, and human rights norms

*Finding:* Hypothesis 1 was primarily measured by knowledge gain among program participants or citizens exposed to RLS-I outreach. Knowledge was organized according to the topics of Afghan statutory law, and family law, inheritance law, and property law provisions of *Shari'ah*. Given that RLS-I Phase 2 baseline and endline data are not considered comparable, no statistically significant changes in knowledge among program participants were observed, while citizen exposure to RLS-I outreach materials was associated with a 6% gain in knowledge of Afghan law ( $p=0.010$ ).

*Hypothesis 2:* The intervention will result in TDR decisions and *shura* and *jirga* members being perceived as more impartial

*Finding:* Hypothesis 2 was measured by four sets of attitudinal items by disputants as to the process of resolution and outcome of their dispute. Disputants linked to adjudicating elders from RLS-I districts were compared to adjudicating elders who were not in RLS-I treatment districts, both at baseline and endline. A statistically significant decrease was found in three of four measures, suggesting a negative treatment effect. However, the conclusion is that these measures are flawed due to the incomparability of baseline and endline data.

*Hypothesis 3:* The intervention will result in a decrease in the number of TDR decisions that negatively impact women and children

*Finding:* Quantitative data collection showed no change, though such measures are not considered to be fully valid. Qualitative data collection suggests that harmful practices

are still prevalent in most communities, but respondents perceive a gradual decline in incidence. However, inference cannot be made from such anecdotal reporting.

**Hypothesis 4:** The intervention will result in an increased role for women in TDR processes as disputants, witnesses or decision-makers

**Finding:** Subject to the caveat that baseline and endline data are not considered comparable, quantitative data showed no change, although there was a 8.5% increase in respondents stating that testimony of women was accepted before a *jirga* ( $p=0.055$ ).

A secondary finding was that treatment districts reported significantly more documentation and registration of disputes in general relative to non-treatment districts. This was partially validated by cross-referencing elder self-reports against the distribution of RLS-I decision books, which was associated with a 7% increase in self-reports of dispute documentation.

While data quality issues adversely affected the validity of longitudinal measurements from baseline to endline, examination of relationships between elder knowledge, disputant perception, and various program metrics within only the treatment group suggests that elders’ knowledge was in fact associated with more positive assessments by disputants of informal dispute resolution. The data also suggest that elders’ attendance at a greater number of RLS-I activities positively affected disputants’ assessments of the process.

The following table presents the expected improvement in disputants’ assessments of four broad indices, each describing a specific aspect of an elder’s adjudication of an informal dispute as a function of that elder’s attendance of RLS-I activities. The expected results are based on application of the RLS-I core program of five legal awareness workshops, typically attended by a subset of all participating elders in a district. These workshops are bookended by an initial district network meeting held before any other RLS-I activities in the district take place, and a final, or “capstone” district network meeting held as the final RLS-I core program activity in the district; these network meetings are attended by the full cohort of participating elders in the district. Together, the workshops and district network meetings represent a total of seven RLS-I activities attended by a given village elder. The disputant assessment scores are for disputes in which RLS-I program participants played a direct mediating role, and therefore serve as a measure of program impact on its ultimate beneficiaries.

<b>Predicted improvement in disputants’ assessment of informal dispute adjudication for an elder passing through the RLS-I core program of seven activities (N=78)</b>			
<b>Index</b>	<b>Percent change against baseline</b>	<b>p-value</b>	<b>Effect size</b>
Access Rights	22%	0.000	1.300
Decision Subverted <sup>8</sup>	-46%	0.001	1.120
Freedom of Forum	20%	0.013	0.832
Outcome Just	18%	0.001	1.050

<sup>8</sup> The Decision Subverted index is negatively scaled, such that negative values represent the positive treatment effect of a decline in disputant assessments of corruption within the *jirga* or subversion by local elites.

While attendance by a given participating elder at a greater number of RLS-I activities has a greater positive impact on disputants' assessments of informal dispute resolution processes and outcomes in which that elder participated, that effect appears to have diminishing returns on disputants' assessments for attendance by a participating elder at eight or more RLS-I activities.

Attendance at RLS-I activities is a measure of program effects on individual elders and on individual disputants. The data also indicate that RLS-I activities also have positive peer effects by virtue of participating elders sharing knowledge and experiences. RLS-I data show that the larger the total number of elders per district passing through the RLS-I core program (i.e., the larger the size of the participating elder cohort), the greater the knowledge gains among the participating elders and the greater the improvement in disputant perceptions of TDR processes and outcomes. For example, the average number of elders passing through the RLS-I core program per district (64) is predicted to improve disputants' assessments of various aspects of a participating elder's adjudication of their disputes by between 6% and 25%.

## LESSONS LEARNED

Lessons learned are derived from participant feedback, RLS-I staff members' observations, and trends in RLS-I monitoring and evaluation data.

### Objectives

- RLS-I believes the three primary objectives appropriately address the challenge of justice as it relates to long-term stability.

### Approach

#### Selection of participants

- As indicated above, RLS-I formalized participant selection criteria at the start of Phase 2. The fact that some initially selected participants failed to attend all RLS-I events and had to be replaced by other participants suggests that, in selecting participants RLS-I should take greater care to determine prospective participants' commitment to attending RLS-I activities.
- The adequacy of the number of RLS-I participants is yet to be determined. While the participant selection criteria attempted to ensure that district groups adequately represented all villages or village clusters, except where security restrictions limited participation,



Male elders attend an RLS-I sponsored property law workshop in Shahjoy district (Zabul province), April 2012

impact evaluation data are inconclusive as to the extent the intervention trickled down from RLS-I participants to other TDR practitioners and the community at large, thus solidifying local cultural shift toward improved legality, etc.

- Although already targeted for participation, RLS-I observed that certain key influential TDR actors, including local *mullayan* and some officials, would benefit from additional education on Afghan statutory law and *Shari'ah* in light of the fact that, as authority figures, they have been known to perpetuate and legitimize misconceptions about those legal frameworks.
- During the course of Phase 2, RLS-I observed that some elderly participants were challenged to understand and retain program material.
- As indicated above, security in some districts hindered RLS-I's goal of participants' geographic representation.

## Sustainability

- The interest of some provincial government officials in continuing support to (or fully controlling) TDR and state-TDR linkage activities bodes well for the future sustainability of such efforts, but central government opposition suggests that such efforts may not succeed or be sustained.
- To promote sustainability and attract genuinely interested participants, RLS-I reduced participants' travel allowances in Phase 2. Some elders complained vigorously, but overall attendance did not suffer as a result.

## Programming and activities

### Research

- Completion of 27 district assessments has demonstrated that roughly 70-80% of district assessment data are common across all districts in the same region, calling into question the usefulness of RLS-I's current district assessment model. The cost, in terms of RLS-I staff time required to gather district assessment data at the beginning of Phase 2 and the resulting delay in adapting the core program to the specific needs of several districts, did not result in a corresponding benefit in terms of added knowledge on which to base district action plans.

### Network meetings

- While revisions to the final district network meeting and creation of the regional network meeting agendas proved successful, the introductory network meeting could have been better structured to establish participants' needs and program goals and expectations, including increasing the focus on practical outcomes. Elders also requested a follow-on regional network meeting.

### Workshops

- Though RLS-I Phases 1 and 2 have focused on emphasizing only the points necessary to help elders improve TDR decisions in relatively specific areas of need – as illustrated by the

development of Key Themes and use of Knowledge Questions as teaching tools – participant feedback, staff observations, and initial impact evaluation results indicate that even this volume of information has been somewhat overwhelming for the audience. While RLS-I's use of respected *Shari'ah* and Afghan statutory law scholars and experts has proven effective, and was probably essential, in garnering participant buy-in, in many cases these experts may have been unable or unwilling to tailor their material to the time available in RLS-I's one-day workshops. Participants have noted that, in

several workshops, too much complex information is covered in too little time, in primarily lecture format, which hinders attention, comprehension and retention for many participants including the illiterate and elderly. Furthermore, workshop materials currently consist of long narratives, which are convenient for trainers but not helpful for illiterate participants.

- The political component of the workshops could be at least as valuable as the knowledge; group exposure to information delivered by highly respected scholars may give elders the political cover they need to change their decision making.
- Given tight timelines, RLS-I was unable to adapt workshop content to each district to the degree desired.
- While ideal, heavy reliance on university instructors in some cases began to have a negative impact on their ability to fulfil their duties to their university students.

RLS-I hosted a **family law workshop** to increase legal awareness among male elders engaged in traditional dispute resolution (TDR) in Kandahar municipality on 6 October 2012. Participants agreed that family disputes are common and were eager to explore family legal rights in accordance with *Islamic* and Afghan statutory law. As the meeting concluded, participants agreed to share the information they had gained with their communities and work tirelessly to resolve family disputes. Participant Gul Mohammed explained during a follow-on RLS-I M&E interview that he still uses the handouts provided "... to improve my knowledge." The tribal elder also recounted an example of how he had used his RLS-I legal training to resolve a dispute. "A young woman had fled her parents to be with a man. They took shelter in my village and, when the other villagers found out, they said they would kill the man and woman who had fled without their families' consent. I talked to both parties and discovered that they were happy together. I organized a *jirga* and decided that the man and woman should be allowed to marry. The other elders agreed and the dispute was resolved peacefully and in accordance with *Islamic* law."

## Discussion sessions

- Discussion session reports indicate that participants did not always agree and commit to practical solutions or next steps in addressing challenges. RLS-I also recognized that discussion session agendas may be missing opportunities to reinforce workshop materials.

## Coordination

- State-TDR coordination meeting event reports did not always explicitly indicate whether agreement on jurisdiction, roles and procedures had been reached. Agreement on use of common mechanisms (decision letters) is indicated by their use.

## Outreach

- RLS-I staff have indicated a need for greater public awareness of legal issues to shape the social context to make it easier for elders to change their decision making and create public demand for such changes.

## Monitoring and evaluation

- In a few districts, lack of program participation by some impact evaluation baseline respondents and the practice by some invited participants of sending replacements to participate in their stead suggests that more could have been done to ensure the application of RLS-I program selection criteria in selecting participants and to confirm prospective participants' commitment to attend RLS-I activities.
- Determining whether or not program reach and inputs have achieved critical mass for self-sustaining progress toward improved justice is difficult to determine without a longer term study.

# RECOMMENDATIONS

RLS-I believes that the program objectives, approaches, and activities have largely been affirmed through experience to date. RLS-I offers the following recommendations as further refinements of the RLS-I program as detailed in the RLS-I Phase 2 Work Plan and summarized in this final report. These recommendations respond to extensive participant feedback collected during program activities, end-of-project participant focus groups and individual interviews, RLS-I staff observations collected during regional RLS-I staff member focus groups, and RLS-I monitoring and evaluation findings and recommendations.

## District selection

- Assuming future funding levels similar to the annualized funding rate for RLS-I Phase 2, RLS-I recommends the addition of up to 30 new districts during an 18-month follow-on program cycle. These could be introduced in two groups of 15 over consecutive six-month core program cycles. This level of effort would allow for implementation of periodic maintenance activities in Phase 1 and 2 districts; the addition of several activities to the



core program; extension of the core workshops to two or three days each; development and rollout of program enhancements; and sufficient ongoing quality control. This recommendation also takes into consideration the limited number of accessible districts with sufficiently permissive security environments that can be serviced from exiting RLS-I Phase 2 offices.

- The addition of more than 30 new districts and continued maintenance activities in Phase 1 and Phase 2 districts would require additional resources to allow sufficient activities, staffing, logistical support and, potentially, new regional offices.

**Women attend a follow-up district network meeting in Jalalabad district (Nangarhar province), June 2012**

## Participant selection

- Determine an average saturation threshold needed to achieve critical mass. A follow-on RLS-I project should consider experimenting with training an additional target group in two or three districts that completed the core program in Phase 2. By monitoring disputant perceptions over time in these districts relative to those receiving only one course of treatment for one participant cohort, determination of the threshold for critical mass could be facilitated. Other factors such as local culture, participant influence and ratio of participants to district population should be considered. Another option would be to double the size of the target group in new RLS-I districts to approximately 240 during the first round of engagement.
- A follow-on RLS-I program should reinforce its selection of TDR practitioners of all types. This should include renewed attention to village *mullayan* to ensure the religious leaders bolster compliance with legal and human rights norms, rather than reinforcing harmful practices through ignorance of *Shari'ah* or acquiescence to and support for the application of local customary law even it violates those norms. Targeting those most likely to resist change – thereby hindering other TDR practitioners' ability to reform harmful customary practice and reducing public expectations of change – will reduce local resistance to change. Similarly, continued emphasis on the most respected elders would promote change by less influential non-participants. As discussed above, direct exposure of greater numbers of elders to accurate information from respected religious and legal sources may also promote movement toward critical mass. Involvement of qualified *ulema* would also bolster the program's legitimacy with elders, *mullayan*, and villagers. The addition of youth participants designated by participating elders as TDR apprentices would help ensure the sustainability of program impact while co-opting youth who might otherwise partake in destabilizing activities. Youth participation will be limited to 10%-15% of the total number of participants to avoid creating rivalries between elders and youth. In light of official gaps in legal expertise, future participant selection will place greater emphasis on involving key state actors in network meetings and workshops in addition to the state-TDR working group for discussion sessions and coordination meetings.
- Selection of a greater percentage of respected middle-aged women as participants will help strike a better balance between female participants' stature and their ability to absorb information and their interest in learning.
- To reduce the number of replacement participants and bolster attendance rates generally, an RLS-I follow-on program should consider developing a vetting tool or questionnaire to

determine potential participants' status as TDR practitioners and their commitment to participation in RLS-I activities. At a minimum, RLS-I should solicit verbal commitments to participate from potential invitees and identify alternatives where original choices are not interested or available. Steps such as photo attendance sheets or ID cards may be considered to reduce the number of replacement participants.

- To promote higher rates of participation by impact evaluation respondents, the group should be randomly selected from the participant group after it has been selected and vetted.
- RLS-I should continue to develop approaches to deal effectively with security constraints, including training of trainers (discussed below) for prominent elders to enable them to train others in villages rather than in district or provincial centers.

## Sustainability

- To promote sustainability of similar efforts, an RLS-I follow-on program should continue to collaborate with the university *Shari'ah* and law and political science faculties, including exploring the potential for establishing university-based adult legal education program aimed at TDR elders and *spinsary* group members. In the interim, the program should consider using university facilities as venues for the educational activities. Similarly, student legal assistants or interns could help demonstrate the complementarity of *Shari'ah* and Afghan statutory law in workshops led by *Shari'ah* and statutory law scholars.
- Collaboration with the university law faculties and government justice sector institutions should be approached with caution given opposition to TDR within many national-level justice sector institutions and concerns about some provincial officials' motivations for demanding control over program implementation.
- As an alternative to overreliance on university professors, an RLS-I follow-on program should consider conducting training of trainers for highly competent elders, teachers, *ulema*, and *mullayan* so that they can conduct training in their villages on the basics of RLS-I workshop topics. See Workshops, below.
- As indicated below, follow-up questioning by participants during program events that follow workshops (especially discussion sessions, coordination meetings, and the follow-on network meetings) could promote participants' comprehension and retention of the information covered in the workshops.
- An RLS-I follow-on program should conduct ongoing maintenance activities in Phase I and Phase 2 districts to address remaining needs and ensure the durability of knowledge gains and practice shifts. The rate of these activities should be based on specific district needs, as determined by RLS-I program staff in collaboration with the monitoring and evaluation team. These activities would also bolster local confidence that the district has not been abandoned; this would, in turn, bolster trust in graduated districts as well as potential new ones.

## Communications and external relations



- Given the lingering opposition to TDR by some formal justice sector actors, an RLS-I follow-on program should consider hiring or partnering with a supportive senior legal expert to liaise regularly with national and sub-national formal justice sector actors. At times joint communication with these actors through the USAID formal justice sector program implementer and USAID could be useful. Wider distribution of project reports highlighting legal compliance work may also be useful to defuse perceptions that the project bolsters informal justice without improving its quality.
- Continued use of qualified formal justice sector trainers could also defuse mistrust and help to link formal and informal justice sector actors.
- Regular contact with the USAID formal justice sector program and other implementers should be maintained to prevent duplication and capitalize on complementarities, for example, in materials. Regular communication can also help to identify where gaps exist in each implementing partner's sector. For example, RLS-I staff have observed that police ignorance of criminal procedure, rights of the accused, etc., can complicate disputes.
- Ongoing communication with justice-related NGOs could help to defuse misconceptions of the project's objectives and activities.



**Men discuss property law in break-out groups during a legal awareness workshop in Dihrawud district (Uruzgan province), April 2012**

## Research

- In light of the repetitive nature of RLS-I Phase 1 and Phase 2 district assessments and the diminishing benefit of conducting them using the current model, RLS-I recommends streamlining the process to identify and report deviations from the common patterns identified in the 27 RLS-I district assessments to date. The first step could be drafting regional (North, East, and South) TDR reference documents or regional assessments as syntheses of all district assessments for each region to date. These regional assessments would continue to provide the basis for the core program activities and training curriculum. District assessments could then be streamlined (perhaps to two to five pages in length) to identify district-specific anomalies that might require customization of the action plan for each district and the application of the core program and curriculum to that district. This may involve reducing the number of male and female interviews and focus groups. The research tools (interview guides) could also be streamlined to avoid time-consuming collection of unnecessary data. Field staff should be retrained on the modifications and given a general refresher on research methodologies and ethics.
- Other recommended modifications include cross-checking elders' accounts of disputes and their resolution with the disputants' accounts. Another is accounting for the potential impact of tribal

power imbalances on focus group responses by holding separate focus groups for members of majority tribes and another for members of minority tribes.

## Programming

- Needs-based follow-on or maintenance activities should follow completion of the core program in all RLS-I districts to ensure sustainability of program interventions. The rate of these activities would be determined by RLS-I program staff, in collaboration with M&E staff, according to district needs, but should be balanced against the need to use program resources to implement the program in new districts.
- To ensure ongoing quality enhancements and opportunities for staff capacity building, future work plans should factor in these maintenance activities. Relative to Phase 2, this would entail a reduction in activity rates in new districts of approximately 20%-30%.
- Review of individual program activity design should continue for activities for which review was not completed during Phase 2. Consideration should be given to event sequencing, structured participation, practical outcomes, etc.
- Activity agendas should facilitate repeated exposure to RLS-I themes across sequenced program components to promote participants' comprehension and retention.

## Network meetings

- As previously indicated, RLS-I revised the follow-on district network meeting agenda and created the regional network agenda. The introductory district network meeting should be further refined. Ideas include dramatizations of disputes and the *jirga* process to convey a sense of urgency in improving and strengthening the institution, and a focus on the practical outcomes of identifying long-standing disputes and agreeing on practical steps to address them.
- Consensus followed by public declarations on agreements and commitments reached by the smaller state-TDR working group in discussion sessions and coordination meetings could be added to the capstone district network meeting.
- If practicable, reduce network meeting breakout group size from the current 25-30 to 15-20.
- Involve state justice sector actors more frequently in network meetings, as indicated above.
- Extend the regional network meetings to three days and add at least one follow-up meeting for volunteer roster members on the status of agreed next steps aimed at resolving long-standing disputes prioritized in previous meetings.
- To promote provincial networking, sharing of local best practices, and coalition building, RLS-I should hold issues-based provincial network meetings involving elders and state justice sector actors to address common challenges such as corruption and the influence of powerbrokers.

## Workshops

- Building on the development of Key Themes in Phase 2 to better focus workshop content, RLS-I



should further adapt workshop timelines, methodologies and materials to an adult and mostly illiterate audience. An adult education specialist should be consulted at least short-term in this process. Current university instructors should be involved in the revisions.

- Additional time should be allocated for most workshop topics - two days to several topics and three days to one or two of the most complex topics such as inheritance law. This would not only accommodate a classroom methodology aimed at adult and largely illiterate audience by slowing down information flow, but would allow more participatory exercises (see below), and facilitate multiple exposures and reflective exercises within the workshop period.

**Male elders participate in discussion session on the influence of powerbrokers on TDR in Kama district (Nangarhar province), May 2012**

## Materials

- Training materials should be further simplified and developed to address relatively low levels of education and literacy among participants. Simple, illustrated hand-outs and brochures should be developed to complement the longer training texts currently in use. These materials should be developed in collaboration with the adult education specialist and current university trainers.
- Training tools such as audio-visual aids and education technology should be considered to make lectures more understandable for the RLS-I audience.
- Educational content should ideally be tailored to the district based on assessment outcomes. Given the level of effort required to do so, however, this may be contingent on the pace of activities.
- If possible, training materials should be distributed ahead of the actual workshop to allow for participant preparation, where desired.
- A teacher's guide should be developed to aid instructors in presenting material and facilitating discussion in the most efficacious manner. This would also help to ensure exposure to Key Themes across the regions.
- The Key Themes and Knowledge Questions developed in Phase 2 should be reviewed and updated, if necessary.
- Renewed efforts should be made to ensure specific parallels are drawn in materials and workshop presentations between *Shari'ah* and Afghan statutory law where Afghan statutory law exists and is relevant.
- New workshop topics should be considered. These include moving ahead with conflict management skills, which was not given in the East and South during Phase 2 due to time constraints. Business law might be a second potential new workshop topic, and has been requested by some members of focus groups conducted at the end of Phase 2.
- A discussion of the relationship between Afghan Constitutional law and *Shari'ah* could be conducted as an introduction to the core workshop series to set the stage for demonstrating the consistency the two legal frameworks.
- Suggestions for modifications to existing legal awareness courses include greater focus on the rights of children, parents, and neighbors in family law and less on divorce.
- RLS-I female staff members have suggested several new ideas for women's workshop topics, including family management, business, and social behavior in the light of Islam.

## Methodology

- As discussed above, extending some workshops to two or three days would facilitate the use of training methodologies suited to adult and largely illiterate audiences, the primary request of elders and RLS-I staff. Likely changes include reducing lectures to no more than half of each workshop day and conducting participatory learning activities, including role-playing and discussion during the remainder of the day.
- If practical, reducing workshop size to about 40 from 60 would allow for greater interaction among participants and between instructors and participants.
- Exercises calling for reflection by participants, such as interactive review sessions, Q&A, and brief quizzes would promote participation, comprehension and retention.

## Trainers

- To promote adaption of adult education methods by the university professors RLS-I engages as its workshop trainers, RLS-I proposes to involve our existing trainers in modifying program training methods and content. Kabul workshops for trainers from all regions facilitated by RLS-I senior staff and an adult education specialist would help determine the most effective approaches to reaching the intended audience and create buy-in from those trainers. It would also promote consistency across regions without stifling customization of the core program.
- In a few areas, trainer stature is not entirely necessary to gain acceptance by target beneficiaries. Therefore, to reduce over-reliance on university faculty, RLS-I could consider conducting training of trainers for qualified RLS-I staff members, elders and local religious leaders, who would then be able to conduct workshops and facilitate discussion sessions. Such local trainers would enjoy access to some areas now considered unsafe for outsiders. RLS-I could hire a master trainer to lead a project education department responsible for training of trainers. Candidates for the master trainer position could include, for example, retired professors.
- Candidates for RLS-I training of trainers should be vetted for mastery of program materials and understanding of effective training methodologies. They should also be provided appropriate materials and ongoing mentoring. Adequate numbers of trainers in a given geographical area are important for mutual support and quality control. Skilled *spinsary* could also be encouraged to train others and form additional *spinsary* groups. This could be tested in pilot activities. A monitoring and quality control system should be established for training conducted by these training of trainers graduates.

## Discussion sessions



- Several modifications would further improve the effectiveness of discussion sessions. Agendas and RLS-I and other expert facilitators could promote practical outcomes to conclude discussion sessions, such as pledges and public declarations to change TDR practices. Examples include pledges to use alternatives to *baad*, agreeing to mutual state-TDR monitoring to prevent corruption, and commitments to mutual support in offsetting the biasing influence of powerbrokers on justice processes.
- Discussion sessions aimed at reaching practical solutions can also serve to reinforce workshop content, especially when expert facilitators are involved and workshop review sessions are included in discussion session agendas.
- Based on RLS-I field staff and participant feedback, additional discussion session topics should be considered, including consent to marriage and qualities of a good mediator.
- The discussion session between elders and officials on women's access to justice should be implemented more regularly.
- If logistically possible, a certain percentage of discussion sessions should include participants from different districts to promote networking and comparative exchanges. A similar result could be achieved through the issue-specific provincial network meeting described above.
- To promote follow through and mutual accountability, follow-up questions at the beginning of second and subsequent discussion sessions should be asked to determine whether ideas and agreements from prior meetings are being implemented. RLS-I could initiate a state-TDR working group decision tracker to facilitate this process.
- As in workshops, role-playing during discussion sessions could be useful in testing newly agreed approaches to TDR.
- To promote participation, discussion group (state-TDR working group) size should be limited to 25-35, as long as geographic and tribal representation can be guaranteed.

RLS-I facilitated a **discussion session** to address the influence of power brokers on traditional dispute resolution (TDR) in Chora district (Uruzgan province) on 13 March 2012. Government representatives and local elders actively participated in the meeting, each acknowledging their individual and group responsibility to work together to prevent biasing intimidation by powerful actors. Mullah Daad Mohammed, an influential religious leader, rallied the other participants by asserting that “if you white-bearded elders want to build your country then you should cooperate with the government and help your people.” Malik Gull, a tribal elder, added that “if the elders [engaged in TDR] unify, then the powerbrokers will not be able to affect [TDR] decisions.” In a proactive move, participants agreed that they should meet again, but next time invite local powerbrokers to discuss their responsibilities to promote justice within their communities.

## Coordination meetings

- As in discussion sessions, follow-up questions about implementation of agreements reached during previous meetings should be added to promote mutual accountability, sustainability and help create solutions to obstacles. The state-TDR working group decision tracker suggested above could facilitate this process.
- RLS-I coordination meeting facilitators may be able to do more to encourage formal justice sector and TDR actors to commit to mutually-agreed procedures for referrals, etc.



- Adding a third core program coordination meeting on implementation or enforcement of TDR decisions could be useful. RLS-I should consider police involvement in this coordination meeting. RLS-I may also consider reclassifying the discussion session on long-standing disputes as a coordination meeting.
- Where both elders and formal justice sector actors lack knowledge of *Shari'ah* or Afghan statutory law, RLS-I may consider involving legal experts in coordination meetings.
- As in discussion sessions, role-playing on dispute resolution scenarios may be useful in coordination meetings to work through potential obstacles to implementing agreements reached between formal justice sector and TDR actors.
- Distribution of decision and authority books should be limited to those who are normally points of contact within any given community. This may include *malikan*, prominent elders, or certain scholars.

## Spinsary groups

- RLS-I should continue to facilitate the formation of *spinsary* groups as forums for empowering women to take a greater role in dispute resolution and to advocate for women's access to justice. Prominent women could be encouraged to conduct training for *spinsary* group members and to help establish additional *spinsary* groups in additional villages, especially where access is challenging for RLS-I staff. In addition, the discussion sessions on promoting sustainability of *spinsary* groups should continue as a maintenance activity after completion of the core program. Local partners, including the Directorate of Women's Affairs and teachers, may be useful in supporting *spinsary* groups.
- Male elders could be encouraged through discussion sessions on women's access to justice to refer disputes involving families and children to *spinsary* groups to further bolster and legitimize women as dispute resolvers.
- Care should be taken in selecting women for participation in RLS-I activities who are authentically engaged in and respected for dispute resolution, rather than accepting unqualified or uninterested women based only, for example, on powerful family connections. For this reason, caution should be taken in administering elections to *spinsary* group membership, as many women could be afraid to vote against women with influential connections.

## Outreach

- RLS-I field staff have noted the importance of making the dispute resolution context more conducive to modified TDR decisions and creating public demand for those modifications (eliminating *baad*, for example). Therefore, RLS-I should continue and consider expanding its outreach component. RLS-I should develop additional topics for the outreach booklets and pamphlets that were effective under RLS-I Phases 1 and 2 and that have generated demand among



**A male elder collects RLS-I outreach materials to distribute in Puli Khumri district (Baghlan province), February 2012**

beneficiaries. RLS-I should explore the potential for using additional outreach media, including radio and television, video screenings and dramatizations in villages during RLS-I events. RLS-I should continue to distribute outreach materials through existing and new local NGO partners such as community cultural centers and other community outreach networks. Efforts to harmonize workshop content with public outreach messaging should be considered, if practical. This could include, for example, workshop participants (elders) disseminating messages and materials in their villages and participating in broadcasts. RLS-I should also determine how the program can expand its outreach program to a larger number of districts.

## Monitoring and evaluation and reporting

- Older or graduating program districts should continue to be monitored to determine if previous RLS-I intervention reached the critical mass needed to help ensure continued progress toward program objectives – higher quality TDR decisions, productive state-TDR cooperation, resolution of long-standing disputes, etc.
- Program resources and accessibility permitting, greater attention should be given to interaction with and observation of elders in village *jirgee* to better understand the outcomes and impact of RLS-I activities.
- RLS-I should continue workshop reviews, including evaluation of materials, methodology, etc. by RLS-I staff members and participating elders. A Key Themes checklist should be added to the lecture component of the workshop event report template. If graduates of the training of trainers program begin training others in their villages, RLS-I should ensure resources are in place to monitor that training.

## District graduation

- RLS-I should implement phased approach to district graduation based on a rapid interim evaluation of remaining district needs with regard to each program component. Based on these interim rapid assessments, periodic maintenance activities in districts having completed the core program can be scheduled. This would address remaining district needs, prevent regression, and demonstrate commitment to the district, which will enhance the project's reputation and make entry into new districts easier.
- Like maintenance activities, periodic monitoring of the overall status of TDR quality and linkage within each district, in accordance with district graduation criteria, should continue until the desired changes are determined to have taken root.

## Internal management

- As previously indicated, care should be taken to pace RLS-I program activities to allow for sufficient oversight and for necessary ongoing feedback and capacity building for RLS-I field staff.
- Vacant RLS-I staff positions should be filled with law and political science and *Shari'ah* faculty graduates, if possible, to promote evaluation of training content and delivery by qualified program staff.



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

- The RLS-I participant database should be updated regularly and current program attendance data made available to the field teams, either through online access or regular distribution.
- RLS-I offices in Laghman and Kunar provinces would make access by RLS-I staff members to districts in those provinces easier and save significant staff travel time.
- Additional administrative support for printing agendas, etc. would help ensure timely delivery of program activities and allow program staff to focus on quality control, etc.
- RLS-I should hold training sessions for field staff on the objectives, approach, and content of each activity. This includes explanations of the roles of RLS-I M&E and program staff to promote collaboration. Similarly, field staff should be consulted and trained on agenda development and revision.
- Additional monitoring of women's events should be instituted.

## ANNEXES

### I. Additional performance and other data

#### Activity and participant totals

RLS-I Life of Project Core Activities													
		East			South			North*			Overall		
Activity Type	Activity Title	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Network meeting	Regional networking meeting	1		1	1		1	1		1	3	0	3
Network meeting	District network meetings	10	11	21	19	15	34	3	3	6	32	29	61
Workshop	Constitutional law	11		11	19	6	25	3	3	6	33	9	42
Workshop	Criminal law	19	20	39	23	20	43	3	3	6	45	43	88
Workshop	Family law	17	18	35	26	26	52	3	3	6	46	47	93
Workshop	Inheritance law	18	18	36	27	27	54	3	3	6	48	48	96
Workshop	Property law	17		17	28	1	29	3	3	6	48	4	52
Workshop	Property deeds	16		16	25	1	26	3	3	6	44	4	48
Workshop	Conflict management skills							3	3	6	3	3	6
Coordination meeting	State-TDR coordination meeting	16		16	31		31	3	3	6	50	3	53
Discussion session	Long-standing disputes	7		7	3		3				10	0	10
Discussion session	Women's participation and access to justice					4	4	3	3	6	3	7	10
Discussion session	Spinsary group formation		22	22		31	31				0	53	53
Discussion session	Promoting spinsary group sustainability		3	3							0	3	3
Discussion session	Alternatives to baad	7		7	7	9	16	3	3	6	17	12	29
Discussion session	Influence of power brokers	4		4	7		7	3	3	6	14	3	17
Discussion session	Dispute prevention		13	13	3	8	11				3	21	24
Discussion session	Anti-corruption	1		1	10		10	3	3	6	14	3	17
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>144</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>249</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>705</b>

\*North workshops and discussion sessions are disaggregated from CPAU's multi-topic, multi-day Broad-Based Education workshops. Network and coordination meetings were also joint activities. These numbers do not reflect CPAU's peace committees or the conflict skills training and legal mentoring they receive.



RLS-I life of project participants													
Activity Type	Activity Title	East			South			North*			Overall		
		M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Network meeting	Regional networking meeting	154		154	149	14	163	43		43	346	14	360
Network meeting	District network meetings	1340	1321	2661	2051	1228	3279	287	358	645	3678	2907	6585
Workshop	Constitutional law	634	2	636	912	366	1278	243	345	588	1789	713	2502
Workshop	Criminal law	1126	1146	2272	908	721	1629	259	326	585	2293	2193	4486
Workshop	Family law	976	1014	1990	942	936	1878	219	313	532	2137	2263	4400
Workshop	Inheritance law	1005	985	1990	1099	941	2040	219	313	532	2323	2239	4562
Workshop	Property law	954		954	1015	29	1044	243	345	588	2212	374	2586
Workshop	Property deeds	948	5	953	960	39	999	243	345	588	2151	389	2540
Workshop	Conflict management skills			0			0	259	326	585	259	326	585
Coordination meeting	State-TDR coordination meeting	603		603	989	1	990	287	358	645	1879	359	2238
Discussion Session	Longstanding Disputes	248		248	103		103			0	351	0	351
Discussion session	Women's participation and access to justice			0	1	89	90	219	313	532	220	402	622
Discussion session	Spinsary group formation	19	630	649	21	797	818			0	40	1427	1467
Discussion Session	Promoting spinsary group sustainability		82	82			0			0	0	82	82
Discussion session	Alternatives to baad	279	2	281	279	343	622	287	358	645	845	703	1548
Discussion session	Influence of power brokers	147		147	227		227	259	326	585	633	326	959

RLS-I life of project participants													
Activity type	Activity title	East			South			North*			Overall		
		M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Discussion session	Dispute prevention	3	487	490	89	177	266			0	92	664	756
Discussion Session	Anti-corruption	39	2	41	328		328	259	326	585	626	328	954
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>8475</b>	<b>5676</b>	<b>14151</b>	<b>10073</b>	<b>5681</b>	<b>15754</b>	<b>3326</b>	<b>4352</b>	<b>7678</b>	<b>21874</b>	<b>15709</b>	<b>37583</b>

\*North workshops and discussion sessions are disaggregated from CPAU's multi-topic, multi-day Broad-Based Education workshops. Network and coordination meetings were also joint activities. These numbers do not reflect CPAU's peace committees or the conflict skills training and legal mentoring they receive.

## Program activities by district

Network meetings - District					
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Mixed (male/female)	Total
Kandahar	Multiple districts			1	1
Kandahar	Arghandab	1	1		2
Kandahar	Daman	1	1		2
Kandahar	Dand	1	1		2
Kandahar	Dand, Daman, Arghandab, Spin Boldak, Kandahar municipality		1		1
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	1	2		3
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	2	1		3
Kunar	Nurgal	2	2		4
Laghman	Mihtarlam	2	2		4
Logar	Puli Alam	2	2		4
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2	2		4
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2	2		4
Nangarhar	Surkh Rod, Bati Kot, Bihsud, Kama, Rodat, Dara-I-Noor, Jalalabad municipality		1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	2			2
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2			2
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2	2		4
Zabul	Qalat district center	2	3		5
Zabul	Shahjoy	2	2		4
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2	1		3



Network meetings - District					
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Mixed (male/female)	Total
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>55</b>

Networking meetings - Regional			
Region	Male	Female	Total
South	1		1
East	1		1
North	1		1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3</b>

Workshop – Criminal law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab	1		1
Kandahar	Daman	2	3	5
Kandahar	Dand	2	2	4
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	2	2	4
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	1	2	3
Kandahar	Spin Boldak, Dand, Daman, Kandahar municipality	1	2	3
Kunar	Nurgal	3	2	5
Laghman	Mihtarlam	2	2	4
Logar	Puli Alam	2	2	4
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	1		1
Nangarhar	Bati Kot, Kama, Shinwar, Rodat, Bihsud, Surkh Rod, Qarghayi (Laghman province), Kuz Kunar	5	8	13
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2	4	6
Nangarhar	Shinwar	1		1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2	2	4
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2	1	3



Workshop – Criminal law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Zabul	Qalat district center	2	3	5
Zabul	Shahjoy	3	1	4
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2	2	4
Zabul	Qalat district center	1		1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>82</b>

Workshop – Family law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab	2	2	4
Kandahar	Arghandab, Daman, Dand, Spin Boldak, Kandahar municipality	1	3	4
Kandahar	Daman	2	2	4
Kandahar	Dand	3	2	5
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	3	2	5
Kandahar	Spin Boldak		1	1
Kunar	Nurgal	3	2	5
Laghman	Mihtarlam	2	2	4
Logar	Puli Alam	2	2	4
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	1		1
Nangarhar	Bati Kot, Kama, Shinwar, Rodat, Qarghayi (Laghman province), Surkh Rod	4	4	8
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2	4	6
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2	2	4
Nangarhar	Kama, Rodat		2	2
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot, Dihrawud, Chora	1		1
Zabul	Qalat district center	2	6	8
Zabul	Shahjoy	3	1	4
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2	3	5

Workshop – Family law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Zabul	Qalat district center	1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>43</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>87</b>

Workshop – Inheritance law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab	2	2	4
Kandahar	Daman	3	2	5
Kandahar	Dand	2	4	6
Kandahar	Dand, Daman, Spin Boldak, Kandahar municipality	1	2	3
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	2	2	4
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	2	4	6
Kunar	Nurgal	3	2	5
Laghman	Mihtarlam	2	2	4
Logar	Puli Alam	2	2	4
Nangarhar	Bati Kot, Kama, Shinwar, Rodat, Qarghayi (Laghman province), Kuz Kunar	4	6	10
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2	4	6
Nangarhar	Shinwar	1		1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2	2	4
Nangarhar	Kama	1		1
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2	1	3
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	3	1	4
Zabul	Qalat district center	2	3	5
Zabul	Shahjoy	3	1	4



Workshop – Inheritance law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2	3	5
Zabul	Qalat district center	1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>90</b>

Workshop - Property law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab	2		2
Kandahar	Daman	2		2
Kandahar	Daman, Dand, Spin Boldak, Kandahar municipality	3	1	4
Kandahar	Dand	2		2
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	3		3
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	1		1
Kunar	Nurgal	3		3
Laghman	Mihtarlam	2		2
Logar	Puli Alam	2		2
Nangarhar	Bati Kot, Kama, Shinwar, Rodat	5		5
Nangarhar	Bihsud, Kama	1		1
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2		2
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2		2
Uruzgan	Chora	3		3
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2		2
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2		2
Zabul	Qalat district center	2		2
Zabul	Shahjoy	4		4
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2		2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>46</b>



Workshop – Property law/deeds				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab	1		1
Kandahar	Daman	2		2
Kandahar	Daman, Arghandab	1		1
Kandahar	Dand	2		2
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	2		2
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	2		2
Kandahar	Spin Boldak, Dand, Daman, Kandahar municipality	2	1	3
Kunar	Nurgal	3		3
Laghman	Mihhtarlam	2		2
Logar	Puli Alam	2		2
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	1		1
Nangarhar	Bati Kot, Kama, Shinwar, Rodat	1		1
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2		2
Nangarhar	Shinwar	1		1
Nangarhar	Shinwar, Bati Kot	1		1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2		2
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	2		2
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2		2
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2		2
Zabul	Qalat district center	3		3
Zabul	Shahjoy	2		2
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2		2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>41</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>42</b>

Workshop - Constitutional law				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Daman	1	1	2
Kandahar	Dand	1	2	3
Kandahar	Dand, Kandahar municipality	1		1
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	2	2	4
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	2	1	3
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	2		2
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2		2
Nangarhar	Shinwar	2		2
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2		2
Nangarhar	Kama	1		1
Nangarhar	Rodat	2		2
Uruzgan	Chora	2		2
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	2		2
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	2		2
Zabul	Qalat district center	2		2
Zabul	Shahjoy	2		2
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2		2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>36</b>

Discussion session – Alternatives to <i>baad</i>				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Daman		1	1
Kandahar	Dand		1	1
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality		1	1
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality, Dand, Daman, Spin Boldak, Arghandab	1	1	2
Kandahar	Spin Boldak		1	1
Kunar	Nurgal	1		1
Laghman	Mihtarlam	1		1
Logar	Puli Alam	1		1
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	1		1



Discussion session – Alternatives to <i>baad</i>				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	1		1
Nangarhar	Shinwar	1		1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	1		1
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	1		1
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	1		1
Zabul	Qalat district center		2	2
Zabul	Qalat district center, Tarnak Wa Jaldak	1		1
Zabul	Shahjoy	1	1	2
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	1	1	2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>14</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>23</b>

Discussion session – <i>Spinsary</i> group formation				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab		3	3
Kandahar	Daman		4	4
Kandahar	Dand		4	4
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality		6	6
Kandahar	Spin Boldak		2	2
Kunar	Nurgal		2	2
Laghman	Mihtarlam		2	2
Logar	Puli Alam		2	2
Nangarhar	Bati Kot		2	2
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor		4	4
Nangarhar	Shinwar		2	2
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality		4	4
Nangarhar	Kama		2	2
Nangarhar	Rodat		2	2
Uruzgan	Chora		2	2
Uruzgan	Dihrawud		2	2



Discussion session – Spinsary group formation				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot		2	2
Zabul	Qalat district center		2	2
Zabul	Shahjoy		2	2
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak		2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>53</b>	<b>53</b>

Discussion session – Dispute prevention, children and neighbors				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Daman, Spin Boldak, Dand, Kandahar municipality	1		1
Kandahar	Dand		1	1
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	1		1
Kandahar	Spin Boldak		1	1
Kunar	Nurgal		2	2
Laghman	Mihtarlam		2	2
Logar	Puli Alam		1	1
Nangarhar	Bati Kot, Shinwar, Rodat, Kama		5	5
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor		1	1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality		2	2
Uruzgan	Chora		1	1
Uruzgan	Dihrawud		1	1
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot		1	1
Zabul	Qalat district center	1	2	3
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak		1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>24</b>



Discussion Session - Addressing the Influence of Powerbrokers				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Dand	1		1
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	1		1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	1		1
Nangarhar	Kama	1		1
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	1		1
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	1		1
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	1		1
Zabul	Qalat district center	1		1
Zabul	Shahjoy	1		1
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	1		1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11</b>

Discussion session - Anti-corruption				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Daman, Arghandab	1		1
Kandahar	Dand	1		1
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality, Spin Boldak, Daman, Dand	1		1
Logar	Puli Alam	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	1		1
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	1		1
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	1		1
Zabul	Qalat district center	2		2
Zabul	Shahjoy	1		1
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	1		1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>11</b>



Discussion session - Women's participation and access to justice				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Dand		1	1
Zabul	Qalat district center		1	1
Zabul	Shahjoy		1	1
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak		1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

Discussion session – Long-standing disputes				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Logar	Puli Alam	1		1
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	1		1
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	1		1
Nangarhar	Shinwar	1		1
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	1		1
Nangarhar	Kama	1		1
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	1		1
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	1		1
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	1		1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>10</b>

Coordination meetings - Strengthening ties between formal and informal justice				
Province	District(s)	Male	Female	Total
Kandahar	Arghandab	2		2
Kandahar	Daman	3		3
Kandahar	Dand	2		2
Kandahar	Kandahar municipality	1		1
Kandahar	Spin Boldak	2		2
Kandahar	Spin Boldak, Dand, Daman, Kandahar municipality	2		2
Kunar	Nurgal	2		2



<b>Coordination meetings - Strengthening ties between formal and informal justice</b>				
<b>Province</b>	<b>District(s)</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
Laghman	Mihtarlam	2		2
Logar	Puli Alam	2		2
Nangarhar	Bati Kot	2		2
Nangarhar	Dara-I-Noor	2		2
Nangarhar	Shinwar	2		2
Nangarhar	Jalalabad municipality	2		2
Nangarhar	Kama	1		1
Nangarhar	Rodat	1		1
Uruzgan	Chora	3		3
Uruzgan	Dihrawud	3		3
Uruzgan	Tirin Kot	3		3
Zabul	Qalat district center	4		4
Zabul	Shahjoy	2		2
Zabul	Tarnak Wa Jaldak	2		2
Zabul	Qalat district center	2		2
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>47</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>47</b>

## 2. List of deliverables

The following documents were prepared by RLS-I and delivered to USAID at various times during Phase 2. A complete set of copies these documents were delivered to USAID on a DVD on 15 July 2012.

Section	Activity	Document name
<b>Task Order requirements</b>		
F.7	Monthly reports	Seven monthly reports plus Q1/FY12 to cover December 2012
F.7	Final report	To be submitted to USAID/Afghanistan by 14 August 2012
<b>Work plan requirements</b>		
Overview	Quarterly PMP reports	Quarterly PMP reports (Q1/FY12, Q2/FY12, Q3/FY12)
Overview	Success stories	10 success stories
Activity 1.1.1, 1.1.2	District assessments	12 district assessments ( Dara-I-Nur, Jalalabad (Nahia 1&4), Shah Joy, Dihrawud, Tirin Kot, Chora, Mihtarlam, Puli Alam, Nurgal, Puli Khumri, Dahana-I-Ghuri, Pashtun Kot)
Activity 1.2.1	Legal awareness workshops for male and female elders	Training Materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Constitutional law</li> <li>▪ Family law</li> <li>▪ Criminal law</li> <li>▪ Property law</li> <li>▪ Property deeds law</li> <li>▪ Inheritance law</li> </ul>
Activity 1.2.2	Regional exchanges on best practices	Report on regional network meetings
Activity 1.2.4	Discussion sessions	Agendas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Discussion session –Anti-corruption</li> <li>▪ Discussion session – Influence of warlords on jirgee</li> <li>▪ Discussion session – Alternatives to <i>baad</i> and <i>machalgha</i></li> <li>▪ Discussion session – TDR decision registration</li> <li>▪ Discussion session – TDR</li> </ul>
Activity 1.4.1	Spinsary group formation	Spinsary event reports



Section	Activity	Document name
<b>Work plan requirements</b>		
Activity I.4.1	<i>Spinsary</i> group training	Agendas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Marriage abuses</li> <li>▪ Rights violations in families</li> <li>▪ Promoting <i>spinsary</i> group sustainability</li> <li>▪ Dispute prevention – neighbors</li> <li>▪ Dispute prevention – children</li> <li>▪ Access to justice and increasing women’s roles in dispute resolution</li> <li>▪ Formation of <i>spinsary</i> groups and their responsibilities</li> </ul>
Activity I.6.1	Outreach	Illustrated booklet 1: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives to <i>baad</i></li> <li>2. Crime as a personal act</li> </ol> Illustrated booklet 2: <i>Jirga</i> and women in legal case resolution  Illustrated booklet 3: Children and forced marriage  Pamphlets (Dari and Pashto combined): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. final decisions of the courts</li> <li>2. rights of an accused upon arrest</li> <li>3. right to a defense lawyer</li> <li>4. women’s rights to equal treatment under the law</li> </ol>
Annex C	Baseline report	To be submitted to USAID/Afghanistan by 14 August 2012
Annex C	Impact evaluation report	To be submitted to USAID/Afghanistan by 14 August 2012
<b>CPAU scope of work</b>		
A.1.2.1.	Legal awareness workshops	See Work Plan, Activity I.2.1 requirements
A.1.2.2.	Conflict management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ CPAU peace and conflict management training material</li> <li>▪ Workshop agenda</li> </ul>
B.1.1.1.	Peace building: training of trainers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Justice Support Worker (JSW) legal training materials, Part I</li> <li>▪ JSW legal training materials, Part II</li> <li>▪ JSW legal training materials, Part III</li> </ul>
B.1.1.2.	Peace committee workshops	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Five-day peace building training workshop materials</li> </ul>



Section	Activity	Document name
<b>CPAU scope of work</b>		
B.2.1.1.	Legal awareness campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Legal information brochure</li><li>▪ Legal information booklet</li><li>▪ Radio announcement and legal awareness message</li></ul>