



Creating an Effective and Sustainable System of Providing Free Legal Aid in Serbia

Second Report of the Project Monitoring Group

October 31, 2008

Contents

Executive Summary	iii
1. Background.....	1
The Assignment.....	1
The Consultants	2
The Methodology.....	2
2. The Legal Aid Project.....	3
Project Overview	3
3. Findings	5
Track I – Assessment of Outcomes	5
Project Management – The Project Implementation Unit.....	5
Public Consultation and Public Information	6
Strategy for Reforming the Legal Aid System	7
Track II – Assessment of Outcomes	7
The Legal Aid Fund.....	7
Project Implementation Arrangements	8
Follow-Up of Recommendations from Previous PMG Report	10
4. Conclusions	12
Strengths	12
Weaknesses.....	13
Opportunities.....	14
Threats.....	14
Cost-Efficiency	15
The Way Ahead.....	16
Annex 1 - Terms of Reference.....	i
Annex 2 – Persons Interviewed	v
Annex 3 – PMG Meeting Schedule.....	vii
Annex 4 – Literature References	viii
Annex 5 – Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	x

Executive Summary

In November 2006 Sida signs an agreement with UNDP regarding Swedish support to the project "Creating an effective and sustainable system of providing Free Legal Aid in Serbia". The Swedish support amounts to SEK 8 832 000 and is to cover project activities from November 2006 until January 2009¹.

In August 2007, Sida decides to commission SIPU International to form a Project Monitoring Group (PMG). This group is to function as "a special resource to Sida and UNDP with regard to the continuous monitoring and follow-up of the performance of the project". The PMG consist of Ms. Barbro Svedberg, Ms. Marijana Trifunovic and Mr. Pär Sköld.

The first PMG visit to Belgrade took place in November 26-30, 2007. This is the report of the second visit which took place in September 22-26, 2008. Interviews were held with a great number of stakeholders representing the Government, the Judiciary, the local authorities, the civil society, and the international community.

The main conclusions are summarised by dividing our observations into Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats:

Strengths

- A project to promote an effective, accessible and affordable legal aid system is fully in line with Serbian as well as Swedish priorities and policies. The intended outputs of the project have a potential for leading towards the project goal. (However, due to delays, it is unlikely that the project will reach the goals of the first phase in time.)
- The project has contributed to an increased understanding and cooperation between different legal aid providers.
- The project has contributed to increased insights into different models of legal aid and to intensified discussions on the future system.
- The project has contributed to strengthening the commitment of the MoJ for legal aid.
- Potentially useful data has been generated through research and the LAF.
- The project may serve as a model for participatory law drafting.

Weaknesses

- Capacity building within the MoJ is limited.
- The UNDP has been the driving force in the project instead of the Working Group/the MoJ.
- The Working Group is not functioning as efficient, nor as transparent, as expected.
- The Programme Implementation Unit is – despite progress - not functioning as efficient as expected.
- Project components have not been synchronized due to severe delays in the original plan and transparency can be increased.
- The goals of the first phase have not yet been reached and the timetable is very ambitious.

Opportunities

- Insights among, and understanding between, stakeholders have increased and can be built upon.

¹ Sida agreed to a three-month non-cost extension from October 2008 until January 2009.

- There is willingness within the MoJ of creating an effective and sustainable legal aid system.
- There is an increased amount of relevant data, knowledge, models and ideas circulating – thus providing a better basis for reaching conclusions on a suitable legal aid system.

Threats

- Agreement on the legal aid strategy may not be reached within the Working Group.
- The drafting of the strategy and the law may be rushed, at the cost of stakeholder participation, discussion and consensus-building.
- A new strategy and law that not take into consideration the lessons learned from the project components might prove to be contra productive, given all stakeholders that have been involved in the project.
- Project activities are carried out earlier than what would be ideal, due to the approaching end of the project phase.
- Financing of a system may not be secured.
- Article 67 of the Constitution may hinder the development of a suitable law.
- The goal of increasing access to justice for the poor and vulnerable may be hindered if the overall judicial reform strategy is unsuccessful.

The cost-efficiency of the project as a whole is still too early to assess. There is a risk that the goals of the first phase will not be met. If this is the case, the cost-efficiency of the first phase must be regarded as rather low. Much depends on the efficiency of the Working Group, which to a large extent is out of the control of the project. A definite assessment of the cost-efficiency of the project as a whole will have to wait. The cost-efficiency of specific activities shows a mixed record. The project budget has been adhered to.

The project management took note of the comments and recommendations given in our previous report. An increased NGO involvement can be seen as well as a slightly increased transparency. We believe that further progress may be made in the issues brought up in the PMG I report.

Phase I of the project will come to an end in January 2009. Before a possible Phase II there is a need for a period in which:

- The Working Group is given time and possibilities to thoroughly discuss substance matters, and to discuss a draft strategy with national stakeholders.
- The internal dynamics within the Working Group is improved – possibly with the intervention of the Minister of Justice.
- The MoJ and the Working Group take the initiative to discuss and specify the need for external support in the coming period. Based on these needs and specific requests, an actor external to the UNDP should ideally draft a possible project document for Phase II.

1. Background

The Assignment

In November 2006 Sida signs an agreement with UNDP regarding Swedish support to the project "Creating an effective and sustainable system of providing Free Legal Aid in Serbia". The Swedish support amounts to SEK 8 832 000 and is to cover project activities from November 2006 until January 2009².

In August 2007, Sida decides to commission SIPU International to form a Project Monitoring Group (PMG). This group is to function as "a special resource to Sida and UNDP with regard to the continuous monitoring and follow-up of the performance of the project".

The first PMG visit to Belgrade took place in November 26-30, 2007. The report of PMG I is dated December 19, 2007.

The present report is the result of the second visit which took place in September 22-26, 2008. At the time of writing this report, less than four months remain of the first phase of the project.

The general Terms of Reference for the PMG are enclosed as annex 1. As these Terms of Reference are quite extensive, and to some extent more appropriate for evaluation missions than for monitoring missions, discussions were held between Sida and SIPU on the focus of the PMG. It was decided that the first PMG mission should focus on the following:³

- Relevance and realism of the project objectives and activities;
- Links between the project and the judicial reform strategy;
- Ownership and conditions for sustainable results; and
- Gender equality aspects.

For the second mission, Sida requested the team to focus on the following:⁴

- Preliminary assessment of project outcomes and result indicators
- Continued risk assessment
- Assess the cost- efficiency of the project activities and project management and adherence to budget
- Assess the extent to which the results and experience of the recipients of the grants from the Legal Aid Fund has been incorporated in the assessment survey
- Evaluate the communication and coordination between the working group and other relevant stakeholders.
- Assess the incorporation of the recommendations and remark presented in the previous monitoring mission.
- Assess any new project proposal for the continuation of the project

We would like to see this second report as a continuation of the first report. Much of what is said in the first report about the political and the judicial context, the relevance of the project,

² Sida agreed to a three-month non-cost extension from October 2008 until January 2009.

³ Sida (2007).

⁴ Sida (2008).

etc is still valid and not repeated here. We have chosen to write a short and concise report, focusing on the questions that were to be given priority in this mission.

The Consultants

The PMG consist of Ms. Barbro Svedberg (SIPU/Stockholm), Ms. Marijana Trifunovic (Ponsconsulting/Belgrade) and Mr. Pär Sköld (Pnyx/Göteborg). Even if the latter formally serves as team-leader, the three consultants work as a team and take equal part in carrying out the assignment.

The Methodology

The PMG (II) visited Belgrade September 22-26, 2007. Interviews were held with a great number of stakeholders representing the Government, the Judiciary, the local authorities, the civil society and the international community. Please find enclosed a list of persons interviewed and the meeting schedule. The PMG was able to carry out all meetings/interviews as planned (with one exception – the consultant drafting the financial study). A few meetings were held individually while others were group interviews. Most interviews were of a semi-structured character.

The working language of the PMG is English. As a substantial number of interviews had to be carried out in Serbian, translation was needed. For a few interviews, an interpreter was contracted by the PMG. Mainly however, the Serbian speaking member of the PMG served as translator as well as co-interviewer. Even if language was an obstacle for the team, we do not think that this has affected the conclusions in any substantial way.

The very limited time available did not permit any field visits outside Belgrade. Even if this is unfortunate it is not regarded as a major problem in terms of the validity and reliability of our findings. It was also arranged with stakeholders operating in other regions of Serbia to meet for interviews with the PMG in Belgrade.

All stakeholders involved have been generous in providing the PMG with documents and written material. Most documents were reviewed and discussed within the PMG ahead of the mission, and thus served as a basis for interviews and discussions.

A de-briefing was organised on the last day of the mission. The preliminary observations were presented to representatives of Sida, the UNDP and the Project Implementation Unit from the Ministry of Justice. This served as a good opportunity to listen to comments and reactions and thus gather additional data for the preparation of the written report.

As an approach to monitoring, the project has been analysed using a SWOT perspective (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats). The conclusions in this report are presented using these four perspectives. A project always entails all these components and the analysis makes them visible. The SWOT perspective could also facilitate continued discussions within the project. We do not believe this report presents a complete picture of the strengths and weaknesses of the project. It merely presents what the PMG could observe during the limited period.

2. The Legal Aid Project

Project Overview

The Government of Serbia has identified the deficient access to legal aid as one of the obstacles to overcome in order to guarantee access to justice – which is a precondition for the rule of law. Presently, the legal framework for legal aid is inadequate. There is a lack of funding and of supply. Furthermore, the quality varies substantially and coordination between the different providers of legal aid is deficient or non-existing. The people who suffer the most from these problems are the marginalised and most vulnerable groups in society.

The Ministry of Justice formed a Working Group on Legal Aid and invited the UNDP to assist them in their work. A project was developed and given the name “Creating an effective and sustainable system of providing Free Legal Aid in Serbia”.⁵ The project document covers two years (2006-2008) but a second phase of the project (2009-2010) is foreseen.

According to the project document, the long-term goal of the first phase of the project is to “establish a roadmap for the creation of an effective and affordable state-funded and run legal aid system for those who cannot afford legal services.” The project document goes on to state that the short-term goals are “to formulate a strategy for the reform of the legal aid system that will be accepted by the key stakeholders and to increase access to justice for the most vulnerable and marginalized groups.”

The two short-term goals, and their respective activities, are divided into two parallel tracks. Track I consist of a number of workshops, study visits, studies, consultation meetings, etc, all aiming at the development of a strategy for the reform of legal aid. The financing of a future system is one of the issues which will be studied. Track II consist of the setting up of a legal aid fund and the disbursements of grants to different providers. In addition to expanding the provision of legal aid, this track aims at testing different models of providing public support to legal aid providers in an efficient and sustainable way.

Experiences, results and findings from both tracks are to be fed into the Working Group of the Ministry of Justice, thus facilitating its work on developing a so called road-map.

Important stakeholders in the project are the Ministry of Justice, the municipalities providing legal aid, the civil society (the Bar Associations on different levels and other NGOs active in the field of legal aid) as well as the beneficiaries of the legal aid services (poor, marginalised people and groups of people, including IDPs/refugees and vulnerable minorities.)

The project is executed by a National Implementing Partner (NEX) with some elements being executed through the Direct Execution Modality (DEX). In addition to the above mentioned Working Group, the following are the most important bodies directly involved in the management of the project:

- The Steering Committee (MoJ, MoF, Bar Association, UNDP and Sida)
- The National Project Director (MoJ)
- The Project Implementation Unit (MoJ)
- The UNDP Programme Specialist and backstopping team
- The Advisory Panel of the Legal Aid Fund (Experts and stakeholders)

⁵ UNDP (2006).

- The Legal Aid Fund Staff (UNDP)

Some important organisational developments since the first PMG visit are the following:

- As a result of the national election in Serbia, the former NPD was appointed Minister of Justice. As new NPD, MoJ State Secretary Ms. Gordana Pualic was chosen. In addition to serving as NPD, Ms Pualic will also serve as coordinator of the Working Group.
- The Working Group was reformed and now consists of 13 members, including four members also serving on the Advisory Panel and one explicit NGO-representative (in addition to the representative of the Bar Association). The first WG meeting of the year was held in April 2008.
- In order to formulate indicators and mechanisms for monitoring quality of legal aid services, the UNDP and the MoJ decided to form a Quality Control Group. This group, consisting of five members, had its first meeting in July 2008.
- Consultants have been contracted to support the Working Group and the Quality Control Group. In order to support the Working Group in drafting the strategy document one international consultant (Mr. Peter Van de Biggelaar, NL) and one national consultant (Ms. Nevena Petrusic) were contracted. An additional Dutch adviser was contracted to serve in the Quality Control Group.

Due to the three months, non-cost, extension of the first phase of the project, almost four months still remain until the end of the first phase. No project document for the second phase has yet been finalised.

Our findings concerning project developments since our first visit are discussed in the chapter below. It should be noted that the PMG does not see as its role to measure and scrutinize the extent to which the activities and timelines described in the project document are followed – and offer critique if timelines are not met. Rather, we try to monitor progress in a forward-looking way, in the hope that our observations can strengthen positive processes and encourage self-reflection, cooperation and efficiency.

3. Findings

Track I – Assessment of Outcomes

Project Management – The Project Implementation Unit

Between the two monitoring missions, much progress has been made regarding the role of the PIU as well as its effectiveness.

The PIU has had significant challenges to overcome, for example reduced WG activities during the general elections period and the forming of new Government, etc. Staff turn-over has been high. Two new project coordinators joined the PIU as the two former coordinators left for other jobs.

Nevertheless, the role of the PIU in the strategy process has been improved and the mandate and scope of work is more defined, although the support has been of a more administrative character than first predicted in the project document. Members of the PIU are assigned to support different parts of the strategy, including one for the WG, one for the quality assurance group and one for the financial assessment.

During this period the PIU provided necessary support to the WG on the organizational level as well as coordinating research activities. The PIU has been involved in the tendering and monitoring process of specific research and public consultation activities for the purposes of Strategy drafting (financial assessment, analysis of beneficiaries, public consultation events, organization of international conference) as well as in day to day coordination with the MoJ.

It is assessed that the establishment of the PIU within the Ministry has played a significant role in maintaining a high level of commitment to the reform of legal aid within the MoJ. The PIU has become perceived as an integral part of Ministry's organizational structure. Still, looking from the perspective of its cost-efficiency we assess that four employees of the PIU is more than enough to support the WG, considering its pace of work. However, this over capacity of the PIU has not been wasted, as the PIU has been engaged in the coordination of some other reform activities within the MoJ in times when the WG activity level has been low.

It is hard to estimate the sustainability of the PIU structure within the MoJ. The Government is facing serious budgetary problems and is very restrictive towards the increase of civil servants. The commitment of the MoJ to use experience and knowledge of the existing staff of PIU has been shown in the interview with the NPD. It is however uncertain if the MoJ would have capacity to keep an organizational unit devoted only to the legal aid reform process on board at this moment.

Looking back on the role of the PIU envisaged in the project document and its practical role in project implementation, we assess that the PIU has made a significant contribution providing operational support to the MoJ and the WG. However, the role of the PIU, as defined in the initial stage, is regarded as too ambitious.

Public Consultation and Public Information

According to the Work Plan for 2008 this output encompasses a series of public consultation events with potential providers of legal aid, surveys on beneficiaries, their needs and attitudes as well as information activities.

Several roundtable discussions for stakeholders have been organised by the PIU according to the work plan, covering the issues of a future legal aid system, as well as experience of the models tested through the legal aid fund. These discussions have facilitated a process of knowledge sharing and most likely contributed to increased respect and understanding among different legal aid providers. There is however an open question to what extent the information from these meetings has reached the members of the Strategy Working Group or to what extent this information is seen as important for the strategy process.

The roundtable discussions have been highlighted from the interviews as very useful and an interesting forum for stakeholders to meet and share experiences. It should be noted that this is not common practice in similar processes in Serbia. Many CSOs have provided suggestions and valuable information from the field, but not received much information on the progress of work of the WG in return.

However, we believe that all key stakeholders in the expected future legal aid system have so far not been sufficiently consulted. This is especially the case with representatives of the Serbian local self governments. Municipalities which participated in the LAF projects have had some opportunities to feed in their inputs. However, on the strategic level of the Working Group, the only representative of local governments has been the Ombudsperson of the City of Belgrade. The question remains, to which extent the local self-governments were informed/consulted about potential additional responsibilities in managing or overseeing the new legal aid structures and, furthermore, about the potential new challenges for municipalities in terms of finance and organization.

Progress has been made towards increased visibility of the project and the process of drafting a Legal Aid Strategy by posting information about the project on the official website of the MoJ, on the website of the Legal Aid Fund as well as by production of a LAF newsletter. Visibility activities were also envisaged in all individual projects funded by LAF. It is assessed that significant attention has been given to these activities by the users of the Fund on the local level (by the production of posters, leaflets, local TV programs, etc).

One of the activities intended to contribute to this output is a national media campaign envisaged as a tool for promotion of the Strategy. This activity started during our assessment (by posting the tender) despite the fact that the draft strategy document is not yet completed. This is one of the situations where project activities are running before key results are achieved.

Another example is the international conference planned for October 23-24. It has been envisaged as the event for presentation of the draft strategy paper to be discussed among different stakeholders and international experts. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that the document will be ready to be presented, due to the delays, the pending differences amongst members of the WG, and its general inefficiency.

In each of the mentioned cases, activities have to reflect the reality and possible delay in reaching agreement within the WG regarding the Strategy. Being aware that the national media campaign as well as the international conference are activities which have already entered the implementation phase, it will be necessary to adapt them to the present situation in order to maximize usefulness and cost-efficiency.

Strategy for Reforming the Legal Aid System

Strategy

Set out as a short term goal of the first phase of the project,⁶ the development of a strategy is regarded as the main output under Track I. For this purpose, the MoJ has nominated a Working Group responsible for devising a strategic approach towards the establishment of a legal aid system. The Working Group was nominated by the Ministry of Justice autumn 2007, but became operational with its current members in April 2008. The members of the WG are now representing most stakeholders in the current legal aid system, including the NGO sector, the Bar Association, the Ministry of Justice and the key bodies of the judicial sector. However, given the current mandate and possible future role of municipalities as providers of legal aid, there is a shortage of representatives from the municipal bodies.

Since the last PMG mission, the WG has held several meetings. A national consultant has also been appointed recently to support the drafting of the strategy. There seem to be a general understanding of the role of the WG in the strategy process, although there are several key issues that need to be agreed upon within the group in terms of scope and focus of the new legal aid strategy. These conceptual and theoretical issues have absorbed a large amount of the WG agenda during the meetings. At the time of the mission there was a deadlock in the WG, due to major differences of opinion on the scope of a new legal aid system between the members. The problems were expected to be solved in a meeting with the Minister of Justice shortly.

Due to delays in appointing the WG and effects of the political changes in the Ministry of Justice the group has not been able to work as efficient as expected in the work plan. There is a deadline for presenting the draft strategy by the end of October at the scheduled international conference. The readiness of the WG to prepare a comprehensive strategy paper, in cooperation with the PIU, remains unclear. Given these conditions the timeframe is rather ambitious and unrealistic if the strategy document shall be a joint product of all the members of the WG and include the results from all the other ongoing activities linked to this process. As described in the project document the consultative and participatory process has been regarded a cornerstone in the project to promote the implementation of the strategy and eventually the development of an acknowledged Law on Legal Aid by most of the stakeholders.

Research

During the last mission the PMG was informed about two key research studies to be carried out through procurement of national consultants. The first was an assessment of the financial aspects of a new legal aid system and the second was a public opinion survey on beneficiaries of legal aid. Both studies have been procured through competition. The financial research has been finalised and shared with the PMG during the assignment and the survey on beneficiaries will be completed shortly. The PMG has not assessed the content or quality of these studies. It was presumed that the surveys would provide important information for the strategy process and be key documents for the Working Group in drafting the strategy.

Track II – Assessment of Outcomes

The Legal Aid Fund

The Legal Aid Fund (LAF) has proven to be both innovative and constructive. The LAF has promoted contacts and cooperation between different stakeholders, on the local as well as on the national level. Furthermore, the LAF has generated relevant knowledge about legal aid in practice and different forms of cooperation between the current providers of legal aid. During the project two open calls have been issued, and a number of small grants have been provided to partnerships of providers at the local level. Data has been collected through the

⁶ UNDP (2006).

installed database, requiring all partners to provide detailed information about the legal aid cases. The results from the first open call have been compiled and assessed, and the result from the second round was expected to be finalised shortly. In addition to the information compiled in the database, experiences have also been shared in the roundtable discussions.

One of the two short-term goals of the project (first phase) is “to increase access to justice for the most vulnerable and marginalized groups through the creation of a Legal Aid Fund”. It is also clearly stated that the fund will serve to test different models of providing legal aid, in order to generate knowledge that will be fed into the process of drafting the strategy. The LAF has primarily been used as a test mechanism with a disbursement of relatively small size grants. The grants themselves have not significantly led to a change in ability to provide more legal aid among the providers. Nevertheless, they have contributed to a more efficient use of resources as the partnerships have proven to be successful. Especially this has been highlighted by the municipal legal aid providers. We believe that it was wise to limit the size and number of grants and pay more attention to other potential outputs of the LAF than mere expansion of legal aid activities in the field. It is a challenge to decide what to do with the LAF in the future, given that a lot of effort has been made to install the database and design a procurement mechanism for the open calls.

The PMG believes that LAF has contributed to provide some valid and reliable knowledge about different ways of providing legal aid. The experiences of the LAF have also been made more visible for the public through the Web page and newsletter produced. NGOs have been recognised for their ability and special competence to provide legal aid for marginalised groups. The increased cooperation between different kinds of legal aid providers has promoted an understanding between, and knowledge-sharing among them. More significant, the NGO sector seems to have obtained an improved status among other providers as an important actor of primary legal aid especially at the local level. And the cooperation has also contributed to strengthen the role of the municipalities in the area. The PMG believes that the advantages of different legal aid providers needs to be further encouraged and promoted at a national and policy level. We therefore have some concerns about how these experiences are integrated in the strategy process of the Working Group.

In the initial project document the expectations were high as the LAF was expected to “ascertain the quality of legal aid given by various providers, the real needs of the beneficiaries, the optimal model for financing legal aid in Serbia, etc.”⁷ The PGM assess the result of the LAF more as contributed with information rather than the aim of increased access to justice. Other activities in the project such as the financial assessment and the study on beneficiaries will also provide important input. It has been unclear to the PGM how these activities have been coordinated to ensure that the analysis provided to the WG is comprehensive and synchronised since they have been overlapping. The project document also envisaged a third round of the LAF open calls. Given the deadline of the project, this will not be completed in this first phase of the project.

We assess the LAF structure to have worked well for the purpose of this first phase of the project. The Fund is managed and supervised by the UNDP and the AP. The fact that the Advisory Panel is an independent body promotes the idea of an independent status of the legal system. However the mechanism itself needs to be further assessed as a structure if it is to be a more permanent body. Given the uncertainties of the strategy process it is too early to predict the role of a potential LAF structure in the new legal aid system.

Project Implementation Arrangements

The most important bodies directly involved in the management of the project are the Steering Committee, the NPD, the PIU, the UNDP, the Advisory Panel of the LAF, and the MoJ-appointed Working Group.

⁷ UNDP (2007c).

The project implementation arrangements have been complicated and the ownership a bit unclear to the PMG, with several key bodies in charge of decision making and with responsibility for the different components. The MoJ was expected to have a key role in the development of the strategy, but has faced some setbacks due to political turmoil, new elections, the late establishment of an effective Working Group and a weak PIU.

We understand that the delay in having the project bodies established and operational, has influenced the progress of the project and the timing of the project activities. The reasons for the delays have although to a large extent been understandable, but it seem to have created a pressure on the project staff and stakeholders to rush through activities in order to catch up, instead of sticking to careful and thorough planning and execution. Given the deadline of the draft strategy, the delay in providing input from the project into the Working Group will most likely limit the value and relevance of the input.

Concerning the relationship between the principal implementing partners, the UNDP and the Ministry of Justice, it is still our overall impression that the partnership is open and guided by mutual interest and respect. Due to the shift in the MoJ after the election, and the weakness of the PIU to be operational, UNDP has held a very strong role in the project. It is unclear to the PMG how much ownership the MoJ is considered to have at this stage. We acknowledge that the initial project document highlight capacity building of the MoJ as important for a potential next phase. The question is rather to what extent this project phase has generated capacity and ownership within the MoJ.

The present *Working Group* for the legal aid strategy had its first meeting in April 2008. The new Working Group includes members from many key stakeholders within the legal aid system, including representation from the NGO sector. Still the mandate of the WG and scope of the strategy are yet to be clarified. A comprehensive work plan for the strategy process has not been made, but the key topics for the legal aid strategy have been agreed upon. A national consultant has been contracted to support the WG in drafting the strategy. She had at the time of the mission been present at one of the WG meetings. The WG has also been supported by an international consultant presenting the Dutch legal aid system. The current deadlock in the WG strategy process is expected to be solved by the MoJ and the analysis of a constitutional expert.

The *Project Implementation Unit* was established in March 2007 with office premises within the MoJ. The PIU was expected to have a key role in the project in terms of supporting the Working Group for developing the strategy, and to a large extent be a link between the two components as the experience from the Track II piloting will be fed into the strategy process of the Working Group.

The PIU has suffered from high staff turn-over, with three out of four staff members leaving the unit. Several activities have been undertaken by UNDP to support and capacitate the PIU staff. The role and responsibilities of the PIU have been developed and the staff has been able to increase its role as a focal point for information and administration of the project. The initial role of the PIU was however too ambitious.

There was a shift of *National Project Director* within the MoJ in August. The NPD is now appointed coordinator of the WG, and has at the time of the mission attended one of the meetings of the WG. She is also informed by the PIU on a regular basis on the development of the project. The PMG sees the higher involvement of the NPD in the work of the strategy as a strength. This may also facilitate more national ownership of the process. The former NPD is now appointed Minister of Justice.

The *Advisory Panel for the Legal Aid Fund* has been operating since May 2007, and comprises members with a distinct and vast knowledge on legal aid and the judicial system. The main functions of the Panel are to guide and oversee the work of the Legal Aid Fund. Furthermore, it should analyse the lessons learned from the pilot activities and formulate policy recommendations.

The *Legal Aid Fund staff* (consisting of a Fund Manager, a Finance Assistant and a Project Assistant) is working on a daily basis on the LAF mechanism, planning and preparing the interventions and coordinating the work of the Advisory Panel. The UNDP Programme Specialist and backstopping team has overseen the work of the Legal Aid Fund staff and supported the MoJ and the PIU when appropriate. The UNDP staff is qualified, motivated and dedicated. Our main concern regards the predominant role of the UNDP in the process. Due to the relative weak capacity of the Ministry of Justice, the Working Group, the Project Implementation Unit and the Advisory Panel, the role of the UNDP has grown in a way that is deemed problematic in terms of ownership and sustainability.

Follow-Up of Recommendations from Previous PMG Report

In our first report⁸ we conclude by giving a number of comments, observations and recommendations. A brief follow-up of relevant recommendations is given below.

Recommendation: Increase NGO participation

Positive developments can be seen. The major arena for NGO participation is the LAF. The LAF serves as a platform through which NGOs may participate in theoretical discussions as well as in the practical testing of methods. The fact that the Advisory Panel decided to accept NGOs as contract holders for LAF grants was a major step forward for NGO participation.

Work-shops and roundtables carried out as Track I activities, also serve as platforms for NGO participation.

The explicit NGO representative in the Working Group (representing CUPS) guarantees some insight of NGOs into the development of the strategy. In reality however, few people outside the Working Group really have a chance to follow developments within the Working Group. Chances for contributing to and influencing the discussions are naturally even more limited. Thus, NGOs have been given a greater role in the project through the LAF but interaction with the Working Group is still too limited.

Recommendation: Increase transparency

Limited positive developments can be seen. Among the encouraging developments it may be noted that a bilingual LAF website – including a web forum – was introduced in July 2008. (www.fondpp.rs) Furthermore, the first issue of a quarterly LAF newsletter (first intended to be monthly) has been issued. Information may also be reached through the website of the Ministry of Justice (www.mpravde.sr.gov.yu).

Despite these developments, transparency is still not satisfactory. More could be done by the UNDP and by the Working Group/the MoJ to open up and given stakeholders and outsiders a chance to follow, for example, the development of plans and strategies. The websites and the newsletter can be developed further.

Recommendation: Do not rush implementation of activities in order to catch up with original time plan

We note that this is still a problem. As explained elsewhere in this report we question if it was wise to invite to an international conference to present the draft strategy, when so much work is still to be done by the Working Group. A similar question could be raised concerning the national media campaign.

Recommendation: Increase clarity concerning central terms, relations between objectives and activities and a more consistent use of indicators and means of verification

There has been some improvement in terms of clarifying the expected results of the project. A major progress is the common understanding of the strategy on legal aid as a key result. The structure of the work-plan has also been improved. However objectives remains imprecisely

⁸ SIPU (2007). The report is dated December 19, 2007.

defined, the expected results are also vague and the use of indicators is mostly linked to the activity level. The relationships between the different components also need to be more specified.

Recommendation: Strengthen gender awareness within the project

This issue has not been followed up thoroughly by the PMG. We note that gender awareness is not discussed in any of the progress reports, but cannot exclude that gender awareness strengthening has been part of capacity building activities.

Recommendation: The next phase of the project should pay much higher attention to strengthening capacities within the MoJ

As there is yet no draft project document for Phase II, this recommendation cannot yet be followed-up.

4. Conclusions

The second monitoring mission has been completed and the main conclusions will be presented in the form of a SWOT-analysis.

We cannot claim to have the full picture of the project and the context in which it operates. We have, however, made some observations of what we believe are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of/to the project. It is our hope that these observations will serve to strengthen the many positive processes that have already started as a result of the project. Hopefully, the observations may also give some input to the efforts being made to overcome some weaknesses and avoid some threats.

The relevance of the project has not changed since our first report. The lack of adequate legal aid today cause great suffering for many individuals in Serbia. The poor and vulnerable are the ones that suffer the most. An effective, accessible and affordable legal aid system is very relevant considering the present situation. A project to promote this development is fully in line with Serbian as well as Swedish priorities and policies. The intended outputs of the project have a potential for leading towards the project goal. However, due to delays, it is unlikely that the project will reach the goals of the first phase in time.

Strengths

Increased understanding and cooperation between different legal aid providers

The project has very much contributed to an increased understanding and cooperation between different providers of legal aid. The Legal Aid Fund has been especially important in this regard, as it has stimulated cooperation between different kinds of actors on the ground. Stakeholder meetings and roundtable discussions have further fostered mutual understanding. Any understanding and cooperation between providers is positive, but the increased understanding between the Bar Association and (other) NGOs is especially worth highlighting. Relations between providers are still far from perfect, but progress has been made.

Increased insights into different models of legal aid and intensified discussions on the future system

The project has carried out many activities serving the purpose of providing insights into different models of providing legal aid. Some models have been tested on the ground through the LAF, others have been studied through study trips or been presented in meetings or through consultants. We believe that these activities have contributed to an increased insight among different stakeholders, including the members of the Working Group.

Strengthened commitment of the MoJ for legal aid

The Ministry of Justice had a commitment to increase access to justice by establishing a system for the provision of legal aid. This was one of the basic requirements for starting the project in the first place. We believe that the project to some extent has served to further promote this commitment.

Potentially useful data has been generated through research and the LAF

The project has succeeded in generating plenty of relevant information on different aspects of legal aid, including beneficiaries, providers, costs and financing, management, quality control etc. The LAF has been instrumental and the research conducted and the work-shops

organized have also contributed. (Some activities were, however, delayed and the research reports on beneficiaries and financing were not completed at the time of our visit.) Information and data has regularly been provided to the Working Group. It remains to be seen to which extent the information is actually used efficiently by the Working Group.

Model for participatory law drafting

The project has shown the possibilities of and advantages with involving stakeholders in law drafting. It may be that this can inspire further participatory law drafting. From a financial point of view, however, less costly ways of stakeholder participation should be sought.

Weaknesses

Capacity building within the MoJ is limited

Many discussions have been held, much relevant information has been generated, and many lessons have been learnt on how to manage, provide and follow-up legal aid. Thus, capacity has been built. Unfortunately, very little of this capacity has been built within the Ministry of Justice. The Project Implementation Unit is located within the MoJ premises but not formally i part of the Ministry . Prospects for the PIU being transformed into a MoJ unit are unknown to us. The UNDP can be said to be the organization which has gained the most capacity through the project. Re-directing capacity building to the MoJ must be a priority.

UNDP is leading/pushing the project instead of the Working Group/the MoJ

The limited capacity of the MoJ and the limited efficiency of the Working Group has very much left the project in the hands of the UNDP. Despite delays and some technical problems, the UNDP is carrying out project activities basically in accordance with plans. The differences in capacity/efficiency between these main bodies have resulted in the UNDP taking the lead of the project. From a sustainability point of view, this is unfortunate.

The Working Group is not functioning as efficient, nor as transparent, as expected

The Working Group existed before the project was formulated. It has since been re-formed. The present WG had its first meeting in April 2008. Our interviews have shown that the mandate of the group has not been clear to all members. Different understandings of the mandate is still a problem. For long periods of time the WG stayed inactive. Partly this was due to political turmoil connected with national elections. Even if we have no full insight into the internal organization and procedures of the WG, our impression is that it is not functioning efficiently. This is a major problem, seriously affecting the prospect for drafting an effective, accessible and affordable legal aid system in a way which includes major stakeholders and takes advantage of available experience and resources. As the Working Group has not been able to solve its problems up until today, there is a need for intervention from the Minister of Justice.

The PIU is not functioning as efficient as expected

The PIU has not been able to live up to the expectations expressed in the project document. This is partly due to factors like high staff turn-over, accidents, and bureaucratic obstacles. The PIU has also suffered from the fact that the Working Group has not functioned efficiently, and from the fact that expectations on the PIU were possibly too high to start with. Nevertheless, the capacity of the PIU has increased over the year.

Transparency ought to increase

Limited positive developments can be seen, for example in the form of a bilingual LAF website and a LAF newsletter. Furthermore, some information may be reached through the website of the Ministry of Justice. Despite these developments, transparency is still not satisfactory. More could be done by the UNDP and by the Working Group/the MoJ to open up and given stakeholders and outsiders a chance to follow, for example, the development of plans and strategies. The websites and the newsletter can be developed further.

The goals of the first phase⁹ have not been reached

The first phase of the project has been extended for three months and there is still some time before this phase comes to an end in January 2009. We assess it to be unlikely that the goals of the first phase will be met in time, and this can naturally be regarded as a weakness.

Opportunities

Insights among, and understanding between, stakeholders have increased and can be built upon

The LAF grants provided in the two open calls have proven very useful for enhancing insights among, and understanding between, stakeholders. Work-shops and round tables have served the same function. As mentioned above, the increased understanding between the Bar Association and (other) NGOs is worth highlighting. Progress in this area is very valuable for the continuation of the project.

There is a willingness within the MoJ of creating an effective and sustainable legal aid system

As mentioned above, there is a commitment within the MoJ to establish a legal aid system. This is a valuable precondition to depart from when working to solve issues of capacity, financing etc.

There is an increased amount of relevant data, knowledge, models and ideas circulating – thus providing a better basis for reaching conclusions on a suitable legal aid system

Even if some research activities have been delayed, there is still plenty of relevant data and information at hand. The different legal aid providers in Serbia are often very experienced and the project has promoted the exchanges of their experiences, knowledge and ideas, thus making them accessible for other stakeholders. This solid base of knowledge and experience is very valuable for the continuation of the project.

Threats

Agreement on the strategy may not be reached within the Working Group

We believe it to be unlikely that a consensus on the draft strategy will be reached in the Working Group in the immediate future. But the lack of consensus may not necessarily be a great problem. The problem would be if the rift is so huge that many stakeholders feel that their arguments, experiences and capacities have not been taken seriously. If a draft strategy is approved by a strong majority against a minority which feels marginalized, this may cause serious damage to the future implementation of the strategy.

The drafting of the strategy and the law may be rushed, at the cost of stakeholder participation, discussion and consensus-building

At the time of our visit the national consultant was drafting the strategy to be discussed in the Working Group. The draft document was not yet finished and had not been circulated. The document will contain a great number of difficult issues that have to be thoroughly discussed before any draft strategy may be published. The research papers on beneficiaries and on financing are still to be circulated and discussed in the Working Group and eventually included in the draft strategy. Likewise with the forthcoming report of the Quality Control Group. Thus, some additional time will be needed before the Working Group will be able to present a draft strategy. Nevertheless, invitations were sent out late August inviting international experts to a conference to be held in Belgrade on October 23-24. The aim of the conference, according to the invitation, is to “present the Draft Strategy”. There is a risk that

⁹ According to the project document, the long-term goal of the first phase of the project is to “establish a roadmap for the creation of an effective and affordable state-funded and run legal aid system for those who cannot afford legal services.” The project document goes on to state that the short-term goals are “to formulate a strategy for the reform of the legal aid system that will be accepted by the key stakeholders and to increase access to justice for the most vulnerable and marginalized groups.”

the Working Group will rush the drafting of the strategy at the cost of stakeholder participation, discussion and consensus-building.

Project activities are carried out earlier than what would be ideal, due to the approaching end of the project phase

The above mentioned international conference is one example of this tendency. The national level media campaign, planned for the end of the first project phase, is another. These activities can probably be used in a positive way, but the cost-efficiency of such activities is doubtful.

Financing of a system may not be secured

The financing of a future legal aid system is far from being solved. A study on financial implications has recently been conducted, but the report was still not circulated at the time of our visit. As little is still known about the possible future legal aid system, even less may be said about the financial needs. Contrary to what was hoped for, the Ministry of Finance has been largely absent from the discussions within the project, even if the Ministry of Finance formally forms part of the Steering Committee. Furthermore, the somewhat limited involvements of local self governments in devising the future legal aid system may be problematic, as they could very well be key actors in the future system also in financial terms. It is easy to foresee that the financing of a comprehensive and efficient legal aid system will be problematic.

Article 67 of the Constitution may hinder the development of a suitable law

Article 67 of the Constitution¹⁰ remains potentially problematic. According to some, it may be interpreted as if only Bar Associations and municipal legal aid offices are eligible for state legal aid funding. This would undoubtedly limit the possibilities of (other) NGOs of providing legal aid services on similar terms. A draft law that would treat the Bar and (other) NGOs as equal providers in the legal sense may very well be stopped in Parliament due to unconstitutionality. The prospects for changing the Constitution are assessed as slim.¹¹

The goal of increasing access to justice for the poor and vulnerable may be hindered if the overall judicial reform strategy is unsuccessful

An efficient legal aid system can do little to protect the rights of the individual if the judicial system as a whole does not live up to minimum standards of rule of law. Thus, the full potential of the project is dependent on, and limited by, progress in the other reform areas identified in the National Judicial Reform Strategy.

Cost-Efficiency

The cost-efficiency of the project as a whole is still a bit early to assess. There is a risk that the goals of the first phase will not be met. If this is the case, the cost-efficiency of the first phase must be regarded as rather low. Much depends on the efficiency of the Working Group, which to a large extent is out of the control of the project. A definite assessment of the cost-efficiency of the project as a whole will have to wait. As described in the chapter above, the cost-efficiency of specific activities shows a mixed record. The project budget has been adhered to.

¹⁰ “Everyone shall be guaranteed right to legal assistance under conditions stipulated by the law. Legal assistance shall be provided by legal professionals, as an independent and autonomous service, and legal assistance offices established in the units of local self-government in accordance with the law. The law shall stipulate conditions for providing free legal assistance.” (Parliament of Serbia, 2006)

¹¹ In order to gain more knowledge on this issue, and limit the possible threat, a constitutional expert is being asked to join the Working Group and the Constitutional Court may be asked for a formal opinion.

The Way Ahead

We were asked by Sida to “Assess any new project proposal for the continuation of the project” but as there is yet no new proposal this has not been done¹². However, we cannot finish this report without giving a few comments on the way ahead.

The idea of the second phase has been to “strengthen the newly established legal aid system through technical, institutional and financial support.”¹³ As we doubt that there will be a “newly established legal aid system” at the end of the first phase, we believe that the way ahead has to be rethought.

In case the goals of Phase I are not met before the end of January 2009, we recommend that Phase II should be delayed for some time¹⁴. The time between Phase I and Phase II should be a period in which:

- The Working Group is given time and possibilities to thoroughly discuss substance matters, and to discuss a draft strategy with national stakeholders.
- The internal dynamics within the Working Group is improved – possibly with the intervention of the Minister of Justice.
- The MoJ and the Working Group take the initiative to discuss and specify the need for external support in the coming period. Based on these needs and specific requests, an actor external to the UNDP should ideally draft a possible project document for Phase II.

We continue to believe that a project of developing and establishing an effective, accessible and affordable legal aid system is still very relevant, that the strengths and the opportunities of the project so far can be taken advantage of, and that Sida can play an important role also in the future.

¹² During our visit some rough ideas on the content of the coming Phase II project proposal were informally presented to us. We have chosen not to comment on this very rough and incomplete draft.

¹³ UNDP (2008f)

¹⁴ Whether Phase II is “delayed”, Phase I “extended” or a “reformulated Phase II introduced”, is a semantic question. We choose to call this a period between Phase I and Phase II in order to make our point clear.

Annex 1 - Terms of Reference

July 12, 2007

Lisa Mossberg/Helena Sancho

Reference: 2006-001781

TERMS OF REFERENCE

for a Project Monitoring Group in reference to the project *Creating an effective and sustainable system of providing Free Legal Aid in Serbia*

Background

Sida is supporting a project in Serbia on the creation of an effective and sustainable system of providing free legal aid. The project aims to increase access to justice for the most vulnerable and marginalized groups of the Serbian society. At the same time it will provide support to the Government of Serbia in the fulfilment of its international human rights obligations. The overall goal of the project is thus to support the establishment of an effective and affordable state-funded and run legal aid system for those who can not afford legal services.

The project, which is carried out in cooperation with the UNDP, is implemented by the Project Implementation Unit placed in the Ministry of Justice. The project extends over the period of two years (November 2006 – October 2008) with a total Sida budget of 8 832 000 SEK. For additional information see the Project Assessment Memo dated June 2006.

The assignment

Due to the rather specific expertise necessary for assessing the implementation, Sida has decided to assign an independent so called Project Monitoring Group (PMG) to monitor and assess the project.

The PMG shall function as a special resource to Sida and UNDP with regard to the continuous monitoring and follow-up of the performance of the project. The PMT will be requested to provide analysis and recommendations on the general progress as well as on the Annual Work Plans and Annual progress reports. Two evaluation missions are foreseen; after the first and the second year of the project implementation.

Conclusions and recommendations presented in the second monitoring mission report will be an important input for the consideration of further support to the free legal aid System (after the period of two years).

Scope of Work

Monitoring of the project implementation during the implementation period.

The PMG shall:

- Assess achievements in relation to the specific project objectives and indicators; adherence to time and work plan for the project.
- Analyse the development of a reform strategy for the provision of legal aid, giving special reference to the assessment of the sustainable funding of a legal aid system through the Serbian Government's increased financial contributions.
- Assess the local ownership of the process of developing a reform strategy for the provision of free legal aid.
- Discuss the conditions for sustainable results.
- Assess the relevance of the project to Sidas general objective "to contribute to creating conditions that enable poor people to improve their living conditions"
- Assess the extent to which a "rights perspective" is applied in the project activities.
- Assess the outcome of the project and the continued risk assessment (continued analysis of identified preconditions and risks in regard to the implementation of the project).
- Analyse the cost-effectiveness of the project activities (analysis of the initial allocation of resources and budget utilization) and adherence to the original budget for the project.
- Assess to what extent the results and experiences of the work of the recipients of grants from the Legal Aid Fund are successfully incorporated into the Assessment Survey for the establishment of a state funded legal aid system.
- Assess how NGOs and Civil Society Organisations providing Free Legal Aid, both those that are and those that are not recipients of grants from the Free legal aid Fund are influenced by the project and integrated in the strategic process.
- Evaluate the communication and co-ordination between the working group and other relevant stakeholders in the area of free legal aid.
- Assess the impact of the public information campaign.
- Assess the disbursement of grants to organizations providing free legal aid by the Legal Aid Fund.
- Assess the effectiveness of the overview carried out by the Advisory Panel over the Legal Aid Fund.
- Evaluate the coordination with other related projects in Serbia and assess how to generate synergy effects to increase the impact of the project.
- Discuss how the gender aspects have been integrated in the planning, management and implementation of the project.
- Assess any new project proposals for a continuation of the cooperation in the area of free legal aid submitted to Sida by UNDP.

- When relevant analyse how the recommendations/remarks from the previous monitoring and evaluation missions are taking into account by the project implementation team.

Methodology

The assignment will include two missions to Serbia and a close dialogue with representatives of the National Project Director, the Project Implementation Unit, the Working Group, other relevant departments of the Ministry of Justice, the UNDP Programme Specialist, the UNDP Backstopping Team, the Legal Aid Fund Advisory Panel, the Legal Aid Fund staff and other stakeholders within legal aid (including municipal legal aid offices, the Bar Association of Serbia, NGOs, trade unions, Centres for Social Welfare).

In the light of information acquired, the study shall analyse and assess the aspects that have been surveyed in respect of reliability and relevance, and a general assessment of UNDP reports to Sida.

The assignment shall result in concrete recommendations directed both to Sida and UNDP. Recommendations are to be stated briefly, clearly and in an analytical manner.

Time schedule

The first missions will take place following the submission by UNDP of the semi annual report on July 31, 2007, preliminary in the end of September or early October 2007. The second visit will be made during 2008 either after the submission of the Annual report in January or following the submission of the semi annual after July 31, 2008.

The first PMG report should be submitted to Sida no later than November 15, 2007.

The second PMG report should be submitted to Sida at a date to be decided by Sida at a later date.

Reporting

The reports should not exceed 20 pages and be restricted to analysis and conclusions including recommendations. The reports shall be submitted to Sida in two printed copies and one digital.

A meeting should be held with the Swedish Embassy in Belgrade both in the beginning and the end of each visit.

A follow-up meeting with Sida Stockholm should be held after submitting each PMG report to discuss the findings and recommendations. Sida will decide if other stakeholders are to be invited to these meetings.

Specification of requirements

The tenderer shall offer services described within the framework of the assignment.

The tenderer shall have documented knowledge and experience of making project reviews. The tenderer shall have documented experience in the area of judicial reform and preferably also from the field of Legal Aid.

The tenderer shall specify how he or she considers the assignment should be implemented. The tenderer shall specify the methods he or she intends to use to implement the assignment and to guarantee quality in the work performed.

The tenderer shall specify how the assignment will be organised. The tenderer shall specify the qualifications of each and every member of the personnel/sub-consultants he intends to make available for the assignment and shall attach a CV for each person. All CVs should be certified that the information on the person in question is correct.

The tenderer shall specify the level of knowledge that is offered in Swedish and English in speech and writing and in other languages for the personnel/sub-consultants allocated to the assignment.

The tenderer shall specify the shortest possible period of time for personnel/ sub-consultants to make themselves available for the assignment.

The tenderer shall describe previous experience of similar assignments that have been performed during the last three years and at least two referees for these assignments (the names and telephone numbers of the referees should be given). The persons in question should also have been informed that they are to act as referees.

The tenderers shall specify the total cost of the assignment, in the form of an hourly fee for each category of personnel, any reimbursable expenses and any other costs and rebates. All types of costs shall be given in SEK, excluding VAT.

The tenderer shall submit a proposal for a time schedule and a work plan for the implementation of the assignment. The tenderer shall accept Sida's general conditions and state whether the draft contract is acceptable and report any reservations in respect of the contractual conditions.

Budget:

The maximum budget for the PMT is SEK 350 000.

Annex 2 – Persons Interviewed

Ministry of Justice

- Ms. Gordana Pualic – State Secretary

The Working Group on Legal Aid

- Mr. Milan Markovic – Public Attorney of the Republic of Serbia
- Ms. Milica Popovic-Djurickovic – President of Fifth Municipal Court of Belgrade
- Mr. Sasha Gajin – Center for Advanced Legal Studies – CUPS
- Ms. Dusanka Gacesa – City Ombudsman, Belgrade

UNDP

- Ms. Olivera Puric - Team Leader, Governance Cluster
- Ms. Jelena Manic – Programme Manager, Judicial Reform/Rule of Law Cluster
- Ms. Marija Lukic – Manager, Legal Aid Fund, Governance Cluster
- Mr. Neven Dobrijevic – Legal Aid Fund, Governance Cluster
- Ms. Ana Jerosimic - Legal Aid Fund, Governance Cluster

Project Implementation Unit

- Ms. Bojana Solevic – Manager of the Project Implementation Team
- Ms. Sanja Laci – Coordinator at the Project Implementation Team
- Ms. Milica Djunic – Coordinator at the Project Implementation Team

The Advisory Panel of the Legal Aid Fund

- Ms. Ljubica Milutinovic – Deputy President of the Serbian Supreme Court

The Quality Control Group

- Mr. Dragi Krstic – President of Bar Association of Nis
- Ms. Biljana Bjeletic – Bar Association of Pancevo

Municipality of Indjija

- Mr. Petar Janjic –Assistant Mayor

Municipality of Vracar

- Ms. Tijana Zivkovic-Blagojevic – Municipality Council Member

Committees for Human Rights in Serbia (CHRIS)

- Mr. Dragan Dordevic - Coordinator

Serbian Democratic Forum (SDF)

- Mr. Miodrag Linta – President of Managing Board

Swedish Helsinki Committee

- Mr. Goran Miletic – Human Rights Adviser

Out of Circle

- Ms. Lepojka Mitanovska – President
- Ms. Svjetlana Timotic (Vovjodina)
- Ms. Verica Ristic (Kragujevac)

Initiative for Development and Cooperation

- Mr. Rastko Brajkovic – Legal Adviser
- Mr. Miodrag Nedeljkovic, Executive Manager

Humanitarian Center for Integration and Tolerance (HCIT)

- Ratko Bubalo – President of the Managing Board

The Bar Association

- Mr. Dejan Ciric – Vice-President of the Bar Association of Serbia

Consultant for drafting the strategy

- Ms. Nevena Petrusic – National Consultant

Embassy of Sweden

- Ms. Snezana Nenadovic – Development Programme Section

Annex 3 – PMG Meeting Schedule

PMG II - September 22-26, 2008

Time	Institution	Participants
Monday 22.		
09:00 - 10:30	SIDA, Belgrade	Snezana Nenadovic
11:00 - 12:30	UNDP	Olivera Puric, Jelena Manic
12:30 - 14:00	The Legal Aid Fund (staff)	Marija Lukic, Neven Dobrijevic , Ana Jerosimic
15:30 - 17:00	Strategy consultant	Nevena Petrusic
Tuesday 23.		
9:00 - 11:00	Project Implementation Unit	Joint session with all employees
11:30 - 12:30	National Project Director - Ministry of Justice	Gordana Pualic, State Secretary
13:00 - 14:00	The Working Group on Legal Aid	Milan Markovic, Milica Popovic - Djurickovic,
15:00 - 16:30	LAF Advisory Panel and Quality Control Group	Quality control: Biljana Bjeletic, Dragi Krstic Advisory Pannel: Ljubica Milutinovic, Dragisa Slijepcevic
16:30 - 17:30	Bar Association of Serbia	Dejan Ciric
Wednesday, 24.		
10:00 - 11:30	Municipality of Vracar, "Out of Circle" and the parnters, including Vracar Municipality	"Out of Circle" NGO: Lepojka Mitanovska, President, Municipality of Vracar: Tijana Zivkovic Blagojevic
12:00 - 13:30	Serbian Democratic Forum and partners	Miodrag Linta, President Mira Barbir, Legal Officer
14:00 - 15:30	Center for Advanced Legal Studies	Sasa Gajin
16:00 - 17:30	Swedish Helsinki Committee and CHRIS	SHC: Goran Miletic, Legal Advisor CHRIS: Dragan Djordjevic, CHRIS Coordinator
Thursday, 25.		
10:00 - 11:30	Municipality of Indjija with its partners	Petar Janjić, project manager, Miodrag Nedeljko, Executive Manager IDC
13:00 - 14:00	City Ombudsman and Member of WG	Dusanka Gacesa
	Team Debriefing	
Friday, 26.		
10:00 - 11:30	Debriefing	SIDA, UNDP, PIU

Annex 4 – Literature References

CUPS, *Legal Aid Model Act*

European Commission (2007), *Serbia 2007 Progress Report*

Government of Serbia (2003), *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper for Serbia*

Ministry of Justice, Republic of Serbia (2006a), *National Judicial Reform Strategy*, April 2006

Ministry of Justice, Republic of Serbia (2006b), *Implementation Plan of the National Judicial Reform Strategy*, April 2006

Parliament of Serbia (2006), *Constitution of the Republic of Serbia*

Sida (2006a), *Decision on Contribution*, Europe/SEE, Case no. 2006-001133

Sida (2006b), *MEMO*, Snezana Nenadovic, June 2006

Sida (2007), *PMT to Free Legal Aid Project*, e-mail from Lisa Mossberg, September 26, 2007

Sida (2008), *PMG September Mission*, e-mail from Helena Sancho, August 15, 2008

SIPU (2007), *Creating an Effective and Sustainable System of Providing Free legal Aid in Serbia*, First Report of the Project Monitoring Group

UNDP (2004a), *Country Programme for Serbia and Montenegro (2005-2009)*

UNDP (2004b), *Access to Justice*, UNDP Practice Note

UNDP (2006), *Project Document*, Creating an effective and sustainable system of providing Free legal Aid in Serbia, Submission to Sida, May 29, 2006

UNDP (2007a), *Project Quarterly Progress Report for 2007*

UNDP (2007b), *Workplan*, Creating an effective and sustainable system of providing Free legal Aid in Serbia, Submission to Sida, Two versions, Not dated

UNDP (2007c), *Progress Report*, To the Swedish International Development and Coordination Agency, January-July 2007, Dated 10/08/2007

UNDP (2007d), *Summarized Note from the Consultative Meetings held in March 2007* (annex to UNDP 2007c)

UNDP (2007e), *The Legal Aid Fund – Objectives and Basic Operational Principles* (annex to UNDP 2007c)

UNDP (2007f), *Role and Composition of Legal Aid Advisory Panel and Criteria for First Open Call of FLA* (annex to UNDP 2007c)

UNDP (2007g), *Conclusions from the Conference: “Creating an Effective and Sustainable System of Providing Free legal Aid in Serbia”* (annex to UNDP 2007c)

UNDP (2008a), *Progress Report*, To the Swedish International Development and Coordination Agency, July 2007-March 2008
UNDP (2008b), *Report on the Work of First legal Aid Fund (LAF) Partners* (annex to UNDP 2008a)

UNDP (2008c), *Work Plan for 2008* (annex to UNDP 2008a)

UNDP (2008d), *Financial Reports* (annex to UNDP 2008a)

UNDP (2008e), *Response to Questions by Sida following the Second Progress Report*

UNDP (2008f), *Progress Report*, To the Swedish International Development and Coordination Agency, April-July 2008

UNDP (2008g), *List of the second open call LAF partners* (annex to UNDP 2008f)

UNDP (2008h), *Financial Reports* (annex to UNDP 2008f)

UNDP (2008i), *List of Members of the Working Group for Strategy, the Advisers and the Members of the Quality Control Group*

UNDP (2008j), *The Main Points from the Report on the Work of Legal Aid Fund Partners, Second Round*

UNDP (2008k), *Study visit to South Africa – Mission Report*

UNDP (2008l), *Conclusions from the Meeting with LAF Partners*, September 11, 2008

Utrikesdepartementet (2004), *Country Strategy, Serbia and Montenegro*, Sep 2004–Dec 2007

Utrikesdepartementet (2008), *Mänskliga rättigheter i Serbien 2007*

Annex 5 – Acronyms and Abbreviations

AP	Advisory Panel
CHRIS	Committees for Human Rights in Serbia
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CUPS	Center for Advanced Legal Studies
DEX	Direct Execution Modality
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
IDC	Initiative for Development and Cooperation
LAF	Legal Aid Fund
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoF	Ministry of Finance
NEX	National Execution Modality
NJRS	National Judicial Reform Strategy
NPD	National Project Director
PAR	Public Administration Reform
PIU	Programme Implementation Unit
PMG	Project Monitoring Group
QCG	Quality Control Group
SCTM	Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities
SDF	Serbian Democratic Forum
SHC	Swedish Helsinki Committee
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WG	Working Group