

## United Nations Development Programme Afghanistan

### Strengthening the Justice System of Afghanistan (SJSA)

### Annual Project Report



**Ministry of Justice Public Legal Awareness Workshop – Kabul, June 2008**

**Project ID:** 00047952

**Duration:** 1 January 2006 – 30 June 2009

**Strategic Plan Focus Area 2:** Democratic Governance

**Total Budget (2008):** USD 2,579,521

## Table of Contents

Executive summary .....	3
I. Context .....	4
II. Performance review .....	5
1. Overall progress towards the CPAP outcome and output(s) .....	5
2. Capacity development .....	5
3. Impact on direct and indirect beneficiaries .....	6
Implementation strategy review .....	6
1. Participatory/consultative processes .....	6
2. National ownership .....	6
3. Sustainability .....	7
Management effectiveness review .....	7
1. Quality of monitoring .....	7
4. Resources allocation .....	7
5. Cost-effective use of inputs .....	7
III. Project results summary .....	8
Summary: .....	8
Output 1: .....	8
Output 2: .....	8
Output 3: .....	9
Output 4: .....	9
V. Implementation challenges .....	10
Project risks and actions .....	10
Project issues and actions .....	10
Lessons learnt .....	11
Recommendations .....	11
Financial Section .....	12

## Executive summary

The rather broad agenda of the project document had already in the previous project years been reduced to a smaller scale, picking out several objectives for implementation. That was mainly due to budget and thus staffing and material shortage, since the start of the project. This concept had to be continued in 2008, with some parameters changed, leading to a more strategic approach.

The drafting and editing works with the NJSS and the NJP, to which the project had committed considerable energy and human resources in 2007 and in 2008 was finished in first quarter 2008 with the successful launch of the NJSS and NJP as lead documents for further justice reform activities, both having full national ownership and endorsement by the MoJ. While the chance to contribute to these key documents could be used successfully, the project in 2008 also had to pay tribute to the fact that these new lead papers are now determining the agenda and to a certain extent also the priorities, for support activities within the judicial reform process. The previous “Justice for All” concept and the project document were insofar partly outdated. Thus the project had to redefine necessary and possible activities in line with the newly applicable NJSS and NJP documents. This redefinition of Project activities was also required due to the budget restrictions. Already in 2007 the objectives were redefined by the project management. Envisaging the NJSS and NJP for 2008, but in need to determine the work plan for 2008 already at an earlier stage, in cooperation/agreement with the donors, 2 of the 15 presented Quick Impact projects, as proposed at the Rome conference in 2007 had been picked up and were elaborated as project papers from end of 2007 until early 2008. These were a Public Legal Awareness campaign, to be implemented with the PLA unit at the MOJ, and the creation of a Translation and Publication Unit within the Supreme Court.

In 2007 the Project underwent a phase of reducing response to requests for assistance by the three PJIs, and focusing on a few select targeted support activities with the partner agencies. In 2008 the Project was entirely focusing on a few selected support activities towards the three PJIs which would provide synergy with the support to be provided to the implementation of the two quick impact projects. These activities had been: providing a containerized office building for the Translation and Publication Unit at the Supreme Court, providing IT and office equipment for the units in charge of the project implementation at SC and MOJ, supporting the training workshop for MOJ PLA staff in Kabul in June 2008.

As result of the newly endorsed NJP in mid 2008 the project was requested from UNAMA/OHCHR and MOJ to take over the final editing, implementation and management of a project component to establish a “Human Rights Support Unit” (HRSU) within the MOJ. As this was still in line with the broad project’s agenda, and listed on the NJSS/NJP, the project accepted this request. From middle of 2008 the Project undertook the final drafting of the related document for the HRSU project-component, in close contact and cooperation with the technical adviser who had worked with OHCHR/UNAMA and MOJ in this context, and with the Planning and Strategy Unit of the MOJ, as well as with the Deputy MOJ. Since third quarter 2008 resource mobilization for this component commenced, expecting the achievement of necessary funding for the commencement of the activity in second quarter 2009. Meanwhile preparatory actions, including drafts for TORs for the key staff is being undertaken.

While the achieved overall results of the project in 2008 remain of course far behind the agenda and benchmarks, as set up 2005 in the project document, that effect is of course due to fact that funding did not allow the full implementation of planned activities, since the start of the project.

Having these as limits for activities in 2008, the implementation results are satisfactory. The project could successfully contribute (and add additional quality) to the NJSS/NJP; it could provide a very focused and pinpointed support, mainly to the SC and MOJ, and mainly in preparation of

further components; two components could be developed and started as selected projects from the list of 15 Quick Impact projects from Rome conference 2007; and although the start of the Human Rights Support Unit could not yet be launched in 2008, the related project document could be finished in 2008 and resource mobilization commenced. . All activities have given solid contributions to the mid and long term achievement of the objectives, set in ANDS and CPAP.

The originally planned lifespan of the project had been reached by end of 2008. It could, however, at the planning of the project not be anticipated that 2007 and 2008 will be such decisive years for the agenda of the justice reform in Afghanistan. The year of 2008 was a period of adapting to the existing scenario and to existing needs. Thus it was chosen to incorporate necessary activities into the current project agenda (PLA campaign, SCTPU and HRSU)<sup>1</sup>. To enable the progress of these activities UNDP and Government Partners agreed to an extension of the project duration, at no cost for previous donors, planning and budgeting necessary funding entirely with donor funding for the newly added components, having the “old” project agenda from the previous project document factually ending per end of 2008 and continuing project activities within the newly added components only. This might coincide with the merge of this project and the partner projects AJDL<sup>2</sup> and PJCM<sup>3</sup>.

## I. Context

2008 was a very important year in terms of development in justice reform in Afghanistan. This year saw the adoption of the National Justice Sector Strategy (NJSS) and National Justice Programme (NJP), the latter of which became the justice component of the Afghan National Development Strategy (ANDS – the Afghan PRSP). The ANDS has since been adopted in whole, and the NJP has already begun to serve as a new framework for interventions in the justice sector which is able to provide far clearer guidance, focus and coordination than was previously in place.

The SJSJ project was able to make significant contributions to these developments, appropriately, as the SJSJ project is a follow on to the successful RJSA project, which had supported the development of the “Justice for All” justice reform strategy by the national justice institutions. The RJSA project was completed at the end of 2005, and the SJSJ project was designed as a mechanism to support implementation of the elements of the Justice for All framework and the justice aspects of the Interim Afghan National development Strategy (I-ANDS) over a three-year timeframe from January 2006 until end of 2008.

The Government of Afghanistan and UNDP agreed on the parameters of the SJSJ project and signed the project document at the end of 2005. Funding for the SJSJ project, was never sufficient to support all of the proposed activities, and as a result the project’s activities were streamlined. UNDP has contributed a greater share of the funding for the project from its own core funds than it had anticipated, but did so in recognition of the key importance of the justice sector to peace building in Afghanistan and the importance of the SJSJ project’s activities to government partners. With this support and that of the project’s external donors, the project was able to make important contributions to supporting two of the three national justice institutions (the MoJ and the SCt) in spite of the overall shortfall of resources.

<sup>1</sup> PLA ,Public Legal Awareness campaign,  
SCTPU, Supreme Court Translation and Publication Unit,  
HRSU, Human Rights Support Unit

<sup>2</sup> AJDL, Acces to Justice on the District Level

<sup>3</sup> PJCM, Provincial Justice Coorerindation Mechanism

## II. Performance review

### 1. Overall progress towards the CPAP outcome and output(s)

The SJSA project supports achievement of the following goals:

ANDS (NJP) Goal 1: Improved institutional capacity to deliver sustainable justice services

UNDAF Outcome 4: By 2008, more Afghans have access to a reformed, comprehensive and effective justice system.

CPAP Outcome two – Deepening Democracy (4.12 “ensuring increased access to justice” and 4.13 “justice reform”)

As described above, the SJSA project has, in the end, been a less ambitious project than anticipated at the formulation stage. In spite of these challenges, however, it has continued to make important contributions toward meeting the justice objectives of the ANDS, the UNDAF and the CPAP, and has distinguished itself by being very much driven by the government’s own objectives. The major achievements of the project this year have been its contributions to the development and adoption of the NJP, its work with the Ministry of Justice and the Supreme Court to implement two of the projects selected by the government for presentation at the Rome Conference, and its work with the Ministry of Justice to plan for the implementation of the MoJ Human Rights Support Unit, which will have a crucial role to play in ensuring that Afghanistan meets its obligations under the human rights benchmark of the Afghan Compact. In addition to these important tasks, however, the project has also provided important assistance to the justice institutions through its ability to respond to ad hoc requests and help the justice institutions meet immediate, and unforeseen, needs.

### 2. Capacity development

The process of formulating the NJSS and NJP was an important opportunity for the government partners to undertake, many for the first time, a long term sector-wide planning process, and to do so in day-to-day partnership with senior technical advisors. The process was a critical capacity development opportunity that left strengthened capacity within the three justice institutions to engage in future planning processes.

The SJSA project’s work with the Public Legal Awareness Unit of the MoJ (PLAU) is entirely focused on capacity development. By shifting the focus from implementing a plain public legal awareness campaign to the creation of standing procedures for the selection of topics, preparation of training and delivery materials, reporting, and collection of lessons learnt, this activity targets its efforts toward building national sustainable capacity within the relevant unit of the MOJ.

The SJSA project’s work with the Supreme Court to create a Supreme Court Translation Unit similarly focuses entirely on capacity development. Here the objective is the creation of a new department within the Supreme Court which will have permanent capacity to meet the translation needs of not only the Supreme Court, but hopefully in the future other justice institutions as well.

Finally, the preparatory work that the SJSA project has done with the MoJ in 2008 regarding the Human Rights Support Unit has contributed very significantly to capacity development, as the MoJ has been supported in formulating and mobilizing resources for the support that it will need to establish this new unit – we look forward to moving forward with the implementation of this crucial activity in 2009.

### 3. Impact on direct and indirect beneficiaries

The project had focused but meaningful impact on the beneficiaries in 2008. The direct beneficiaries, the Ministry of Justice and Supreme Court, benefitted from capacity building support in areas which they themselves had identified as their priority areas. The indirect beneficiaries of the project are the people of Afghanistan, who are in need of a better functioning justice system; they benefited in particular from the contributions made by the SJSA project to the NJSS and the NJP, as the NJP is expected to significantly improve the overall coherence and impact of justice reform efforts in Afghanistan in the years to come.

## Implementation strategy review

### 1. Participatory/consultative processes

The project works extremely closely with its government partners. Two Project staff members worked in the Supreme Court during 2008, providing direct capacity building support to the Court. MoJ staff from the Public Legal Awareness Unit worked on a daily basis with project staff as they jointly developed public legal awareness materials and strategies. On a higher level, the project consulted regularly with government partners, both through project board meetings, but also far more frequently through ad hoc discussions. With the MoJ, collaboration was particularly close as the project worked with the MoJ to finalize planning for the activity and mobilize resources for the HRSU.

#### Quality of partnerships

The partnerships between the project and the government partners have been very good, as the government partners have been very pleased by the project's responsiveness to needs identified by the government. The only challenge has been at times when the project did not have sufficient resources to respond to all government requests or when some requests (e.g. new furniture for the Supreme Court) could not be fulfilled as they were not within the guidelines for the funding available. The strong partnerships developed through the project are serving as an excellent foundation for the new phase of the UNDP justice programme which is being formulated in 2009.

The project has also enjoyed excellent partnerships with other international actors working in the justice sector. In supporting the formulation of the NJSS/NJP, the project worked very closely with colleagues from JSSP, ASI, and the Italian Embassy/ISISC. The support to the MoJ HRSU is an activity that has been handed over to the project by OHCHR/UNAMA and where we continue to have a very strong partnership with the UNAMA Human Rights Unit and the OHCHR colleagues within that unit.

Finally, the project enjoys excellent synergy with other UNDP projects. The SJSA project is co-located with UNDP's other two justice projects – Access to Justice at the District Level (AJDL) and Provincial Justice Coordination Mechanism (PJCM – a joint project with UNAMA) and benefits from not only sharing facilities and operations staff, but also from collaboration on substantive work. This has been particularly valuable in respect to the work with the MoJ Public Legal Awareness Unit, where the previous experience of the AJDL project in doing public legal awareness work have contributed substantially to the work of the SJSA project.

### 2. National ownership

The SJSA project selects its activities based entirely on government-identified needs and, as a result, has always enjoyed an extremely high level of national ownership. As the project plans

future activities, it will do so under the umbrella of the NJP, which will give further structure to the way in which national priorities guide the work of the SJSA project and the justice reform process as a whole.

### **3. Sustainability**

The project has worked carefully to ensure that all of its activities produce sustainable results. This has sometimes required some shifts in the design of activities. For example, in 2008, after careful consideration, the project adjusted the modality of the support to the MoJ Public Legal Awareness Unit to increase the sustainability of the results, although doing so meant that the project would need to be implemented over a somewhat extended timeline. While it would have been faster to have the public legal awareness activities implemented through NGOs, a decision was taken that greater capacity would be developed within the MoJ if they implemented the activities themselves and the project has proceeded in this manner – which is more time consuming but ultimately very rewarding in terms of capacity development.

## **Management effectiveness review**

### **1. Quality of monitoring**

Throughout the year the Country Office has undertaken general quality assurance.

### **2. Timely delivery of outputs**

The support to the development of the NJSS and NJP was done under enormous time pressures and results were produced within the required time frames.

Support to the MoJ PLAU has faced some delays as a result of the change in modality discussed above but the activity was moving forward smoothly in the final months of the year.

Support to the Supreme Court Translation Unit faced some delays as a result of challenges in recruiting the needed staff with high level translation skills, but it also achieved significant progress by the end of the year.

Development of the HRSU activity moved forward smoothly, although resource mobilization for the activity lagged behind a bit due to donors wish to have many donors invest small amounts of resources – and a lack of sufficient donors to do so. By the end of the year, however, there was an indication that one large donor might provide sufficient support to make it possible to launch the activity in early 2009.

### **4. Resources allocation**

The Project costs constituted only 18% of the expenditures for 2008 and 82% of spending was done on development activities.

### **5. Cost-effective use of inputs**

The project has been able to use resources in a cost-effective way, especially by relying heavily on the expertise of national staff. The project has many senior national staff and a limited international presence. The project has also increased the cost-effective use of inputs but sharing expenses with the other justice projects.

### III. Project results summary

#### Summary:

#### **Output 1: Increase in number and diversity of persons receiving effective legal services from Permanent Justice Institutions.**

##### **Annual Target / Deliverables:**

**Consolidated National Justice Sector Strategy (NJSS) is edited and finalized. NJSS has national and donor acceptance. Post Rome conference on NJSS has taken place by March 2008.**

This target was fully met. The NJSS and NJP were adopted in spring 2008. The drafting process was a very intensive one, and was done under great time pressure. Significant support from international advisors was provided, but there was also a high level of national ownership from all three of the national justice institutions and the process was considered to have been a significant success and to have produced one of the best of the sectoral plans that make up the ANDS. The NJP has already had, and will continue to have, a very important and substantial global impact on the coherence and effectiveness of assistance to the justice sector in Afghanistan.

#### **Output 2: Increase in number and diversity of persons receiving effective legal services from the Ministry of Justice.**

##### **Annual Target / Deliverables**

**Improved capacity of Planning and Strategy Unit at MoJ. Hukuk department reorganized. Legal rights awareness increased through Hukuk department/Public Legal Awareness unit. MoJ developed Legal Aid policy.**

##### **Logistic assistance to MoJ:**

In response to specific needs identified by the MoJ, the SJSA project supported the MoJ through provision of IT equipment (computers, printers, etc.) to the Taqin Department and the Public Legal Awareness Unit within the MoJ. The project also provided office furniture and basic office equipment to the Huquq department after facilitating a move of the entire Huquq department (including the Public Legal Awareness Unit) to a new annex building. This was done in order to provide adequate space and decent working conditions for the PLA unit as it expands and rolls out of the planned campaign.

##### **Public Legal Awareness Campaign:**

As one of the 5 quick impact project proposals presented by the MOJ at the Rome Conference in 2007, the "Public Legal Awareness Campaign" was supported by Canada. The SJSA project joined the MoJ as an implementing partner for this project and designed a plan of action for the activity to be realized. The goal is to build the capacity of the MoJ Public Legal Awareness Unit by working side by side with them to develop and implement a public legal awareness campaign. The activity benefited from synergies with other activities, as discussed above, which had provided office and IT equipment to the PLA unit in early 2008. The recruitment process for the project team was finalized in June 2008. In June 2008 the first ever workshop by the MOJ for all PLA staff, from Kabul based offices and from all provincial offices, was supported by the project and was also used as platform to collect experience from the MOJ PLA staff and to make them familiar with the planned component activities. The assessment of previous PLA activities by MoJ and by third parties, NGOs and other donors/agencies, was accomplished by October 2008. Selection of priority topics, together with MOJ key staff and the AIHRC was finished in September 2008. The selection of districts and provinces for the roll out and the preparation of handout materials and

training materials for civic educators, in order to establish a standing operating procedure was still ongoing end of December.

#### **Legal Aid:**

Although the MOJ finished development of a policy on the implementation of Legal Aid by the end of 2008, the SJSA project was not directly involved in this initiative. The project had mapped the involvement of other actors on this issue and determined that as sufficient support was being provided through other sources and that the SJSA project's resources could be better directed toward areas enjoying less support.

#### **Human Rights Support Unit:**

In mid-2008, the SJSA project, at the request of the MoJ and UNAMA/OHCHRA, agreed to take the lead in supporting the MoJ in the establishment of a Human Rights Support Unit, a crucial entity that will be responsible for ensuring Afghanistan's compliance with the human rights benchmark of the Afghan Compact. The initial work in helping the MoJ to design the unit was done by a consultant working for UNAMA/OHCHR and UNAMA/OHCHR will continue to provide support and assistance to the SJSA project and MoJ as the implementation of the HRSU moves forward.

### **Output 3: Increase in number and diversity of persons receiving effective legal services from the Office of the Attorney General.**

#### **Annual Target / Deliverables**

**AGO to be supported in establishing of a resourceful library and technical trainings to attorneys.**

The project provided IT equipment to the AGO in early 2008. The project also provided professional technical assistance through a national staff who assisted the AGO in follow up activities on the pending PRR process. The PRR process at the AGO is expected to enter phase 2 in early 2009, following several pending agreements between the Civil Service Commission and the AGO.

The advisor to the AGO also contributes regularly to the law reform process through participation in the Law Reform Working Group. This advisor and a colleague from the Country Office, also provided input to revision of the Criminal Procedure Code through a special session of the Law Reform Working Group held in Italy in spring 2008 where the three justice institutions worked together to define the principles for finalizing the revision of the law.

### **Output 4: Increase in the number and diversity of persons receiving effective legal services from the Supreme Court.**

#### **Annual Target / Deliverables**

**Capacity building through technical assistance for SC. Supporting the establishment of accountability mechanisms. Professional translation services available at the Supreme Court.**

In March 2008, the project completed construction of a new building on the grounds of the Supreme Court which provided crucial new office space for 20 Supreme Court staff; this space was much needed due to overcrowding in the existing facilities.

The Supreme Court sought support at the Rome Conference for the establishment of a Translation and Publication Unit. Canada agreed to support this unit, and the SJSA project joined the effort as an implementing partner. Funds were available mid-year and the implementation began. In the course of preparations, the project sent a delegation of the Supreme Court management staff, who will be involved in the implementation of this component, to the 9<sup>th</sup> conference of the Federation of Legal Interpreters and Court Translators to Tampere/Finland in early June 2008. The

conference provided very useful lessons learned and best practices used in other countries in regard to legal translation. The national participants from the Supreme Court were able to gain a much better appreciation of the technical issues involved in establishing and managing such a unit; this increased capacity will be crucial in helping the Supreme Court to manage the unit in a sustainable manner.

Implementation of the unit began in July 2008, with staff recruitment and establishing work spaces for the staff, etc. We encountered some challenges in recruiting qualified staff, as this is a specialist field, but by the end of 2008 the unit was fully functional and meeting many of the Supreme Court's translation needs. One of the greatest challenges has been recruiting an international team leader with specific expertise in translation who will be able to mentor the Supreme Court colleagues and ensure the full integration of the translation unit into the Supreme Court's structures and functioning; the recruitment for that post is on-going.

The project also supplied the Supreme Court with IT equipment and in late 2008 commenced providing support in the areas of budget and asset management.

## V. Implementation challenges

### Project risks and actions

The risks identified in 2008 and actions taken to mitigate had been:

**Difficulty recruiting qualified staff:** Given Afghanistan's history, it is not surprising that it is not always easy to recruit skilled staff, particularly in a highly technical area. This created some challenges for the project this year, particularly in the area of support to the Supreme Court Translation Unit. The project has tried to mitigate this risk by being realistic in planning processes regarding how long recruitment takes, by headhunting for good staff, and by being prepared to invest a great deal of resources in capacity building of staff to help new recruits who have enthusiasm and potential but who may lack some technical expertise to acquire this expertise.

**Limited capacity in the partner government institutions:** The human capacity of the three justice institutions is limited and this has posed challenges particularly for the support to the MoJ Public Legal Awareness Unit where the capacity building process has needed to start at a quite basic level. The project has mitigated this risk by committing to invest as much project staff time as is necessary to work side by side with the government partners to strengthen their capacity – and by asking for patience from the donor for the additional time that this will require.

**Lack of funding:** The project has suffered from a lack of donor funds over the course of 2008. We attribute this at least in part to the shift in international justice sector support toward the World Bank-administered ARTF-supported Justice Sector Reform Project which has a first phase budget of over US \$27 million. We have mitigated this risk by looking for interventions that can provide a large impact, and be very meaningful to our partners, while still being relatively inexpensive.

**Security:** The deteriorating security situation in Kabul was a matter of serious concern in 2008, with specific concerns raised regarding the security of the justice institutions themselves, as our staff regularly visit the institutions and, in some cases, work there full-time. This risk was mitigated through UN Department of Security Services review of project offices in the justice institutions and adoption of measures to conceal the affiliation of national staff with UN during their visits to the institutions.

### Project issues and actions

Confusion caused by UNDP having three separate justice projects: At the beginning of 2008, UNDP had two justice projects (SJSA and AJDL); by the end of the year a third had been added (PJCM). Under the guidance of a new country director, a decision has been taken to consolidate these three projects into a single justice programme, which will be launched on 1 July 2009. This consolidation will not only avoid confusion with external partners, it will also improve synergy between different aspects of UNDP's engagement in the justice sector, streamline management structures, and create some economies of scale.

## V. Lessons learnt and next steps

### Lessons learnt

The value of the NJP: The development of the NJP was a very important step toward greater coherence and effectiveness in the justice reform process. The SJSA project is proud to have contributed to this development, and UNDP as a whole is committed to ensuring that all of its future engagements in the justice sector are fully within the framework of the NJP.

Capacity building takes time: The SJSA project this year launched two activities – support to the Public Legal Awareness Unit and the Supreme Court Translation Unit – that were intended to be “quick impact” projects and to be completed within one year. Both activities, however, focus on challenging capacity development tasks, and one of the key lessons learned this year by the project was that doing capacity building is not a quick process.

### Recommendations

Merger of UNDP justice projects: The merger of the SJSA project with the other two UNDP justice projects, AJDL and PJCM, will improve costs effectiveness and management of this project.

## Financial Section

**Table 1: Contribution overview [Jan 1, 2006 – June 30, 2009]**

DONOR NAME	CONTRIBUTIONS		CONTRIBUTIO N BALANCE
	Committed	Received	
NETHERLAND	691688	622530	69158
UNDP	395520	395520	0
UNDP	630400	630400	0
UNDP	400000	400000	0
UNDP	80000	80000	0
UK	753024	753024	0
CANADA	110965	110965	0
DFAIT	1852654	1852654	0
DENMARK	199997	199997	0
NORWAY	193496	193496	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5307743</b>	<b>5238585</b>	<b>69158</b>

**Table 2: Funding status (as of Dec 31, 2008)**

Financial Status

DONOR NAME	RECEIVED*	EXPENDITURES			PROJECT BALANCE	EARMARKED**	AVAILABLE FUNDING (as of 1 Jan of the next year 2009)	REMARKS
		Period Prior to the Reporting Year	Reporting Year Only	TOTAL				
NETHERLAND	622530	416164	160373	576537	45993		45993	
UNDP	1505919	1039495	466425	1505920	-1		-1	
UK	753024	739111	0	739111	13913		13913	
CANADA	110965	99005	0	99005	11960		11960	
DFAIT	1852654	0	260727	260727	1591927		1591927	
DENMARK	199997	0	0	199997	199997		199997	
NORWAY	193496	0	0	193496	193496		193496	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5238585</b>	<b>2293775</b>	<b>887525</b>	<b>3574793</b>	<b>2057285</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2057285</b>	

NOTE: The DFAIT, DENMARK AND NORWAY funds are the available fund for the year, 2009.

**Table 3: Annual expenditure by activity [1 January – 31 December, 2008]**

ACTIVITY	BUDGET 2008	EXPENDITURE (01 JAN - 31 DEC)	BALANCE	DLIVERY RATE
ACTIVITY01( Programme Management)	213,043.82	184,172.52	28,871.30	86.4%
ACTIVITY02( Support to MoJ)	950,047.11	359,152.10	590,895.01	37.8%
ACTIVITY03( Support to AGO)	179,414.06	163,998.44	15,415.62	91.4%
ACTIVITY04 (Support to SC)	1,094,986.76	164,016.92	930,969.84	15.0%
UNDP GMS	142,028.78	16,184.78	125,844.00	11.4%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>2,579,521</b>	<b>887,525</b>	<b>1,691,995.77</b>	<b>34.4%</b>

**Table 4: Annual expenditure by donor [1 January, 2008 – 31 December, 2008]**

DONOR	ACTIVITY	BUDGET 2008	EXPENDITURE (01 JAN- 31 DEC)	BALANCE	DELIVERY RATE	REMARKS
UNDP 00012	ACTIVITY01( Programme Management)	74,828.91	101,931.37	(27,102.46)	117.4%	
	ACTIVITY02( Support to MoJ)	223,652.11	273,653.49	(50,001.38)		
	ACTIVITY03( Support to AGO)	140,726.48	150,666.41	(9,939.93)		
	ACTIVITY04 (Support to SC)	40,792.50	37,045.91	3,746.59		
00012 Total		480,000.00	563,297.18	(83,297.18)		
Netherland 00182	ACTIVITY01( Programme Management)	29,422.19	21,256.49	8,165.70	31.0%	
	ACTIVITY02( Support to MoJ)	128,126.98	7,323.49	120,803.49		
	ACTIVITY03( Support to AGO)	38,687.58	13,280.58	25,407.00		
	ACTIVITY04 (Support to SC)	38,286.66	30,656.74	7,629.92		
UNDP GMS (%)		12,343.35	4,074.60	8,268.75		
00182 Total		246,866.76	76,591.90	170,274.86		
DFAIT 10281	ACTIVITY01( Programme Management)	108,792.72	60,984.66	47,808.06	13.4%	
	ACTIVITY02( Support to MoJ)	598,268.02	78,175.12	520,092.90		
	ACTIVITY03( Support to AGO)		51.45	(51.45)		
	ACTIVITY04 (Support to SC)	1,015,907.60	96,314.27	919,593.33		
UNDP GMS (%)		129,685.43	12,110.18	117,575.25		
10281 Total		1,852,653.77	247,635.68	1,605,018.09		
Grand Total		2,579,520.53	887,524.76	1,691,995.77	34.4%	

**Note:**

Due to internal cash flow issues, some expenditure recorded against Netherlands' funds in the first two quarters of 2008 were reversed and applied to funds that were set to expire sooner. This decreased the delivery rate of the Netherlands funds to 31% at the end of 2008, as reflected in the annual report. However, in the first four days of 2009, the entire balances of the funds were expended, bringing the delivery rate back to 100%. This will be reflected in the 2009 quarterly report.