REPORT

Understanding National Progress: A Cross Regional Exchange on Access to Justice

This report presents the main conclusions and a summary of the issues discussed during the Understanding National Progress: A Cross Regional Exchange on Access to Justice organized by the Open Society Justice Initiative in Washington D.C. in October 2016.

The workshop brought together participants from a range of country contexts including Indonesia, Nepal, South Africa and the United States. Participants brought expertise in access to justice and legal aid, in case management, data collection, conducting legal needs surveys, and developing and managing justice indices. This outcome document includes discussion on some of the needs workshop participants identified for justice data providers and data users such as classification of useful datasets, assessing and strengthening data quality, mobilizing different data sources, and increasing investment in capacities of community-based practitioners on data related tools, analytical skills and data visualization strategies.

Introduction

The two-day discussion sought to forge a common understanding of data underlying existing efforts to measure access to justice through justice indices and deepen exchange within the OSF network on these tools. Participants discussed existing strategies to measure rule of law and access to justice and explored what would be most appropriate and useful in their country contexts. The workshop focused on both methodologies (and different data sources) as well as the political practicalities of measurement. On the first day, participants discussed specific justice measurement frameworks, including the Access to Justice Index and the Rule of Law Index, how they could conceptualize measurement in access to justice, and how they might define the 'big picture' outcomes each relevant constituency would like to see over the long run. Afterwards, the focus shifted to more concrete sources of data – including administrative, survey, and experimental data – and how those different types and sources of data could contribute to constituencies' long-term goals. On the second day, the conversation moved to practical examples and case studies from experts and practitioners from South Africa, the United States, and Indonesia who had used measurement to spur change – either at the subnational or national level – or through effective government-civil society partnerships.

Key Findings, Trends and Lessons Learned

Our discussions highlighted several trends for advancing country-level strategies for strengthening and measuring access to justice. Key findings, trends, and lessons can be organized across four primary themes: (1) sources of data, (2) strategies to organize data, (3) inclusive national processes and (4) cross country learning. This section will summarize lessons in these areas.

Sources of data

First, participants agreed that it was important to think strategically about the main sources of data for understanding progress towards access to justice. Government, civil society organizations, and academia all have a role to play.

Administrative data was viewed as critical for effective service delivery, meaningful assessment of progress, and as a foundation for advocacy with governments. On the government side, data produced by the legal services community as well as national planning agencies highlighted how representational and organizational data helped deliver a picture of how services were being provided and a clearer understanding of the procedural problems justice seekers encountered while seeking remedies. Civil society providers in Indonesia, Nepal, and South Africa all highlighted how they were working to strengthen their own case management systems to provide more information of their client bases and how they seek and ultimately attain access to justice. Case management from legal aid providers, both government and civil society, can be beneficial to understand trends in justice needs, who is lacking access to justice, geographic spread of justice services, what assistance communities need to resolve disputes, the experience of marginalized groups, and the utility and impact of legal aid and paralegal services. Yet, civil society service providers mentioned challenges they face in effectively collecting and managing administrative data, which include financial and human resource limitations in developing

strong case management tools. Civil society service providers noted the need for more technical expertise and support. But measures for access to justice should go far beyond just legal aid. There is a need to better understand how to measure 'justice' in a broader sense beyond just the number of lawyers or cases, for instance. Increased attribution of administrative data in national planning processes and policy discussions can also encourage data providers to generate relevant data and incentivize organizational commitment to evidence-based policy work. However, administrative data providers need additional help with collecting, processing and managing data as well as tracking attribution. Administrative datasets can also capture socio-economic outcomes of accessing legal aid services, credibly demonstrating linkages between access to justice and socio-economic gains. Collected in real-time, administrative data potential in the justice sector has been largely left untapped by practitioners, researchers and policy makers and can contribute meaningfully to access to   justice measures of progress. Finally, participants discussed a number of challenges in generating and accessing administrative data. The data that exists is often piecemeal, with lack of comprehensive, integrated and easily comparable data. Moreover, even where data exists, it is not always made public or organized and maintained in an easily accessible manner.

Surveys can help deliver a more comprehensive picture of progress on access to justice at a point of time, including assessments oustice needs of people, how and where such justice problems are currently resolved, and the performance of various justice sector institutions from the perspective of justice seekers. Participants in all four countries who attended the workshop are exploring how data – through either government or independent non-governmental surveys – can help present a complementary picture of experiences from the perspective of ordinary people. Integrating into government surveys has particular strengths, including the comparative cost, the size of the sample, possibilities for disaggregation, boosting for particular population and the possibility of more regular surveys. However, such an approach also has weaknesses; large national surveys often do not have space for significant interrogation of particular themes and there is a risk that justice issues are not sufficiently included or deeply explored. While civil society might be able to commission much more in-depth surveys, it may not have the resources to do so each year to illustrate long-term trends, may be limited by availability of donor funding, and may lack the legitimacy of government surveys in certain circumstances. In such cases, it might be crucial to ensure government collaboration or ownership over the survey even if it is conducted by an external or civil society actor, to ensure the results are taken seriously by government and public alike. The pros and cons must be weighed given each country context.

Expert surveys and surveys of users of particular services (e.g. legal aid or a particular court) are also complements to consider in developing a holistic strategy for measurement. Expert surveys allow organizations to integrate subjective assessments of progress based on the experiences of particular key informants. User surveys, on the other hand, allow government and civil society policy makers to understand the performance of particular institutions—as opposed to general experiences seeking justice—from the perspective of the people seeking justice.

Cost benefit analysis, particularly illustrating the economic benefits of investing in legal aid or basic justice services, can be particularly persuasive to governments in incentivizing scaling up, institutionalization, and investment in legal aid and justice services. Similarly

experimental data can be useful to show the impact and value of paralegal or legal aid work.

Across countries, administrative data is currently the most prevalent. Still, the data that does exist often is not easily comparable across sectors and regions because each source of data uses different measures or indicators. However, the longitudinal and qualitative nature of administrative data, with strategic datasets and scope, can make administrative data crucial to measuring progress. Survey data and to an even lesser extent, experimental data, is not very available. However, participants were most interested in seeing new survey data developed to document the status of the justice system and justice needs of people in their country contexts, and in leveraging administrative data more effectively to show trends, patterns, and impact.

Strategies to organize data

Participants identified key constituencies involved in creating, interpreting, disseminating, and using data in their respective contexts. These include a multitude of actors such as government (executive, legislative and judicial branches as well as national ministries and local government), civil society (service providers, think tanks, and advocacy groups), government legal aid providers, donors, media, academia, and the private sector.

In organizing efforts to respond to particular constituencies there are numerous tools and mechanisms, from organizational annual reports to engaging the media. Participants discussed indices as a particularly useful tool to weigh and compare access to justice at subnational levels (in different states, provinces or districts, for example the Justice Index in the United States) or across countries (e.g. the World Justice Project Rule of Law Index). Indices have many benefits. Primarily because they rank entities either at the national (globally or regionally) or sub-national levels (districts or local governments), they can be a very useful way to interpret and present data in a simple, accessible, and compelling manner to the general public or in advocacy targeting particular institutions. When presenting data in this way, it can become clear which entities are performing "well" and which are not. This can serve as positive reinforcement for those doing well and a push to those not performing well, giving the latter motivation to adopt best practices. Indices can also reveal some of the best practices that could be applicable across contexts, providing a concrete first step for lower performing entities.

Beyond indices, civil society often seeks to incentivize government reform through the collection and analysis of data. Effective use of data to spur reform at the national or sub-national level, in policy and practice, is heavily dependent on the analysis and presentation of the data. If not presented in a concrete and relevant manner to targeted actors, the impact of data may be limited. Effective data visualization tools can prove particularly important in this process.

Inclusive national processes

Participants devoted significant time to discussing how to promote effective partnerships amongst governments and between governments and civil society. Several key lessons emerged. For one, participants from several contexts discussed that holistic pictures of progress in the justice sector require the collaboration of multiple actors—from the executive branch and the statistical agency to civil society providers and academia.

The processes by which these constituencies can be brought together to work to expanding access to justice matters. In Indonesia, participants discussed how the planning agency played a role in formally bringing civil society representatives into the strategic process to identify important datasets, develop survey instrument, as well as produce complimentary administrative data that is incorporated into assessment of progress. In the United States, participants spoke of strategies to harness civil society expertise in developing national indicators to measure access to justice. Participants emphasized the importance of process that are inclusive and participatory from the outset in generating trust and paying dividends in crafting more effective and jointly shared strategies.

Cross-country learning

One of the most useful outcomes of this workshop was the sharing of experiences, knowledge, challenges, and progress across the country contexts of South Africa, U.S., Nepal, and Indonesia. Similar approaches and tools – such as justice needs surveys, development of indices and rankings, or case management – are being utilized in differing contexts and in countries with unique challenges. In South Africa, for instance, data is often available and the degree of transparency is high, but data needs to be analyzed and harnessed effectively. On the other hand, in Indonesia, much of the basic administrative data on justice – such as the police and courts – is not either not available nor made accessible. As a result, there is great scope to share challenges and reflect upon effective practices across countries, and to work together to share resources and expertise. Furthermore, participants from civil society organizations demonstrated a strong desire to learn from and share best practices with other CSOs in order to strengthen their case management and data collection and analysis systems and mechanisms   to effectively generate and utilize administrative data. Thus, there is great interest in working together, and in South-South collaboration in particular.

In many countries, including Indonesia and the U.S., SDG Goal 16 provided an initial push, political space and, incentive for governments to prioritize access to justice. The next step will be developing indicators and collecting the necessary data to measure progress on implementation of the SDGs. Here, countries must grapple with utilizing indicators that can link both to national level strategies/development plans and the SDGS.

Annex 1. Session Summaries

Conceptualizing measurement in access to justice

The first session sought to introduce participants to existing global methodologies to measure access to justice. Three speakers highlighted different methodologies and approaches, followed by a group discussion of what international methods were relevant in particular country contexts.

David Udell, from the U.S.-based National Center for Access to Justice at Fordham Law School, began by laying out some key concepts, such as the definition of different classes of data (administrative data, survey data, and experimental data), indicators, and how data needs to be organized to establish findings. David discussed the process of indexing and its

benefits, particularly how indexing allows ranking which can spur positive competition and change among those ranked over time. He described the Justice Index, its methodology, and how the National Center for Access to Justice gathers the underlying data. The Justice Index scores and ranks the 50 states, District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico on their adoption of selected good practices for ensuring access to justice. Through this, the Index has created incentives for state officials to replicate and expand such practices. David concluded by discussing how the Justice Index is funded and how participants might be able to leverage different types of contributions and partnerships, including pro bono and corporate.

Next, Sarah Long of the World Justice Project (WJP) described WJP's Rule of Law Index, which indexes and ranks 113 countries and jurisdictions on adherence to rule of law. The Index seeks to measure rule of law from the perspective of how it is experienced by the general public in practical, day-to-day life. Sarah explained that Rule of Law Index is informed by a household survey and an expert survey. The household survey is a probability sample of 1000 respondents in each county's three largest cities. The survey reaches over 100,000 individuals in total (conducted through contracts with local polling companies). In addition to the household component, WJP also administers an online expert survey which targets justice practitioners. Relying on these two data points, WJP determines performance of countries based on 44 indicators across eight rule of law factors: Constraints on Government Powers, Absence of Corruption, Open Government, Fundamental Rights, Order and Security, Regulatory Enforcement, Civil Justice, and Criminal Justice. Each indicator is then aggregated into a country score and countries are ranked globally and against peers regionally and by income. While data is also collected on informal justice systems, this data is not weighed and ranked because informal justice systems vary so greatly across countries. Sarah concluded by describing how the WJP collected this data and analyzed it on an annual basis, as well as the impact the index has had and responses it has garnered around the world.

Finally, Pete Chapman from the Justice Initiative discussed two additional global efforts at standardization and measuring justice. He examined the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators (WGI) and the United Nations Surveys on Crime Trends and the Operations of Criminal Justice Systems (UN-CTS). He discussed the WGI methodology, which is based on the aggregation and incorporation of existing household and expert surveys relating to rule of law and criminal justice. Pete discussed how the WGI provides a comprehensive picture of rule of law that is based on multiple metrics and questioned its applicability for justice practitioners seeking to advance these themes in practice. The UN-CTS is premised on standard definitions for criminal justice and the UN system annual collects these annual statistics from country focal points. Pete discussed how this standardization effort was helpful in enabling countries to compare performance in their criminal justice systems over time but it was also entirely reliant on the strengthen of national data systems in its annual government reporting.

Defining the change we want to see

In the second session, voices from government, legal aid, and philanthropy – representing different constituencies in access to justice – articulated the big-picture changes they seek in their work. They also discussed the different audiences involved in the production and use of data in their national contexts.

Vidhu Vedalankar, from Legal Aid South Africa, told participants about Legal Aid South Africa's strategy for measurement. Their first measurement goal is organizational: they seek to measure their own performance as a service provider to determine whether they are fulfilling their mandate and whether they are making good use of the public resources allocated to them. Their second goal is societal: what does justice mean in the South African context and is Legal Aid expanding access to justice in South Africa? They collect data on the supply and demand of access to justice to understand whether needs are being met, and whether gaps exist, in both civil or criminal cases. Vidhu discussed the importance of process in measurement and highlighted the need to strengthen linkages between stakeholders. She highlighted that Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) target 16.3 on access to justice provided one opportunity to advance such coordination. Finally, Vidhu noted that defining different audiences for measurement is critical in successfully reaching the most important constituencies. In South Africa this includes service providers (government, NGOs, private sector), clients, and affected communities. Data can help organizations evaluate whether service providers are meeting their mandate, and whether communities are realizing and understanding their rights.

Next, Diani Sadiawati, from Indonesia's Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS), spoke about the context in Indonesia. Existing survey research has found that the scope of legal needs extends to both criminal and civil needs. However, such surveys in the past have been undertaken on ad hoc or one-off bases as part of programming or because of donor interest. She stressed that there is also a need for more regular collection of such survey data to look at trends and shifts in people's perception of and experience with the justice system. Basic administrative data – for example on criminal cases, the courts, or the number of lawyers – does not currently exist. Agencies like the police and courts are not always systematically collecting basic data and if they are, they are not making it publicly available or gathering it in a way that can be released. Ibu Diani then spoke about various tools and resources used for effective measurement in Indonesia including the national strategy on access to justice which has identified key priority areas and a focus on specific vulnerable groups. Within the current strategy, the Planning Ministry has identified the need for a more comprehensive national index on access to justice that will draw on different data sources for measuring national progress. The audience for the index, in particular, will be the Ministry of National Development Planning, local government, academics, civil society, the private sector, and ordinary community members. As in South Africa, Ibu Diani felt that SDG 16.3 provided a useful frame and allowed for more deliberate contact with civil society and academia on measurement issues. Finally, Ibu Diani ended with a challenge faced in Indonesia: how one can maintain the consistency of data through political transition and changes in government, which often result in new bureaucrats and politicians with different priorities and new budget allocations.

Neetu Pokharel of Alliance for Social Dialogue (ASD), OSF's national foundation in Nepal, spoke next about the context in Nepal. She identified several challenges in Nepal when it comes to data tracking access to justice issues. First, organizations providing legal assistance do not typically share their data with researchers, other organizations or government. Data is largely siloed in particular institutions and organizations, not comprehensive, integrated, or systematic in nature. Within providers there is not a strong culture of using data for systemic monitoring of performance or for advocacy. Institutionally, there are also data

gaps. To date there has been no comprehensive documentation of legal needs in Nepal. Agencies planning and budgeting for the justice sector in Nepal do not use data and measurement to make decisions on policy, national budgeting and planning. Given that discrimination is a major justice issue in Nepal, there is a need to develop reliable data sources on the scope of discrimination, particularly in access to legal identity, in order to inform evidence-based policy advocacy.

Finally, Sumaiya Islam from the Open Society Justice Initiative reflected on the need to think about how we can analyse data and inform public discourse as we strengthen and collect existing and new forms of justice data. Justice data will need to inform dominant representations of inequalities, permeate public policies, reforms, and practices, and showcase basic legal services as a public service. To strengthen the use of legal aid administrative data from civil society organizations, shared insights from the Justice Initiative's ongoing experimentation with 'data pooling' in partnership with legal aid providers in different contexts including Indonesia and Nepal. Recognizing that there continues to be a lack of tools in the legal empowerment community to find related data and to integrate heterogeneous data sets, Justice Initiative is working with coalitions and networks of partner organizations to develop a common format for primary data that can make integration simpler. Integration into a common system is both a political and technical process.. Getting credible and useful data from multiple sources using different formats and data standards is challenging – something practitioners across the justice sector are realizing but also deem essential to unpack trends and patterns of exploitation and deprivation. With greater technology penetration and increasing need for evidence, there is a greater interest in using common platforms and leveraging collective data as long as data is secure and confidentiality is maintained.

Signposting progress and breaking down measurement

This session moved the conversation from constituencies and audiences to how civil society legal service providers are capturing their own representational data. Each participant was asked to speak about the concrete measures being employed by their organizations, including the indicators and sources of data that they utilize to understand access to justice, define success, and measure progress in meeting their strategic goals.

First, Donny Ardyanto from the Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI) presented various sources of data collected and analyzed by YLBHI. Donny spoke about the challenges of measuring justice within the YLBHI offices in Indonesia, a diverse and vast country with over 17,000 islands. YLBHI collects two sources of data. First they are increasingly collecting representational data from the network of Legal Aid Foundation legal aid providers around the country. YLBHI is also gathering and organizing data from the justice sector and he his analysis of the number of legal aid organizations in each Indonesian district. This visual representation illustrated the disparities among districts, some of which had no legal aid service providers at all.

Next, Akhila Kolisetty, a consultant with the Open Society Justice Initiative, spoke about data collected by the Legal Aid and Consultancy Center (LACC) in Nepal. LACC has documented over 7,000 applications for legal identity documents, including citizenship, birth, death, marriage, divorce and migration certificates, across two districts in Nepal – Jhapa and Kanchanpur. Over the course of a year and a half, LACC has tracked a range of

information about applicants including demographic data (gender, ethnicity/caste, religion, education level, and marital status), the type of legal identity document, the reason for not having legal identity documents, the type of support needed from paralegals, and delays and denials in applications. In denial cases, LACC is also collecting information on the factors that might have led to rejection, and the impact of the denial on the client (e.g. inability to work, family issues, education for children, restrictions on accessing government benefits). She noted that the data is used to demonstrate evidence of the key barriers preventing communities from accessing legal identity, particularly discrimination against marginalized groups; and to illustrate the impact and value of community paralegals as an intervention. Finally, she discussed challenges in using this data, particularly that there is no control group, so the number of denials in this set of cases might show the positive impact of paralegal support.

Finally, Nomboniso Nangu, of the National Alliance for the Development of Community Advice Offices (NADCAO) in South Africa, spoke about NADCAO's efforts to improve administrative data collection. South African Community Advice Offices (CAO) are frontline legal service providers and NADCAO is working to strengthen how specific offices record their case data. NADCAO is piloting an approach to case intake and closure in a subset of these offices and, in collaboration with Legal Aid South Africa, has built an online platform for CAOs to record case data. These efforts seek to improve the quality of services provided by CAOs as well as make the case for public funding of these frontline services. Nomboniso discussed the importance of data in demonstrating how legal aid and justice contribute to alleviating poverty as well as institutional objectives. She concluded by highlighting a court diversion program, where CAOs collaborate with the local judiciary, and reduce the court docket by successfully resolving civil cases out of court.

Beyond organizational data – how can surveys help?

Following the discussions focused on administrative data, this session focused on how household and expert surveys could present a complementary picture of access to justice. The goal was to discuss the design, value, and utility of surveys in measuring access to justice as well as what constituencies could be effectively influenced by this data. First, Alejandro Ponce from the World Justice Project spoke about how the Rule of Law Index uses expert and household surveys. He told participants about a new module in their household survey which asks respondents if they have had 25 common justice problems and whether or how they pursued resolution. This is the first global effort to gather standardized, cross-country data on the most frequent types of legal problems people have and how they go about seeking resolution. In addition to the methodology, Alejandro emphasized the importance of communicating the results of surveys effectively, illustrating how such marketing of the survey and indexing results can motivate government officials, politicians and policymakers. In certain cases, political leaders themselves – such as the President of Colombia – have used the results of the World Justice Project as an advocacy tool. Strategic communication of findings can lead to longer-term and widespread impact.

Second, Deepak Thapa of Social Science Baha (SSB), Nepal, spoke about the complexities of conducting household surveys in Nepal. Deepak and SSB are conducting the first ever justice needs study in Nepal in 2017. A key goal is to capture the experience of marginalization and discrimination. The survey will cover 66 local government units in Nepal, called Village Development Committees (VDCs), capturing caste, gender, ethnic

diversity, and class, among other demographic information. Accurately measuring intersecting dimensions of identity poses challenges as Muslims, for instance, are lumped into one caste group, making it challenging to understand diversity within that community. Second, caste often becomes conflated with class, since traditionally higher-caste communities often do not want to be identified as poor. Finally, language is a barrier in administering the survey given the number of local languages, as is geography, as some VDCs are very remote and difficult to reach. Finally, Deepak also noted that such surveys, at least in the Nepalese context, are quite dependent on donor funding, which can limit their scope and sustainability in the long run.

Finally, Nick Menzies of the World Bank presented on the World Bank's work of integrating justice and legal needs related questions into country-wide household surveys that are already being conducted on a regular basis by the national statistical agency. He noted that a key challenge with surveys conducted by non-governmental organizations is that they might not be legitimized or "owned" by the government. Thus, Nick suggested that it could be valuable to work towards engaging the national statistics agency (or relevant institution) in any given country context to collect data on justice needs in ongoing surveys. He noted several pros of this approach: the data is credible given that it is collected by the government; it is generally nationally representative; it can be cross-represented to draw out broader patterns; the size of the sample generally provides ample opportunity for disaggregation; it can be repeated, providing longitudinal data; and the cost is less than fielding a standalone survey. On the other hand, surveys conducted by the national statistics agency will likely be limited in space, offering the potential of only a small number of justice-related questions; and civil society and advocates will have less control over what questions ultimately get into any single survey.

Following these presentations, participants spoke of the different strategies they have used to gather data on legal needs. Several participants spoke of the challenges that civil society encounter when seeking to convince a statistical agency to incorporate questions focused on justice. Statistical agencies often only want to examine a handful of justice questions which forces advocates to prioritize. Participants also spoke about the importance of process. A statistical agency can gather data, but it is important that the process of fielding the survey includes consultation with government agencies and civil society on the types of questions to include that are most relevant in the country context and how findings might feed into policy development and reform. On the other hand, some highlighted that engaging the statistical agency directly—without significant political engagement—might be a better strategy to avoid policy makers from pushing back on the inclusion of justice themes seen as too sensitive.

Nationally produced, locally used – how can measurement make a difference?

In this session, Derek Powell of the Applied Constitutional Studies Laboratory (ACSL), an interdisciplinary research unit of the Dullah Omar Institute of Constitutional Law, Good Governance and Human Rights at the University of the Western Cape, South Africa spoke about approaches used to help policy makers, data users and constituencies at the sub-national level. He began his presentation by setting the stage and introducing South Africa's commitment to social justice, and the fact that the state is highly transparent, regulated, and data rich. There is quite a bit of transparency and data is readily available in South

Africa. The challenge is how to effectively analyze and make use of the data to promote evidence- based decision-making. The main focus of his work has been to measure 'social justice' and 'rule of law' broadly, broken down into specific types of data. This includes data on civic protest and gender.

At the sub-national level, Derek demonstrated provided examples of how existing data could be used to track progress towards government targets. He showed how political targets for clean financial audits were shown to be unrealistic based on measurement of the actual performance of particular local government units. Such analysis is important because you could see what units were performing well or improving and compare them with those making no progress in near real time. Each of these constituencies would need different strategies for support. Some of those making no progress were in fact captured by local elites and not serving basic governance functions. This granular data allows policy makers and civil society to adjust strategies and more effectively respond.

Spurred by Derek's presentation, participants discussed how other types of local data could be used to improve government and civil society programming. Participants returned to our previous discussion of how legal needs surveys that demonstrate the justice gap could be used, for instance, to generate more investment in local governance. Participants discussed how this evidence can be used to provide evidence on the need to invest in local justice programs. In addition to legal needs surveys, participants also strategized about the value of cost-benefit analyses to calculate economic benefits from investing in different models of legal assistance. While a cost-benefit analysis has already been done in South Africa, convincing analysis will require continued production of experimental data and depend on civil society partnerships.

Participatory Measurement

This session included two presentations on domestic efforts to promote holistic measures towards access to justice. The two presenters discussed the importance of participatory measurement processes and highlighted how their efforts are drawing on the SDG framework to advance measurement.Karen Lash from the Department of Justice in the United States spoke about the Legal Aid Interagency Roundtable (LAIR), co-chaired by the Attorney General and the White House. LAIR has the involvement of over 20 U.S. government agencies, and the goal is to integrate legal aid into social services and programs already being funded and conducted by federal agencies, as well as any new programs or initiatives where outcomes can be improved by adding civil legal aid partners. Although LAIR was established in 2012, it was elevated to a White House initiative by Presidential Memorandum, signed by President Obama in late 2015, corresponding with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals. LAIR offers training and technical assistance to agencies on what legal aid is and how it can improve and complement their work in particular sectors. Karen noted the SDGs really provided a push for institutionalizing LAIR through the Presidential Memorandum. The hope is that this Memorandum gives LAIR greater institutional footing as a new administration comes into office in the United States in 2017. One overarching lesson that members of the LAIR effort have learned is to focus on specific issue areas that are relevant to a particular audience and explain how providing legal aid can more effectively and efficiently accomplish their goal. For example, if an agency seeks to prevent domestic violence show how legal aid helps victims escape the cycle of violence and create more stable lives, or document how agencies working to prevent

homelessness veterans can be more effective by incorporating legal aid to help remove obstacles to housing. The same case for incorporating legal aid can be made for agencies working to increase access to housing, health care, employment, education, family stability and public safety. Anchoring the discussion to a specific problem an agency seeks to solve is also more compelling than advocating for 'access to justice' broadly.

Next, Diani Sadiawati of Indonesia spoke about the SDG process in Indonesia and the development of the national strategy on access to justice. She noted that the strategy incorporates not just access to courts or legal aid, but more broadly access to conflict resolution mechanisms, legal literacy, and natural resource use and management. Indonesia has also conducted legal needs studies and found informal justice systems to be as important for dispute resolution as much as the formal justice system. With the promulgation of a Presidential decree on the implementation of the SDGs, Indonesia will be developing indicators that will intersect both with SDGs Goal 16 targets and the national and mid-term development plans in order to meet the common and complimentary goals. BAPPENAS has also established a high level working group that includes state actors in the justice system, stats agency, civil society actor and academics to develop a national access to justice index and is reviewing existing justice and governance measurement frameworks in Indonesia to inform the process.

Gaps in our knowledge

In this final session, participants discussed what the next steps might be. Discussion focused on how we can all work together, develop a common vision, think strategically about the gaps in our knowledge and abilities, and determine the most effective ways to fill them. Participants all found that one of the most useful aspects of this workshop had been the opportunity to learn from similar approaches, initiatives, and challenges across different country contexts. There was great interest in continuing to build relationships and partnerships, and to continuing this exchange across countries.

Participants offered the following recommendations:

- Strengthening South-South partnerships to develop a "measurement group" that would also share experts and researchers. Data that exists often is not comparable because each source of data uses different measures or indicators, making it different to compare across sectors and regions. This group could work to produce something comparable, such as potentially comparable justice needs surveys or indices across countries.
- Participants were interested in country-level strategies to develop national indicators on access to justice, partially linked to Goal 16 implementation. Indonesia and the United States are both in the process of developing such indicators and this work poses opportunities for collaboration.
- In addition to exchange on specific indicators and metrics, government and civil society representatives were interested in the *processes* through which such indicators and strategies were developed. Participants encouraged further exchange on the experiences and practices of developing national strategies and plans for access to justice as well as experiences and practices in developing justice needs surveys.
- In Indonesia, the government and civil society are advancing in thinking through a justice index. Participants from other countries were interested in continued exchange

on how this process unfolds and whether it might offer lessons to other countries exploring such an approach. Participants wondered whether this group could continue as a "learning community" to keep in touch and share resources, updates, outputs, and progress on various issues including justice indices in each country; obtaining resources for indices/surveys; successes/lessons learned; and indicator development in each country. The group could similarly share case management and data analysis expertise among CSOs and legal aid service providers in these four countries.

- Participants also suggested that new partnerships were necessary beyond those who attended this workshop. Several suggested that we deepen data partnerships with academia, the media and journalism schools, development actors and potentially the private   sector.

CONTACT INFORMATION

For more information about our work on Access to Justice and Sustainable Development Goal 16.3, please contact Peter Chapman of the Open Society Justice Initiative, at Peter.Chapman@opensocietyfoundations.org

The Open Society Justice Initiative uses law to protect and empower people around the world. Through litigation, advocacy, research, and technical assistance, the Justice Initiative promotes human rights and builds legal capacity for open societies. Our staff is based in Abuja, Brussels, Budapest, The Hague, London, Mexico City, New York, Paris, Santo Domingo, and Washington, D.C.