



# Project Completion Report

---

## PCR

***Project Name: Administration of Justice Program***

***Country: Barbados***

***Sector/Subsector: Reform Modernization of the State-  
Modernization & Administration of Justice***

***Original Project Team: Ancile Brewster (COF/CBA), Team  
Leader; Claire Nelson (RE3/OD6); Lisa Bhansali (RE3/OD6);  
Cristina Biebseheimer (SDS/SCS)***

***Project Number: BA0055***

***Loan Number(s): 1332/OC-BA***

***QRR Date: February 5<sup>th</sup> 2013***

***Final Approval Date of PCR: April 2<sup>nd</sup> 2013***

***PCR Team: Stefano Tinari (ICS/CBA), team leader; Janette Archer  
Headley (CCB/CBA); Roger Pipe (Consultant); and Melissa  
Gonzalez (IFD/ICS)***

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| ADCR  | Audio Digital Court Reporting          |
| ADR   | Alternate Dispute Resolution           |
| AJP   | Administration of Justice Program      |
| CPC   | Chief Parliamentary Council            |
| CSO   | Civil Society Organizations            |
| GIS   | Government Industrial School           |
| GOB   | Government of Barbados                 |
| HMP   | Her Majesty's Prison                   |
| IDB   | Inter-American Development Bank        |
| IJIS  | Integrated Justice Information System  |
| JA    | Judicial Assistant                     |
| JEMS  | Judicial Enforcement Management System |
| LSI-R | Level of Service Inventory-Revised     |
| MDA   | Ministry, Department, and Agency       |
| MHA   | Ministry of Home Affairs               |
| OAG   | Office of the Attorney General         |
| OFIS  | Open Facility Industrial School        |
| PCR   | Project Completion Report              |
| PTU   | Program Technical Unit                 |
| PSC   | Program Steering Committee             |
| WBS   | Work Breakdown Schedules               |



## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b>I. <u>Basic Information</u></b>                        | 1  |
| * CURRENT AMOUNT (ADJUSTED FOR REDIRECTIONING):           | 1  |
| <b>II. <u>The Project</u></b>                             | 2  |
| A. PROJECT CONTEXT  | 2  |
| B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION                                    | 2  |
| i. <i>Development Objectives</i>                          | 2  |
| ii. <i>Description and Components</i>                     | 2  |
| C. PROJECT COSTS  | 11 |
| <b>III. Results</b>                                       | 4  |
| A. PROGRAM LEVEL OUTCOMES                                 | 4  |
| B. COMPONENT 1 OUTCOMES                                   | 5  |
| C. COMPONENT 2 OUTCOMES                                   | 5  |
| D. COMPONENT 3 OUTCOMES                                   | 6  |
| E. JUSTIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES CLASSIFICATION | 6  |
| F. COMPONENT 1 OUTPUTS                                    | 6  |
| G. COMPONENT 2 OUTPUTS                                    | 8  |
| H. COMPONENT 3 OUTPUTS                                    | 9  |
| <b>IV. Program Implementation</b>                         | 11 |
| A. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL FACTORS                           | 11 |
| B. BORROWER PERFORMANCE                                   | 12 |
| C. BANK PERFORMANCE                                       | 13 |
| <b>V. Sustainability</b>                                  | 13 |
| A. ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL FACTORS                           | 13 |
| B. POTENTIAL RISKS  | 14 |
| C. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY                                 | 14 |
| <b>VI. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>                      | 14 |
| A. INFORMATION ON RESULTS                                 | 14 |
| B. FUTURE MONITORING AND EX-POST EVALUATION               | 15 |
| <b>VII. Lessons Learned</b>                               | 15 |

## Annexes



## I. Basic Information

| BASIC DATA (AMOUNTS IN US\$)   |  |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
|--|--|------------------------|----------------------|--------|--|--|--|
| PROJECT NO: BA0055   | TITLE: Administration of Justice Program   |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
| Borrower: Government of Barbados<br>Executing Agency (EA): Office of the Attorney General (OAG)          | Date of Board Approval: 01 Aug 2001<br>Date of Signature: 23 Nov 2001<br>Date of Loan Contract Effectiveness: 23 Nov 2001<br>Date of Eligibility for First Disbursement: 12 Nov 2002<br>Date of Actual First Disbursement: 18 Dec 2002   |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
| Loan(s): 1332/OC-BA<br>Sector: RM-JUS  | <u>Months in Execution</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>from Approval: 130</li> <li>from Signature: 126</li> <li>from Effectiveness: 126</li> </ul>  |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
| Lending Instrument: Investment Loan – Specific Project   | <u>Disbursement Periods</u><br>Original Date of Final Disbursement: 23 Nov 2005<br>Current Date of Final Disbursement: 23 July 2012<br>Cumulative Extension (Months): 80<br>Special Extensions (Months):   |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
|  | <u>Loan Amount(s)</u><br>* Original Amount: US\$ 8,750,000<br>* Current Amount: US\$ 8,750,000<br>* Pari Passu (if applicable): 69.31%   |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
| Poverty Targeted Investment (PTI): No<br>Social Equity (SEQ): No<br>Environmental Classification: B13(R) | <u>Disbursements</u><br>Amount to date: US \$8,750,000<br>Amount remaining in Revolving Fund: US\$0 (0%)<br><br><u>Total Project Cost</u> (Original Estimate): US\$12.5 million<br><br><u>Redirectioning</u><br>Has this Project?<br>Received funds from another Project [ ]<br>Sent funds to another Project [ ]<br>N/A [ X ] |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
|  | <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>To/From Project Number</th> <th>From Sub-Loan Number</th> <th>Amount</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | To/From Project Number | From Sub-Loan Number | Amount |  |  |  |
| To/From Project Number   | From Sub-Loan Number   | Amount                 |                      |        |  |  |  |
|  |  |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
|  | * Current amount (adjusted for redirectioning):  |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |
|  | <u>On Alert Status</u><br>Is project currently designated "on alert" by PAIS: No<br>If yes then why is the project on alert (DO , IP Ratings and/or relevant PAIS indicators):<br><br>Comments on relevance of "on alert" status for this project (if applicable):   |                        |                      |        |  |  |  |

| Summary Performance Classifications |                              |                      |                           |                              |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Development Objective               | [ ] Highly Probable (HP)     | [ ] Probable (P)     | [X] Low Probability (LP)  | [ ] Improbable (I)           |
| Implementation Progress             | [ ] Highly Satisfactory (HS) | [ ] Satisfactory (S) | [ X ] Unsatisfactory (US) | [ ] Very Unsatisfactory (VU) |
| Sustainability                      | [ ] Highly Probable (HP)     | [X] Probable (P)     | [ ] Low Probability (LP)  | [ ] Improbable (I)           |



## II. The Project

### a. Project Context

Why did the government request financing from the Bank?

The government requested financing from the Bank to support the implementation of reforms intended to improve the administration of civil and criminal justice and to address priority justice sector issues. It was recognized that Barbados requires a judicial system that is able to respond in a timely fashion to commercial disputes and criminal infractions alike, while assuring judicial independence and accessibility to the system.

#### Context at time project was conceptualized

**Political context:** Political commitment to the goals of the Administration of Justice Program (AJP) was shared by all political parties.

**Social context:** Crimes involving young male perpetrators, such as robbery, were on the increase and the profile of the young offender in Barbados demonstrated the urgent need to employ effective rehabilitation strategies which focus on youth.

**Economic context:** Like those of other Caribbean countries, Barbados' economy relies heavily on tourism, and the country was paying a high price to meet the criminal justice challenges presented by the rising incidence of crime.

**Institutional context:** Institutionally, the justice sector was characterized by: i) a lack of sector coordination; ii) a lack of adequate information management systems; iii) inefficient court reporting; delays and backlogs in court processes; iv) inefficient legal aid; v) a lack of a public legal information system; and vi) a lack of focus on youth rehabilitation due to inadequate institutional structure and training, inappropriate education and antiquated facilities at reform schools, and ineffective prison rehabilitation programs.

#### Context during execution

**Political context:** Political commitment to the goals of the AJP remained solid notwithstanding changes in government.

**Social context:** The attitudinal behaviour of young males between the age of 17 and 25, considered during project design to be the "at-risk" group, appears to have shifted to more violent and criminal behaviour.

**Economic context:** Severe economic shocks occurred during program implementation, including the global financial crisis that commenced in 2007 and continues to affect the world economy and which impacts tourism revenue in Barbados.

**Institutional context:** The presence of too many agencies involved in the execution of this project resulted in loss of ownership, and produced delays in the disbursement of the program and a reduced ability to achieve its development results.

### b. Project Description

The total Program cost was US\$12,5 million, including an Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) loan financing of US\$8,75 million as well as counterpart contribution of US\$3,75 million. The program comprised three components: Component 1: Sector Management; Component 2: Access to Justice; and Component 3: Youth and Rehabilitation.

#### i. Development Objectives

The overall development objective of the Program was to modernize the judicial system and reduce the economic and social costs of the administration of justice in Barbados. Each component had a specific development objective:

Component 1: to improve content and management of justice sector information.

Component 2: to increase speed of resolution of conflicts, and expand access to justice.

Component 3: to expand the institutional capacity to rehabilitate offenders.

#### ii. Description and Components

##### **Component 1. Sector Management (US\$4,400,000)**

**Subcomponent 1.1 Information management (US\$3,800,000).** Supports the re-engineering and streamlining of information and document flows throughout the sector. Training on the use of new systems as well as exposure to change management techniques was to be provided in order to ensure full assimilation and utilization of the new technologies.

Project 1.1.1 Computerized Court Management System. Funds the establishment of a computerized court management system that would be used for scheduling court dates, tracking case progress, mediation orders, electronic case files, and generating court-related reports. A register was to be kept of judgments and sentences, the payment of fines, bail sureties, and juror lists.

Project 1.1.2 Modern Court Reporting Capacity. Supports the establishment of a modern court reporting capacity by: i) contracting consultancy services to provide immediate, limited court reporting services, and review and analyze the current and future requirements in court reporting; ii) purchasing modern court recording and transcription equipment; and iii) providing sustainable training programs for local court reporters.

Project 1.1.3 Sector-wide Information Exchange System. The intent was to establish a sector-wide information exchange and management capability that would enhance sector planning, research and program evaluation as well as public information and outreach. Activities were to include: i) the installation of computer/digital information networks; ii) the introduction of computerized data management in all penal sub-sector departments to improve general management and reporting; and iii) specialized short-term consultants to design and execute public education campaigns and outreach materials to encourage the support and participation in the Program by the Barbadian society. The objective of this system was to facilitate continued drafting and publishing of legislation, and include capabilities such as version control, point-in-time access, automated consolidation, and improved content delivery and access via the internet. As a result of the system's implementation, it was intended that practitioners, researchers and the general public would have simplified and timely access to the most complete and up-to-date legislation possible using proven, widely available technologies.

Subcomponent 1.2 Civil society coordination (US\$600,000). This subcomponent was designed to expand the collaboration between government agencies and civil society groups working in the sector. The Program Technical Unit (PTU), through a coordinator hired for that purpose, was to assist Civil Society Organizations (CSO) to access resources to implement projects in a variety of areas which directly support the efforts of State agencies and the objectives of the Program. Activities envisaged included foster care, after-care services, conflict mediation, and crime prevention initiatives such as youth training programs and after-school programs.

## **Component 2. Access to Justice (US\$1,750,000)**

Project 2.1 Case Management (US\$850,000). The Program was intended to support the introduction and implementation of modern case management techniques in the court system. Case management involves judges taking an active role in working with litigants from the moment a case is filed, to narrow issues in dispute, encourage settlement, request that parties attempt mediation, and set a timetable for discovery and preparation of the case for trial. As part of this project, it was envisaged that a case management pilot project would be designed and undertaken involving a subset of judicial officers. The project was also to include outreach to and education of the Bar. Once the pilot project had been evaluated, the intention was to expand case management to the whole court system. Judicial training in evolving areas of the law, and collaboration with the law faculty to assign law students as research and drafting assistants to judges, was also to be included.

Project 2.2 Alternative Dispute Resolution (US\$750,000). This project was designed to promote the use of negotiation, mediation, early neutral evaluation and settlement conferences to resolve disputes and broaden access to justice. The Program was to finance: a) a consultant to coordinate a pilot project in court-annexed alternative dispute resolution whereby trained and certified mediators and early neutral evaluators would be made available for referral of cases by judges; b) assistance to CSO that were interested in providing mediation and other means of conflict resolution in the community; and c) courses in negotiation and mediation for the legal profession, justice sector officials, and the general community.

Project 2.3 Legal Aid (US\$150,000). This project was to include a consultancy to evaluate options for improving current legal aid structure, including identifying private sector resources and preparation of a study to analyze the feasibility of a Public Defenders' facility.

## **Component 3. Youth and Rehabilitation (US\$4,500,000)**

Subcomponent 3.1 Institutional Strengthening of Juvenile Justice Agencies (US\$1,100,000). This subcomponent was designed to support the institutional strengthening of the two principal agencies, which deal with youth in the criminal justice system:

Project 3.1.1 Strengthening of the Probation Department. It was intended that the Program would finance consultancy services for: a) management reorganization; b) design and implementation of specialized short and long-term training in risks/needs assessments, including operations manuals; and c) design of physical infrastructure improvements and equipment.

Project 3.1.2 Strengthening of the Government Reform Schools. For the reform schools, it was intended that the Program would finance technical assistance in the following areas: a) design of a revised educational curriculum in coordination with the Ministry of Education; b) design and implementation of vocational and interpersonal training for students, emphasizing employable skills; and c) design of a specialized training of the trainers program for staff in cognitive behavioral problems of at-risk youth.

Subcomponent 3.2 Rehabilitation Capacity (US\$1,000,000). It was intended that under this subcomponent the following activities would be financed: a) training for middle and upper level staff of the Glendairy correctional facility on methods of inmate rehabilitation, including the design of training manuals; b) cognitive behavior and interpersonal skills training for inmates; and c) the design of a post-release Program in coordination with other government agencies, the private sector, and CSOs to facilitate ex-inmate reintegration.

Subcomponent 3.3 Civil works (US\$2,400,000). This subcomponent included the following projects:

Project 3.3.1 Young Offenders Institution. Renovation of the existing Dodds reform school campus to convert it to a young Offenders Institution to provide an intensive rehabilitation regime for about 100 low risk young offenders, who would otherwise be housed in prison with serious adult offenders.

Project 3.3.2 Construction of an Open Facility industrial School for adolescents who are at risk of entering serious criminal lifestyles. The facility was intended to ensure that the appropriate level of attention and social and educational remediation were provided through-life skills, technical/vocational and academic training. The facility was to have a capacity for about 40 students.

Project 3.3.3 Prison Agricultural and Training Facilities, including financing of engineering and material costs for the upgrading of the existing agricultural and additional classroom space, training facilities and farm equipment to support the rehabilitation training initiative and correct unhygienic and unsafe environmental conditions.

### III. Results

#### a. Program Level Outcomes

| Program Level Outcomes   |   |                     |   |
|--|---|---------------------|---|
| <b>Program Development Objective:</b>  |   |                     |   |
| Modernise the judicial system and reduce economic and social costs of the administration of justice.                           |   |                     |   |
| Classification   |   |                     |   |
| [ ] Highly Probable (HP)      [ ] Probable (P)      [ <b>X</b> ] Low Probability (LP)      [ ] Improbable (I)                  |   |                     |   |
| Key Outcome Indicators   | Baseline  |                     | Results   |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 1</b><br>Cost of resolution of disputes reduced, measured by time taken for cases.                | Percentage of cases settled within 12 months*:  |                     | Statistics on the time taken for cases not available  |
|  |   | Civil      Criminal |   |
|  | Magistrate Courts   | 37%      88%        |   |
|  | High Court  | 36%      83%        |   |
|  | *Average for the years 2000 through 2006  |                     |   |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 2</b><br>Increase in the number of citizens accessing Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR) services | 0 cases are resolved through court-annexed ADR services [2002 baseline]                   |                     | Legislation and training has been completed, but the system is not yet operational.   |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 3</b><br>Knowledge about rights and services  |   | Aware      Accept   | Follow-up survey was not undertaken.  |
|  | General Public  | 41%      83%        |   |
|  | Lawyers   | 17%      46%        |   |
|  | Court Staff   | 35%      71%        |   |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 4</b><br>Reduction in recidivism  | Average re-conviction rate for the two years 2000 and 2004 = 39% (2000 = 45%; 2004 = 33%) |                     | First cohort of inmates benefiting from the newly-formed (Oct 2011) Reintegration Unit has recently been released. The planned-for Links Centre to benefit short-term inmates has not yet been established. |



## b. Component 1 Outcomes

| Component 1 Development Objective: Improve content and management of justice sector information.  |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Classification  |  |  |
| [ ] Highly Probable (HP) [ ] Probable (P) [ X ] Low Probability (LP) [ ] Improbable (I)   |  |  |
| Key Outcome Indicators  | Baseline   | Results  |
| <b>C1 Outcome Indicator 1</b><br>Courts more user-friendly.   | Percentage of respondents who are of the opinion that the courts as user-friendly & accessible [2006 baseline]. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General public = 49%</li> <li>Lawyers = 50%</li> <li>Court Staff = 52%</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Introduction of JEMS for scheduling of court dates as well as placing of electronic notice boards contributes to increasing user-friendliness of courts.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>C1 Outcome Indicator 2</b><br>Information about cases readily available to the public (court schedules, transcripts of public trials). |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transcripts of high court public trials are available within 24 hours.</li> <li>The installation of electronic bulletin boards in the High Court provides information about the location of upcoming trials.</li> <li>JEMS is used to schedule cases in the High Courts.</li> </ul> |
| <b>C1 Outcome Indicator 3</b><br>Increased understanding and acceptance of penal reform initiatives such as parole and work release.      |  | Program did not include communication strategy to increase understanding and acceptance.   |

## c. Component 2 Outcomes

| Component 2 Development Objective: Increase speed of resolution of conflicts, and expand access to justice.               |                  |   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
|---|------------------|---|--|---|------------------|------------|-------------|---------|-----|----------------|------|---|-------------|-----|----|---|
| Classification  |                  |   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| [   ] Highly Probable (HP)  |                  | [ <b>X</b> ] Probable (P)   |  | [   ] Low Probability (L)   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
|   |                  |   |  | [   ] Improbable (I)  |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| Key Outcome Indicators  |                  | Baseline  |  | Results   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| <b><u>C2 Outcome Indicator 1</u></b><br>Time from filing to final resolution of criminal cases reduced by 20%.            |                  | Average adjudication rate within 12 months for the period 2000-2006 was: <table><tr><td></td><td>Magistrate Court</td><td>High Court</td></tr><tr><td>&lt; 12 months</td><td>37%</td><td>83%</td></tr><tr><td>13 – 24 months</td><td>88%</td><td>11%</td></tr><tr><td>&gt; 24 months</td><td>36%</td><td>6%</td></tr></table> |  |   | Magistrate Court | High Court | < 12 months | 37%     | 83% | 13 – 24 months | 88%  | 11%   | > 24 months | 36% | 6% | Preliminary data shows a reduction in trial processing cases. The complete data will be available through the JEMS system, once that system has been fully implemented. |
|   | Magistrate Court | High Court  |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| < 12 months   | 37%              | 83%   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| 13 – 24 months  | 88%              | 11%   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| > 24 months   | 36%              | 6%  |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| <b><u>C2 Outcome Indicator 2</u></b><br>Increase in citizens accessing legal aid  |                  | <table><tr><td>Year</td><td>Total Cases</td></tr><tr><td>1999/00</td><td>723</td></tr><tr><td>2004/05</td><td>894</td></tr><tr><td>2005/06</td><td>1055</td></tr></table>   |  | Year  | Total Cases      | 1999/00    | 723         | 2004/05 | 894 | 2005/06        | 1055 | Results show a positive trend for this component, with increased number of citizens accessing legal aid services. |             |     |    |   |
| Year  | Total Cases      |   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| 1999/00   | 723              |   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| 2004/05   | 894              |   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| 2005/06   | 1055             |   |  |   |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |
| <b><u>C2 Outcome Indicator 3</u></b><br>Reduction in adjournments due to lost documents and late police/probation reports |                  | Proportion of adjournments where reason was “files lost/not ready” in:<br>Magistrates Court – 12.8%<br>High Court – 2.3%<br>Late police or probation reports were not found to be a significant reason for adjournments in either court<br>[2003 baseline]  |  | Data not available. The Judicial Enforcement Management System (JEMS) system will be able to generate such reports, once it has been fully implemented. |                  |            |             |         |     |                |      |   |             |     |    |   |



#### d. Component 3 Outcomes

|  |            |  |           |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
|--|------------|--|-----------|--|------------|-------|-----------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|--|
| <b>Component 3 Development Objective:</b> Capacity of penal institutions to rehabilitate offenders expanded.     |            |  |           |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| Classification   |            |  |           |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| [   ] Highly Probable (HP)   |            | [ <b>X</b> ] Probable (P)  |           | [   ] Low Probability (LP)   |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| [   ] Improbable (I)   |            |  |           |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| Key Outcome Indicators   |            | Baseline   |           | Results  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| <b>C3 Outcome Indicator 1</b><br>Increase in the number of non-custodial sentences                               |            | <b>High Court Criminal Cases:</b> <table><tr><td>Year</td><td>Not guilty</td><td>Cust.</td><td>Non-Cust.</td></tr><tr><td>2004</td><td>23%</td><td>62%</td><td>15%</td></tr><tr><td>2005</td><td>31%</td><td>40%</td><td>29%</td></tr><tr><td>2006</td><td>46%</td><td>26%</td><td>28%</td></tr></table> Average Non-custodial = 24% |           | Year   | Not guilty | Cust. | Non-Cust. | 2004 | 23% | 62% | 15% | 2005 | 31% | 40% | 29% | 2006 | 46% | 26% | 28% | ADR Training provided under the AJP has created a solid foundation for the successful introduction of court-annexed ADR in the future, which will likely result in an increased number of non-custodial sentences. |
| Year   | Not guilty | Cust.  | Non-Cust. |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| 2004   | 23%        | 62%  | 15%       |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| 2005   | 31%        | 40%  | 29%       |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| 2006   | 46%        | 26%  | 28%       |  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| <b>C3 Outcome Indicator 2</b><br>Increase in number of ex-offenders employed                                     |            |  |           | Data not available as this information is not tracked by the Aftercare Committee.  |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |
| <b>C3 Outcome Indicator 3</b><br>Sector's prevention and rehabilitation programs expanded through CSO activities |            |  |           | 6 CSO projects implemented. Plans to establish a Links Centre at Her Majesty's Prison (HMP) Dodds to link short-term prisoners with services in the outside community such as housing, employment, and welfare services. |            |       |           |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |      |     |     |     |  |

#### e. Justification of Development Objectives Classification

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <i>Briefly justify DO classification, based on degree to which planned targets were met, explaining the differences between planned and achieved outcomes as well as any other relevant factors. Include references to evidence that can support these results</i>  |  |
| <b>Program-Level DO Classification:</b> Low Probability   |  |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 1 (Reduction in cost of resolution of disputes)</b><br>The projects that would have had the greatest impact on this indicator were not fully implemented. As a result, the Program has not yet significantly impacted this indicator. The projects that would have impacted this indicator are:<br>(i) The computerized court management system, JEMS, is currently only used to schedule new cases in High Court. Scheduling is only one aspect of JEMS' functionality and to achieve the full intended effect of JEMS, it would need to be implemented for the backlog of cases, expanded to Magistrate Courts, and used for document archiving and fines management;<br>(ii) ADR training did not result in the establishment of certified ADR practitioners. ADR pilot project not implemented. Additionally, legislative reform and/or a Judicial Order would be required to implement court-annexed ADR;<br>(iii) The court reporting project did not succeed in significantly strengthening the Court Reporting Unit as a sustained corps of stenographers. ADCR reporters were not created. The speed and accuracy of court reporters did not achieve required level for timely, accurate transcripts in all courts. ADCR not introduced in Magistrate Courts;<br>(iv) Seven judges participated in brief attachments to UK courts, however formal training to all judges in modern court techniques was not provided and the case management pilot project was not implemented. |  |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 2 (Increase in the number of citizens accessing ADR services)</b><br>ADR training did not result in the establishment of a sustainable, certified group of professional ADR practitioners. Additionally, legislative reform and/or a Judicial Order would be required to implement court-annexed ADR.  |  |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 3 (Knowledge about rights and services)</b><br>A communication strategy was not developed and implemented to inform stakeholders about rights and services. The Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) was not developed and therefore the annual reports based on IJIS statistics are incomplete.   |  |
| <b>Program Outcome Indicator 4: (Reduction in recidivism)</b><br>A high quality consultancy delivered a comprehensive and innovative training program and institutional strengthening tools to HMP Dodds that are expected to impact positively over time on the recidivism rate of inmates. Creation of a Reintegration Unit. Strategy includes creation of Link Unit to 'link' prisoners, particularly short-term prisoners, with services in the outside community: housing, employment, welfare, among others.  |  |
| <b>Contribution to Country Strategy</b><br><i>Given the results described above, briefly discuss how the project contributed to the Bank's strategy in the country.</i>   |  |

#### f. Component 1 Outputs

|                                      |
|--------------------------------------|
| <b>COMPONENT 1 SECTOR MANAGEMENT</b> |
| <b>Classification:</b> S             |



| Indicator  | Baseline and Planned Outputs  | Achieved Outputs  |
|--|---|---|
| <u>Output Indicator 1</u><br>Court information management system implemented and users trained   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 court information management systems implemented<br><u>Planned Output (May 2010)</u><br>1 court information management system implemented in High Courts and Magistrate Courts.  | <u>As of June 2012</u><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 court information management system (JEMS) partially implemented in High Courts</li> <li>• At present, JEMS is used solely for scheduling trials; not yet used for tracking mediation orders, case files, court-related reports, judgments and sentences, the payment of fines, bail sureties, and juror lists).</li> <li>• 80 users trained in JEMS.</li> </ul>   |
| <u>Output Indicator 2</u><br>Sector information management system installed  | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 Sector Information Management<br><u>Planned Outputs (May 2010)</u><br>2.1 IJIS installed<br>2.2 User training delivered.<br>2.3 Program in change management (related to IJIS) delivered   | IJIS not implemented (therefore user training and program in change management was not required)<br><br>Stakeholder consensus achieved on the scope of IJIS and on data-sharing.<br>Terms of Reference prepared including technical specifications (ready to be tendered).  |
| <u>Output Indicator 3:</u><br>Immediate, limited court reporting capacity implemented.   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>11 court reporters in Court Reporting Unit<br><u>Planned Outputs</u><br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 court reporters hired on short-term consulting basis by month 6 (June 2003)</li> </ul>  | 1 court reporter hired on consulting basis for the period July 2003 through Nov 2007.   |
| <u>Output Indicator 4:</u><br>Audio Digital Court Reporting (ADCR) equipment purchased.  | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 courts have ADCR equipment.<br><u>Planned Output</u><br>Pilot project in ADCR carried out in 2 Magistrate Courts.  | ADCR Pilot not implemented.<br>Note: The newly-constructed High Court (open in October 2009) has ADCR capability, but this was not financed by the Program.   |
| <u>Output Indicator 5:</u><br>Institutional Strengthening for Court Reporting Unit   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 Plans for strengthening the Court Reporting Unit<br><br><u>Planned Outputs</u><br>A plan for training and placing court reporters in all courtrooms completed by December 2005.<br><br><u>Note:</u> This planned output is specified in the original logframe, but not in the 2008 logframe. Annex A of the Loan Contract specifies that the intention was to implement "sustainable training programs for local court reporters." | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 cohorts of court reporters trained by December 2003. No additional court reporters were trained after that time.</li> <li>• 4 of the "class of 2003" court reporters hired by Court Reporting Unit in May 2006.</li> <li>• Replacement of the former computer-aided transcription software with 10 new systems. 10 desktop computers, a server and surge protectors replaced the older 486 computers (Q1 2005).</li> <li>• Acquisition of notebook computers; transcribers; headphones; a new document center and a networked system in the office that facilitates printing and photocopying from each work station; four new stenotype Mira A3 writers; and resource books</li> </ul> <p>As of June 2012, a total of 12 court reporters are employed in the Court Reporting Unit. Notwithstanding these investments, "The daily output of individual reporters has not been significantly changed. Quality has improved in some officers, but quantity has not kept similar pace. The ratio of note taking to transcription time has not significantly improved" (Jennifer Leach <i>Court Reporting Evaluation Study</i>, p 6. Dec. 2007).</p> |
| <u>Output Indicator 5:</u><br>Number of studies carried out to analyze court reporting needs and provide recommendations to strengthen existing capacity   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 studies of court reporting needs<br><br><u>Planned Output</u><br>1 study completed by December 2007.   | 1 study completed December 2007. The study proposed, inter alia, a revised organizational structure, with an expanded Transcript Unit of 44 persons including 21 on the ADCR segment (10 each at the Junior and Senior levels) and 21 stenographic reporters. The recommendations have not been implemented.  |
| <u>Output Indicator 6</u><br>Implementation of Legislation Production and Management System for Office of the Chief Parliamentary Council<br><br>This project is additional to the original program design and 2008 logical framework. | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>Office of the Chief Parliamentary Council (CPC)<br><br><u>Planned Output</u><br>1 Legislation Production and Management System installed, enabling the automation of the legislation drafting process and publication of updated legislation in a timely fashion.  | 1 Legislation Production and Management System installed, enabling the automation of the legislation drafting process and electronic publication of updated legislation in a timely fashion.  |



## g. Component 2 Outputs

| COMPONENT 2 ACCESS TO JUSTICE   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Classification: U</b>  |  |  |
| Indicator   | Baseline and Planned Outputs   | Achieved Outputs   |
| <u>Output Indicator 1</u><br>Number of judges and bar trained in modern case management techniques.   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 Judges and bar members trained in modern case management techniques.<br><br><u>Planned Output (May 2010)</u><br>Judges and magistrates attend courses in case management (target number not indicated in logframe. Assumption is that all judges and magistrates would be trained.                                | i) Consultancy undertaken to observe and assess the operations of the courts to enable them to plan the Case Management Program (February 2008)<br>ii) 6 judges attached to High Courts in England and Wales for between 7 to 10 days, between 2003 and March 2009. No visit reports were submitted.<br>iii) No formal training provided to judges and magistrates.<br>iv) Data not available on number of judges applying modern case management techniques as of May 2012.   |
| <u>Output Indicator 2:</u><br>ADR training for judges, magistrates, mediators, and trainers of trainers implemented.  | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br><br><u>Planned Outputs</u><br>4.1 Courses delivered in the following areas: i) court-annexed ADR; ii) mediation; iii) negotiation; iv) advanced techniques; and v) training trainers.<br>4.2 Standards for certification and evaluation of mediators approved.<br>4.3 List of certified mediators in use by judges. | <u>Output 4.1</u><br>207 people received, on average, 24 hours of training in ADR. Courses included: Role of Judges and Magistrates in court-annexed ADR Training; Court-annexed ADR Training designed especially for judges; Role of Magistrates in court-annexed ADR; Basic and Advanced Mediation Training; Mediation Advocacy Training; Mediation for Business People Training; Peer Mediation Training for School Administrators and Education Officers; Family Mediation Training; Train the Trainers Course in ADR.<br><u>Output 4.2</u><br>Standards for certification and evaluation of mediators approved. It was envisaged that the training would be buttressed with practical training in the pilot project (minimum of 40 practice hours),<br><u>Output 4.3</u><br>Training did not produce certified mediators. |
| <u>Output Indicator 3:</u><br>Number of studies on Legal Aid service improvement and Public Defender completed.   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 studies completed<br><br><u>Planned Outputs (by Dec 2010)</u><br>1 study on Legal Aid service improvement and Public Defender completed.  | Upgrade of the Community Legal Services Department IT system. Implementation of a software/database solution that will improve the efficiency of case load management and will make it possible to analyze case data to identify trends taking into account the type of legal issue as well as demographic, socioeconomic data. Is expected to make it possible to prepare grant requests to take advantage of provision in Act for grant funding.   |
| <u>Output Indicator 4</u><br><br>Number of Judicial Assistants (JA) hired.<br><br><u>Note:</u> This activity is addition to the original program design and 2008 logical framework. | <u>Baseline</u><br>0 JA posts (2000)<br><u>Planned Output:</u><br>Hiring of 4 JAs [2007]   | Between Jan 2007 and Dec 2009, 4 individuals contracted as JAs for a total of 113 person-months.<br><br>JAs were assigned duties by the Chief Justice in the High Courts and Courts of Appeal. These duties include:<br>Research of law and drafting of judgements;<br>Attendance in the scheduling of cases; Attending in Court during trials and appeals.<br><br>Due to the success of this project, the posts of JA were created in the Registration department and 4 JAs hired.  |
| <u>Output Indicator 5</u>   | <u>Baseline</u><br>Books and law reports in the library of the Supreme   | Acquisition of 98 law books, law reports and legal references for the library of the Supreme Court;  |



| Indicator   | Baseline and Planned Outputs   | Achieved Outputs  |
|---|--|---|
| Procurement of Law Books, Law Reports and Legal References, for the Supreme Court and the Office of the Attorney General (OAG)<br><u>Note:</u> This activity is additional to the original program design and 2008 logical framework. | Court and the OAG worn out and damaged due to dust and mould.<br><u>Planned Output:</u><br>Replacement and updating of the libraries of the Supreme Court and the OAG (acquisition of law books, law reports and legal references) | Acquisition of 331 law books, law reports and legal references for the library of the OAG |

## h. Component 3 Outputs

| COMPONENT 3 YOUTH AND REHABILITATION   |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Classification:</b> US  |   |   |
| Indicator  | Baseline and Planned Outputs  | Achieved Outputs  |
| <b>Output Indicator 1</b><br>Probation Dept. reorganized and institutionally strengthened<br><br>1.1 One consultancy to provide institutional strengthening services to the Probation Department, including specialized probation department training.<br>1.2 Recommended staffing plan implemented. | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>No baseline measurement of institutional capacity available.<br><br><u>Planned Output (May 2010)</u><br>Institutional Strengthening and Management Re-organization Program implemented, including development of Probation Policy Manual, Protocol for Staff Conduct and Procedural Manual; Operations Manual. The objective of the Institutional Strengthening consultancy is to improve the structure and operations of the Probation Department in order to facilitate a more efficient and effective execution of its mandate. | Probation officers received training in risks/needs assessments<br><br>1.1 A total of 528 hours of training provided to a total of 207 people, covering 4 training modules: i) Fundamentals to Offender Management; ii) Practitioner Skills and Knowledge; iii) Delivering Offender Management; and iv) Managing Probation Change.<br>1.2 Final draft version of the consultant's report is currently being completed.  |
| <b>Output Indicator 2:</b><br>Vocational skills training program that improves employment opportunities of all pupils developed.<br><br>[Note: this indicator was included in original logframe but not in the 2008 logframe]  | <u>Baseline</u><br>Not defined<br><br><u>Planned Output (May 2010)</u><br>1 vocational skills training program developed for young people.  | Not implemented   |
| <b>Output Indicator 3:</b><br>Training for middle and upper level management of penal institutions delivered.  | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>Not defined<br><u>Planned Outputs</u><br>Target numbers not established  | Training for middle and upper level management of criminal institutions delivered.  |
| <b>Output Indicator 4:</b><br>Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) program established   | <u>Planned Outputs (by Dec 2010)</u><br>1 LSI-R program established. Use of LSI-R in Probation Department.  | AJP financed the purchase of materials (the copyrighted LSI-R forms) in support of the LSI-R program implemented by the National Task Force on Crime Prevention.<br>22 Probation and Community Service Officers participated in the LSI-R training. LSI-R currently in use in Probation Department.   |
| <b>Output Indicator 5:</b><br>Number of staff trained as trainers in inmate Rehabilitation   | <u>Baseline (November 2002)</u><br>0 staff trained in inmate rehabilitation<br><u>Planned Outputs (by Dec 2010)</u><br>i) All management trained in inmate rehabilitation.<br>ii) Establishment of formal, post-release programs with community involvement.<br>iii) Staff Handbook, Operational Manual, Trainer Manual developed.  | A total of 226 hours of training provided in the following topics:<br>(i) Thinking & Living Skills Program; Leadership Training for Senior Managers; Risk & Needs Assessment Training; Case Management Training; Personal Officer Training (Process Issues); Follow-up training in Thinking & Living Skills. Around 20 participants on average per training event. Staff from the Training Unit at HMP Dodds participated in Case Management Training, Personnel Officer Training and with a view to equipping them to deliver this training in the future. |



| Indicator  | Baseline and Planned Outputs  | Achieved Outputs   |
|--|---|--|
| <u>Output Indicator 6:</u><br>Increase of eligible inmates trained.<br>Program to enhance technical and life skills training for inmates established.  | <u>Planned Outputs (Dec 2010)</u><br>10% of inmates to be released exposed to Pre-release efforts   | The first cohort of 50 inmates completed the T&LS module of the newly-formed Reintegration Unit (formed Oct 2011).   |
| <u>Output Indicator 7:</u><br>Strategic Intervention Centre designed and proposal put to Government of Barbados (GoB) for funding.   | <u>Planned Output (Dec 2010)</u><br>Strategic Intervention Centre designed and proposal put to GoB for funding  | Design not implemented; proposal not submitted to GoB for funding  |
| <u>Output Indicator 8:</u><br>Vocational skills training program that improves employment opportunities for all pupils developed.<br>[Note: This indicator included in original logframe but not in 2008 logframe] | <u>Baseline</u><br>Not established<br><u>Planned Output (End of Year 4)</u><br>1 Vocational training program developed.   | Vocational skills training program not implemented   |
| <u>Output Indicator 9:</u><br>Establishment of formal, post release programs with community involvement.   | <u>Baseline</u><br>Not established<br><u>Planned Output</u><br>Not defined  | Strategic Plan includes the development of a Links Centre in HMP Dodds. This will allow community agencies such as housing, employment, welfare etc. to have easier access to the prison so that they can work more closely with shorter-term prisoners.   |
| <u>Output Indicator 10:</u><br>Young offenders' institution renovated.   | <u>Baseline</u><br>No young offenders institution to maintain young offenders from adult population<br><br><u>Planned</u><br>10.1 Facility operational.<br>10.2 100 low-risk youth relocated from adult prisons to full-time educational program.                     | Young Offenders Institution not renovated. The reasons were two-fold: first, the renovations were to take place at Dodds GIS, which in the original program design was to be replaced by an Open Facility Industrial School (OFIS). There was, however, lack of consensus on whether to construct the OFIS. Dodds was not, therefore, available to be renovated. Furthermore, there was lack of consensus on the approach that should be taken for young Offenders Institution, since the behavior of at-risk youth who were the original target beneficiaries had become more violent and criminal in nature. |
| <u>Output Indicator 11:</u><br>School for at-risk boys constructed.<br>• Facility operational.<br>30 at-risk adolescents enrolled in approved reform educational program.  | <u>Baseline</u><br>Government Industrial School (GIS) currently houses around 40 youths.<br><br><u>Planned</u><br>10.1 Facility operational.<br>10.2 30 at-risk adolescents enrolled in approved reform educational program   | Project to construct school for at-risk boys not constructed.  |
| <u>Output Indicator 12:</u><br>Prison agricultural and training facilities upgraded  | <u>Baseline</u><br>Animal pens in close proximity to inmates at HMP Glendairy<br><br><u>Planned</u><br>• Animal pens and animals removed from main prison;<br>• Beef farm relocated to Dodds, St. Phillip<br>• Expanded program for agricultural training implemented | Financing of Environmental Impact Assessment of livestock operations at farm; Financing of agricultural implements, replacement tractor, and barb-wire fencing for farm.<br>Agricultural training program implemented.   |
| <u>Output Indicator 13:</u><br>Outfitting of the OAG Chambers and Ministry of Home Affairs.  |   | Outfitting of Outfitting of the OAG Chambers and Ministry of Home Affairs completed.   |



### c. Project Costs and Disbursements

**Table 1: Original Program Costs (US '000)**

|              |                                 | Original Budget |              |               | Disbursed    |              |               | Original ÷<br>Disbursed |
|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------------------|
|              |                                 | IDB             | GOB          | TOTAL         | IDB          | GOB          | TOTAL         |                         |
| <b>1</b>     | <b>Sector management</b>        | <b>3,500</b>    | <b>900</b>   | <b>4,400</b>  | <b>3,675</b> | <b>204</b>   | <b>3,878</b>  | <b>88%</b>              |
| 1.1          | Information management          | 3,000           | 800          | 3,800         | 3,421        | 146          | 3,567         | 94%                     |
| 1.2          | Civil Society coordination      | 500             | 100          | 600           | 254          | 58           | 312           | 52%                     |
| <b>2</b>     | <b>Access to Justice</b>        | <b>1,150</b>    | <b>600</b>   | <b>1,750</b>  | <b>1,874</b> | <b>62</b>    | <b>1,936</b>  | <b>111%</b>             |
| 2.1          | Case management                 | 600             | 250          | 850           | 1,339        | 30           | 1,369         | 161%                    |
| 2.2          | ADR                             | 450             | 300          | 750           | 499          | 28           | 527           | 70%                     |
| 2.33         | Legal Aid                       | 100             | 50           | 150           | 37           | 4            | 41            | 27%                     |
| <b>3</b>     | <b>Youth and rehabilitation</b> | <b>2,950</b>    | <b>1,550</b> | <b>4,500</b>  | <b>2,633</b> | <b>433</b>   | <b>3,066</b>  | <b>68%</b>              |
| 3.1          | Institutional strengthening     | 850             | 250          | 1,100         | 389          | 115          | 504           | 46%                     |
| 3.2          | Rehabilitation capacity         | 700             | 300          | 1,000         | 318          | 37           | 355           | 35%                     |
| 3.3          | Civil works                     | 1,400           | 1,000        | 2,400         | 1,927        | 281          | 2,208         | 92%                     |
| <b>4</b>     | <b>Program Administration</b>   | <b>200</b>      | <b>550</b>   | <b>750</b>    | <b>257</b>   | <b>2,775</b> | <b>3,032</b>  | <b>404%</b>             |
|              | Program Technical Unit          | -               | 450          | 450           | -            | 2,757        | 2,757         | 613%                    |
|              | Technical Assistance            | 200             | 100          | 300           | 257          | 18           | 338           | 92%                     |
| <b>5</b>     | <b>Unallocated</b>              | <b>650</b>      |              | <b>650</b>    |              |              |               | <b>0%</b>               |
| <b>6</b>     | <b>Financial costs</b>          | <b>300</b>      | <b>150</b>   | <b>450</b>    | <b>258</b>   | <b>413</b>   | <b>671</b>    | <b>149%</b>             |
|              | Interest                        | 175             | -            | 175           | 175          | 310          | 443           | 253%                    |
|              | Commitment fee                  | -               | 150          | 150           | -            | 121          | 121           | 81%                     |
|              | Audit                           | 25              | -            | 25            | 76           | 24           | 87            | 350%                    |
|              | FIV                             | 100             | -            | 100           | 7            | -            | 7             | 7%                      |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                                 | <b>8,750</b>    | <b>3,750</b> | <b>12,500</b> | <b>8,750</b> | <b>3,886</b> | <b>12,636</b> | <b>101%</b>             |

**Table 2  
Cumulative Disbursements (US\$ Millions)**

|                             | 2002       | 2003       | 2004       | 2005       | 2006       | 2007       | 2008       | 2009       | 2010       | 2011        | 2012        |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. Sector Management        | -          | 0.1        | 0.2        | 0.4        | 0.4        | 0.5        | 0.6        | 1.2        | 1.4        | 3.1         | 3.9         |
| 2. Access to Justice        | -          | 0.0        | 0.1        | 0.2        | 0.3        | 0.4        | 0.5        | 0.9        | 1.0        | 1.8         | 1.9         |
| 3. Youth and Rehabilitation | 0.0        | 0.1        | 0.1        | 0.1        | 0.1        | 0.1        | 0.1        | 0.2        | 0.2        | 2.4         | 3.1         |
| Project Administration      | 0.1        | 0.4        | 0.6        | 0.8        | 1.0        | 1.4        | 1.7        | 2.1        | 2.5        | 2.9         | 3.0         |
| Audits & Financial Charges  | 0.00       | 0.01       | 0.01       | 0.026      | 0.034      | 0.044      | 0.055      | 0.066      | 0.077      | 0.077       | 0.089       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                | <b>0.1</b> | <b>0.7</b> | <b>1.1</b> | <b>1.7</b> | <b>2.1</b> | <b>2.7</b> | <b>3.3</b> | <b>4.8</b> | <b>5.7</b> | <b>10.8</b> | <b>12.6</b> |
| % Disbursed of total        | 1%         | 5%         | 9%         | 14%        | 17%        | 22%        | 26%        | 38%        | 45%        | 86%         | 100%        |

Note: Data for financial charges was not available on an annual basis. The total financial charges have been divided equally in each year.

## IV. Program Implementation

### a. Analysis of Critical Factors

The principal factors that positively affected Program implementation were:

1. Well-qualified Project Executing Unit, with project management training;
2. Commitment of the relevant Department (Prisons) with a "champion" to move the project forward and a Technical Committee that engaged with the PTU Project Officer and consultants to achieve the project goals;
3. Ability of the PTU to identify new projects consistent with program goals that could be implemented within the extended timeframe of the AJP.



The principal factors that negatively affected Program implementation were:

**Design:**

1. Failure to achieve stakeholder consultation during project preparation on the scope and implementation strategy for the following projects: IJIS, Court Reporting, ADR, Case Management, Strengthening of Government Industrial School (GIS), Creation of a Young Offenders Institution, and Construction of an Open Facility Industrial School;
2. Not all the indicators used in the Logical Framework Model were measurable;
3. The first generation of IDB funded "Administration of justice project had the tendency to consider a large number of activities in different sectors (Criminal justice, Civil Justice, penitentiaries etc.), making project execution very complex, given the large number of stakeholders involved in the operation. Successive operations were more focused to single component, with a leaner administrative structure, making project execution easier to administer and monitor.

**Project Management:**

1. Lack of results-oriented terms of reference with appropriate performance benchmarks for PTU staff and Program Steering Committee;
2. Inadequate operational staffing of PTU in terms both of numbers of Project Officers, lack of a Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. In the case of preparation of the IJIS project, inadequate institutional and IT expertise within the PTU to achieve stakeholder consensus;
3. Inadequate use of project management tools (Development of realistic WBS, Critical Path, Stakeholder Analysis, Communications Management Plan, Risk Management Plan);
4. Lack of mentoring support to the PTU to strengthen project management skills;
5. Lack of clarity about the role of the PTU versus the role of participating MDAs;
6. Inadequate organizational structure of the Program Steering Committee (PSC): PTU Director acting as Chair did not provide adequate oversight; lack of terms of reference for the PSC; lack of decision-making by PSC to help solve operational issues negatively affecting implementation; lack of follow-through by PSC to ensure that decisions were implemented in the respective Ministries and Departments.

**Institutional:**

1. Lack of a "champion for change" at each participating Ministry and Department to drive forward the program, communicate effectively, coordinate activities and monitor progress in the implementation of projects;
2. Failure to assign technical staff from the key departments as required to carry out specific aspects of the Program;
3. Ministers, Permanent Secretaries and Senior Officials were individually aware of the objectives and how their Ministry/Department fit into the Program, but there was no general consensus about the strategic vision.
4. Lack of accountability for Ministry of Home Affairs (MHA) projects resulting from the failure to shift responsibility to the MHA for disposition of resources when the post for Permanent Secretary MHA was filled;
5. Changes in key senior officers at OAG and MHA affected continuity and provided challenges in terms of understanding, "buy-in" and commitment to the program;
6. Project "fatigue" in the face of lack of implementation progress resulted in a loss of credibility of the PTU and lack of interest in the Program;
7. Failure to develop Departmental Action Plans that incorporated the Annual Work Plans of the AJP.

**Unforeseeable Events**

1. The uprising at HM Prison Glendairy was an unforeseeable event that affected the implementation of the agricultural and training facility project.

**b. Borrower Performance**

**Borrower/Executing Agency**

☐ Highly Satisfactory (HS)

☒ Satisfactory (S)

☐ Unsatisfactory (U)

☐ Very Unsatisfactory (VU)

In terms of fiduciary control the performance of the GOB was satisfactory: there were no significant issues reported by the Bank in regard to the presentation of Annual Financial Statements and audits.



Implementation performance was problematic. The overall effectiveness score for the program, indicating the percentage of expected outputs that were achieved, was 34%. On average, only 28% of key government stakeholders believe that AJP expected outcomes were achieved.

Supervision effectiveness was reduced due to the lack of a results-based monitoring system with a sound framework by which to assess actual progress compared to planned progress.

During the period 2002-2008, the PSC responsible for program oversight rarely met and lacked formal Terms of Reference. The effectiveness of the PSC improved during the period 2009-2012, but still did not provide the required level of problem-solving and decision-making required to move the projects forward in a timely fashion.

Risk Management: A formal risk management plan was not developed. The logical framework model included a limited number of assumptions, which were related to risk, but a comprehensive risk management plan was not developed. A Risk Mitigation Strategy Matrix was developed as part of the Systematic Review of the program in 2008, but it was not formally adopted.

Monitoring of Project Performance: The monitoring of project performance was unsatisfactory. Inadequate monitoring and evaluating mechanisms makes it difficult to measure progress. The proposed monitoring and evaluation framework included in the Systematic Review was not implemented, and the PTU did not have an individual assigned to monitoring and evaluation.

Semi-annual reports provided information on progress in procurement activities, but did not adequately address pre-investment project management activities. The usefulness of the reports would have been strengthened if they had explicitly referred to the goals defined in the Annual Work Plans and if the reports had provided information on the achievement of the outputs in the program Logical Framework Model.

Time performance: initially planned to be completed within a four year timeframe, the program was twice extended for a total of 80 additional months. The delays are the consequence of institutional weakness, as well as the high number of stakeholders included in the program. Coordination had been an issue during the first years of execution, and gradually improved during the life of the project.

Quality of products: The quality of the products produced by consultants contracted by the AJP was very high with only one exception: the institutional strengthening analysis of the Probation Department. The quality of works and goods procured met technical specifications.

### c. Bank Performance

To this date, the Ministry of Finance Project Implementation Unit, the entity with responsibility for this program following the disbandment of the Executing Unit, has not submitted the evaluation of the Bank's performance.

| Bank Performance                                  |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Satisfactory (HS) | <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (S) | <input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (U) | <input type="checkbox"/> Very Unsatisfactory (VU) |

## V. Sustainability

### a. Analysis of Critical Factors

The following sustainability issues are noted:

(i) Investments in outfitting of the OAG and MHA will require maintenance.

JEMS: Even at its present level of implementation within the High Courts, annual license fees for up to 50 users will be incurred;

Training to GIS staff would require booster training for staff who benefitted from training under the AJP. Training of trainers was not included. Over time new staff would require training.

Civil Society Support Fund: the AJP demonstrated the effectiveness of a fund to finance CSO projects but sustainability of this initiative would require budgetary allocation.

Upgrading of the Community Legal Services Department IT system: it is probable that maintenance and further upgrading of the system will be required;

Judicial Assistance: under the AJP, three Judicial Assistants were financed. All four have been contracted on a permanent basis by the Registrar;

Implementation of Legislation Production and Management System for Office of the CPC: it is it is probable that maintenance and further upgrading of the system will be required;

Law Books, Law Reports and Legal References, procured for the Supreme Court and the OAG: This investment was necessitated by the poor archival conditions of the previous libraries. The new library facilities at the Supreme Court and OAG should ensure that archival conditions are adequate, but it is recommended that an archival specialist confirm the adequacy of the new facilities and, if necessary, recommend investment to achieve adequate archival conditions;

Agricultural equipment purchased under the AJP will require routine maintenance.

## **b. Potential Risks**

Risks to sustainability of the above-mentioned results are minimal, depending simple on the fiscal commitment necessary for the relatively small maintenance costs in the case of works and upgrading costs in the case of IT systems.

Although not indicated as a sustainability risk above, the AJP-financed investments in ADR training created a significant level of awareness and understanding of ADR that provides an excellent platform on which to build. To achieve the outcomes to which the introduction of ADR is expected to contribute (increased speed of resolution of conflicts and reduced economic cost of the administration of justice). Subsequent investments are still required in a certified ADR training, together with an ADR pilot project. The risk is that, if these subsequent investments are not made within a relatively short period of time, the benefits that have accrued may begin to diminish.

## **c. Institutional Capacity**

Project Management: The Loan Contract notes that one of the key responsibilities of the PTU is “to ensure the greatest possible transfer of expertise acquired during the execution process to the permanent establishment. In this regard, some of the technical staff associated with the unit will be absorbed by the various beneficiary agencies on completion of the Program”. The transfer of expertise is planned, and some technical staff associated with the unit will be absorbed by the beneficiary agencies.

Maintenance of goods and works: With regard to the maintenance of goods and works financed by the program, the PTU has submitted the first annual maintenance report to the IDB, and it is expected that OAG will continue to submit annual maintenance reports in future. Institutional capacity is adequate to ensure that necessary maintenance is provided.

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
|   |  |   |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Highly Probable (HP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Probable (P) | <input type="checkbox"/> Low Probability (LP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Improbable (I) |

# **VI. Monitoring and Evaluation**

## **a. Information on Results**

The baseline study provides good data on most outcome indicators. Baseline data was collected from available records and statistics as well as an analysis of a sample of cases (for judgment times; custodial and non-custodial sentences; time to prepare pre-sentence reports. The public survey was undertaken especially to establish the baseline of public knowledge and opinion. No additional results data was collected by the PTU as a project monitoring system was not established to collect data on an annual or periodic basis.



Baseline data was not collected for the “new” projects that did not form part of the original program design.

## **b. Future Monitoring and Ex-Post Evaluation**

The IJIS would have formed the monitoring and evaluation “backbone” of the justice system in Barbados. Failure to implement it under the AJP greatly diminishes the future monitoring capacity not only of AJP interventions, but also future justice-sector interventions. It should, therefore, be considered a strategic priority to develop IJIS, taking advantage of the significant efforts and notable achievement of the PTU to establish stakeholder consensus.

## **VII. Lessons Learned**

1. A PTU with strong project management skills and formal project management training and/or operational project management experience in areas such as realistic work breakdown schedules (WBS), critical path, stakeholder analysis, communications management plan, and risk management plan is very important to achieve effective and efficient project management;
2. Each participating or benefiting Ministry, Department and Agency (MDA) should have a “champion” to drive forward the project, communicate effectively, coordinate activities and monitor progress in the implementation. The champion should have seniority and enjoy sufficient respect within the entity to play a catalytic, motivational role.
3. The responsibilities of the PTU and the participating MDAs need to be clearly established and annual work plans with realistic WBS that specifically assign human resources to each pre-investment, monitoring and supervisory task and activity. The Project Director should be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the annual work plans and the WBS, making adjustments as necessary and ensuring adequate communication of progress and delays to all participating stakeholders. For each project, a Technical Committee should be established within each participating department to engage and collaborate with the assigned PTU Project Officer and consultants to achieve the project goals. Failure to achieve stakeholder consultation during project preparation on the scope and implementation strategy for projects may create delays in implementation.
4. It is important to develop a communication plan that takes into account the need to get new senior and operational staff of participating MDAs “on board” and familiarize them to the program’s goals and objectives, progress to date, implementation plan, issues affecting implementation progress; and their expected role in the program’s implementation.
5. Results-oriented terms of reference with appropriate performance benchmarks for PTU staff and the Project Steering Committee can help to provide clarity in the performance requirements and are also essential for strong monitoring capacity.
6. It is important to adequately calculate the operational staffing requirements of the PTU in terms both of numbers of individuals as well as the required areas of professional expertise: managerial, technical, financial, and monitoring and evaluation. Mentoring support should be available to the PTU, if required, to strengthen the project management skills of operational staff. It is important to evaluate early on the PTU’s managerial capacity, by including the development of the above-mentioned project management tools in the terms of reference of the PTU team and having the quality of those documents subject to expert review and mentoring support. Program design and development of annual work plans should calculate the time requirements of managerial and technical staff.
7. It is important that the PTU be given sufficient authority to engage with officials of participating MDAs and achieve the necessary level of commitment to pre-investment and supervisory activities. This usually does not happen readily, especially when the PTU staff is contracted from outside the executing agency and so a concerted plan needs to be developed and implemented, with indicators that will enable the executing agency to ensure that an adequate level of authority has been achieved.
8. It is important to ensure that the organizational structure of the Program Steering Committee has an adequate level of hierarchy to provide an oversight function and plays a decisive decision-making role to help solve operational issues negatively affecting implementation.
9. Project “fatigue” may set in if there is no demonstrable progress during the initial 18 to 24 months of implementation, resulting in a loss of credibility of the PTU and lack of interest in the Program. It is important to develop “quick wins” to create excitement about the project.



**Annexes:**

1. Minutes from the Exit Workshop
2. Borrower Evaluation (To be included once received)



**Loan 1332/OC-BA – Administration of Justice Programme (AJP)**  
**Minutes of the Exit Workshop held on October 22, 2012 at the**  
**Conference Room, Office of the Attorney General**

**I. Agenda**

|       |  |  |
|-------|--|--|
| 9:00  | Welcome  | Ms. Diane Campbell, Permanent Secretary, Office of the Attorney General  |
| 9.05  | Opening Remarks  | Mr. Joel Branski, Representative , IDB                                   |
| 9:15  | Feature Address  | Hon. Adriel Brathwaite, Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs    |
| 9:30  | Presentation of Project Completion Report Inputs and Results | Mr. Roger Daviss Pipe, Consultant  |
| 10:45 | Presentation on Lessons Learned                              | Mrs. Lana Chandler, Project Director, JIPS                               |
| 11:00 | Discussion on Results  |  |
| 11:30 | Discussion on Lessons Learned                                |  |
| 12:30 | Closing Remarks  | Mr. Stefano Tinari,<br>Modernization of the State Senior Specialist, IDB |

**Present were:**

|                           |   |   |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Hon. Adriel Brathwaite    | Attorney General and Minister of Home Affairs | Attorney General and Ministry of Home Affairs |
| Ms. Diane Campbell        | Permanent Secretary                           | Office of the Attorney General                |
| Mrs. Lucene Wharton-Isaac | Permanent Secretary                           | Ministry of Home Affairs                      |
| Mrs. Lana Chandler        | Project Director                              | JIPS  |
| Ms. Paula Jackman         | Deputy Permanent Secretary                    | Office of the Attorney General                |
| Mrs. Cheryl Willoughby    | Director                                      | National Task Force on Crime Prevention       |
| Mrs. Dorita Lovell        | Chief Probation Officer                       | Probation Department                          |
| Ms. Bernadeth John        | Director                                      | Community Legal Services                      |
| Mrs. Sandra-Dawn Taylor   | Deputy Chief Parliamentary Counsel (ag.)      | Chief Parliamentary Counsel's Office          |
| Mr. Ronald Brathwaite     | Principal (ag.)                               | Government Industrial School                  |
| Mr. De Carlo Payne        | Assistant Superintendent                      | Her Majesty's Prison                          |
| Mrs. Eleanor Nurse        | Senior Administrative Officer                 | Ministry of Home Affairs                      |
| Ms. Emel Best             | Administrative Officer II (ag.)               | Ministry of Home Affairs                      |
| Ms. Sonia Seale           | Administrative Officer II (ag.)               | Ministry of Home Affairs                      |
| Ms. Jennifer Small        | Deputy Director                               | Community Legal Services                      |

|                             |                              |                                 |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Miss Angela Dixon           | Senior Probation Officer     | Probation Department            |
| Ms. Sandra Rawlins          | Senior Crown Counsel         | Solicitor General's Chambers    |
| Ms. Marcia Thompson         | Systems Administrator        | Registration Department         |
| Ms. Trecia Boucher          | Senior Project Analyst (ag.) | Public Investment Unit          |
| Mr. Joel Branski            | Representative               | Inter-American Development Bank |
| Mr. Stefano Tinari          | Senior Specialist            | Inter-American Development Bank |
| Mrs. Janette Archer-Headley | Operations Senior Associate  | Inter-American Development Bank |
| Ms. Angela Blanchette       | Senior Accountant            | JIPS                            |
| Ms. Donna Wood              | Secretary                    | JIPS                            |
| Miss. Andrea White          | Clerical Officer             | JIPS                            |
| Mr. Roger Pipe              | Consultant                   | GoB                             |

## **II. Welcome**

- 2.1 The Permanent Secretary, Office of the Attorney General gave a brief welcome to the GoB and IDB participants and acknowledged their contribution to the sector over the years. The Permanent Secretary indicated that the workshop was a reflective exercise where the lessons learnt would provide the direction on the way forward for similar projects.
- 2.2 The IDB Representative noted the shared responsibility of the project especially in respect of the over-ambitious design and that identifying the lessons learned was significant to the continued partnerships between the Bank and GoB, as well as the development of Barbados. Additionally, the feedback from the Exit Workshop will aid in the development of much better projects in the future.
- 2.3 The Attorney General, in his feature address, acknowledged the contribution made through the financing of new accommodations for the OAG and MHA, as well as the Legislation Information Management System though he expressed concern about the GoB's inability to implement projects. He urged stakeholders to identify the pitfalls and learn lessons to transmit to the wider government.

## **III. Presentation of Inputs and Findings**

- 3.1 Mr. Roger Pipe provided a brief overview of the project objectives, cost and component.
- 3.2 The main results which were completed as planned under the project were Rehabilitatoin Capacity and the Civil Society Projects. The JEMS project, Legal Aid, the Strengthening of the Probation Department and Government Industrial School which were planned were partially achieved. However it is expected that the intended outcomes will eventually be achieved ex-post. Furthermore, Court Reporting, Case Management and Alternative Dispute Resolution although they were implemented, did not significantly impact the intended outcome. The Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) and the Youth Offenders Institution (YOI) were not completed under the project.

However it should be noted that all the substantive preparations for the IJIS including the specifications and Bidding Documents have been completed.

#### **IV. Lessons Learnt**

- 4.1 It is import to ensure that programme design, including the Results Matrix permits a very high level of evaluability.
- 4.2 Stakeholder consultations should involve key operational personnel as well as senior officials.
- 4.3 A programme Management Unit with strong management skills and formal project management and/or operations project management experience is very important to achieving effective and efficient project management results.
- 4.4 Each participating or benefitting Ministry, Department and Agency should have a “champion” to drive forward the project communication effectively.
- 4.5 Failure to achieve stakeholder consultation during project preparation on the scope and implementation strategy for projects may create delays in implementation.
- 4.6 If organizational change affecting the implementing Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) takes place during programme implementation, it is important to review the programme’s organizational structure and revise it if necessary to ensure that all MDAs have an adequate level of accountability to disperse project finances.

#### **V. Discussion**

- 5.1 The Permanent Secretary, Office of the Attorney General highlighted that there was a delay in the implementation of the ADR Pilot Project, however this matter is very much at the forefront of the GOB’s efforts .The Chief Justice has developed a framework for the roll-out of ADR in the courts over the next year, and the work will be based on the outputs from the project..
- 5.2 The Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs informed that the Residence at the Government Industrial School – YOI – will be undertaken, once financing is secured and that discussions were currently ongoing to locate possible funding for this initiative.
- 5.3 Assistant Superintendent Prisons noted that although the IJIS was not completed, the prison was currently undertaking an information management system that will, among other things, serve towards the ongoing evaluation of recidivism.
- 5.4 The Chief Probation Officer highlighted that there were issues associated with delays in procurement which delayed project execution during 2 ½ years, . Additionally, lack of clarity caused by poor communications meant that the Probation Department did not fully understand its role vis-à-vis the Justice Improvement Programme Secretariat (JIPS), in the implementation of the programme.
- 5.5 The IDB Project Team Leader noted that though the use of SMART indicators was not the practice at the time of the design of the programme, there were enough means of

evaluation included in the logical Framework of the program that shows achievements that should be quantified/identified and noted, even if the result cannot be evaluated numerically..

## **VI. Closing Remarks**

- 6.1 The Project Team Leader informed that AOJP was among the first IDB projects of its kind in the justice sector. Since then, the IDB has developed a new framework for implementing projects in the Modernization of Justice sector – developing projects that are more specialized, and covering single aspects of Justice administration, compared with the global approach of the first generation of programs.

There being no further business, the Workshop was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.