

SECOND PHASE OF THE PROGRAM FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

(CR-0141)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Borrower:	Republic of Costa Rica	
Executing agency:	Supreme Court of Justice	
Amount and source:	IDB: (OC)	US\$22.4 million
	Local:	US\$ 9.6 million
	Total:	US\$32 million
Financial terms and conditions:	Amortization period:	25 years
	Grace period:	5 years
	Disbursement period:	5 years
	Interest rate:	variable
	Inspection and supervision:	1 %
	Credit fee:	0.75%
	Currency:	U.S. dollars (Ordinary Capital under the Single Currency Facility)
Objectives:	<p>The main objective of the proposed program is to improve the administration of justice by making it more accessible, equitable, dependable, and efficient. The specific objectives are to help: (i) improve the institutional capacity for developing crime prevention policies and projects; (ii) ensure that the legal rights of the accused are protected; (iii) make prosecutorial activities more reliable and effective; (iv) reduce congestion in the judicial system; and (v) improve the administrative capacity of the judiciary.</p>	
Description:	<p>The proposed program builds on the achievements made during the program's first phase in the area of efficiency in managing judicial offices and cases, which were supported by Bank loan 859/OC-CR. It also introduces new areas in accordance with the stakeholder analysis, updated sector assessments, and public opinion polls conducted. The program is composed of the following five projects: (a) institution-strengthening for the prevention of crime, which includes: (i) developing national policies and strategies for crime prevention; (ii) promoting the use of out-of-court conflict resolution mechanisms;</p>	

and (iii) improving community-police relations; **(b) strengthening the Public Defenders' Office**, which includes: (i) making administrative and functional improvements; and (ii) improving case management; **(c) strengthening the Public Prosecutors' Office**, which includes: (i) strengthening management and strategic planning; (ii) improving the management of judicial offices; (iii) providing victim services; and (iv) strengthening human resources; **(d) judicial efficiency in conflict resolution**, which includes: (i) office management; (ii) procedural reform; (iii) resolving more cases out of court; (iv) improving legal training and the practice of law; and (v) implementing legal and judicial information systems; and **(e) management capacity of the judicial branch**, which includes: (i) reforming the decision-making structure; (ii) reorganizing the managerial system; and (iii) institutionalizing gender policies.

**The Bank's
country and
sector strategy:**

The Bank has been supporting the judicial systems of its member countries since 1994. The Report on the Eighth General Increase in Resources of the Bank states that the Bank may work with governments to strengthen and modernize their judicial systems (AB-1704). Furthermore, the Frame of Reference for Bank Action in Programs for Modernization of the State and Strengthening of Civil Society (GN-1883-5, 1996) establishes principles and criteria for such programs. The proposed program is consistent with the Bank's strategy, and will benefit from the experience gained over the past several years as well as execution of the first phase of the program. In addition to loan 859/OC-CR, financing has been provided in Costa Rica to: (i) the Ministry of Justice, for the design of sustainable Houses of Justice models, six of which are currently in operation (ATN/SG-6394-CR), and an action plan for the prevention of violence (ATN/SG-6395-CR); and (ii) the Board of Trade [*Cámara de Comercio*], for the establishment of a center for the arbitration and out-of-court settlement of trade disputes (ATN/MT-5397-CR). In addition, the Program for the Regularization of the Cadastre and Property Registry (1284/OC-CR), with the Ministry of Justice to improve legal certainty, which includes the use alternative methods for resolving conflicts over property rights, is up for approval in the legislature.

**Environmental
and social
review:**

By strengthening the judicial system, the program will help improve enforcement of current legislation, which includes environmental law. The works for rehabilitation of facilities to be carried out under the program will be subject to strict compliance with the country's environmental regulations. (paragraph 4.9)

The program will have a positive social impact inasmuch as it will help support national efforts to speed up case processing times and

improve legal services, placing special emphasis on the systemwide implementation of a nondiscriminatory approach and gender (paragraph 4.10).

Benefits:

The principal benefit that the program will confer is the opportunity to continue the efforts, thus far successful, to make organizational and managerial changes at the central management level of the judicial branch, as well as in the judicial offices that provide legal services directly to users. The program will help ensure that these efforts are expanded to include not only the courts in additional judicial circuits, but also the offices of public prosecutors and public defenders, in order to ensure effective implementation of the new penal code.

The establishment of a modern organizational framework for the judiciary will help administrative and managerial processes become more effective and efficient. This institutional improvement will enable a foundation to be laid for tackling more complex challenges in the future, such as bringing the modernization and reform efforts to bear upon all of the country's judicial circuits. Under the proposed program, attempts to clear the backlog and prevent congestion in the judicial system will continue, thereby strengthening the judiciary's institutional and technical capacity and preparing the system's various stakeholders for a long-term process of institutional change.

The introduction of modern administrative systems will increase the efficiency and transparency with which the judiciary's resources are used. Relieving Supreme Court justices, judges, and public prosecutors of administrative tasks will allow the former to dedicate more time to strictly jurisdictional duties and the latter, to investigative duties.

The program will help launch an interinstitutional effort within the government to draft public policies and national strategies for the prevention of crime, in the framework of pilot activities in this area. The expansion of services provided by the Victim Services Office will benefit the victims of physical or mental assault.

Risks:

The main risk associated with the program has to do with the scope of the proposed amendments and changes, and particularly that of administrative and procedural changes, as these entail changing the well-established practices of the various stakeholders involved in the administration of justice, essentially judges, public prosecutors, high-level officials, and lawyers. This risk is mitigated by the experience gained during the first phase of the program and by the willingness to change demonstrated by the Supreme Court and its members in the

reform process that they have been carrying out, which includes the transformations called for in this operation.

A possible risk associated with project E, Management Capacity of the Judicial Branch, is that an amendment to the Judicial Branch Act may not be passed. However, since its independence is constitutionally guaranteed, the judicial branch has legislative authority in this matter. The risk that the legislature would override a Supreme Court decision is minimized by the fact that, constitutionally, it would need a two-thirds majority to do so.

Another risk is the possibility that judiciary officials and law practitioners may be resistant to the use of computers and the measurement of management and performance with management control tools. This risk will be reduced by applying the lessons learned in this area during the program's first phase, specifically through proper orientation, outreach and management of the process of change both within the judicial branch and beyond, with structured awareness raising activities; training for the system operators as called for under the program; and strengthening for the system's mid- and upper-level offices and agencies, which will lead the process of change.

**Special
contractual
clauses:**

Prior to the first disbursement, the executing agency must submit to the Bank's satisfaction: (a) a copy of the agreement entered into by the Ministry of Finance and the Supreme Court, which establishes the both the obligation to transfer the program financing to the Supreme Court on a nonreimbursable basis and the responsibilities of the Court with regard to program execution (paragraph 3.2); (b) the first annual operating plan (paragraph 3.22); (c) records indicating that the Program Monitoring Committee has been established and launched (paragraph 3.6); (d) the resolution establishing the Technical Unit of the Supreme Court's Commission on Gender, according to the terms agreed on with the Bank (paragraph 3.9); and (e) records indicating that the project managers have been appointed according to the terms agreed on with the Bank (paragraph 3.13).

In order for project A to receive financing, the executing agency must submit to the Bank's satisfaction evidence that: (i) the execution agreements with the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of the Interior, Police, and Security have entered into force (paragraph 3.15); and (ii) the Ministries of Justice and the Interior, Police, and Security have appointed, by mutual agreement, the manager for project A, according to the terms agreed on with the Bank (paragraph 3.15).

For disbursement of the funding earmarked for the consolidation of information systems, the executing agency must submit the following information: (i) for the Costa Rican Legal Information System, evidence that it has entered into an execution agreement with the Public Prosecutor's Office; and (ii) for the Prison Management Information System, evidence that it has entered into an execution agreement with the Ministry of Justice (see paragraph 3.15).

Poverty-targeting and social sector classification:

This operation qualifies as a social equity enhancing project, as described in the objectives for Bank activity set forth in the Report on the Eight General Increase in Resources (document AB-1704). It does not qualify as a poverty-targeted investment (PTI).

Exceptions to Bank policy:

None.

Procurement:

The selection and hiring of consulting services and all the procurement called for under the program will be conducted according to Bank procedures. International competitive bidding will be required for the procurement of goods in amounts above US\$350,000 and contracts for works in amounts above US\$2 million. Procurement in amounts below the aforementioned thresholds will initially be governed by national legislation. In the case of consulting service contracts in amounts over US\$200,000, an international call for proposals will be required.

I. FRAME OF REFERENCE

A. Background

- 1.1 Since 1989, Costa Rica has been pursuing a process of judicial reform that is exceptional for the commitment that the three branches of government, academia, the private sector, and the various participating civil society organizations have made to the long-term objectives required to make the judicial system more accessible, equitable, predictable, and efficient. In support of this process, the Bank approved a loan in January 1995 to partially finance the Program to Modernize the Administration of Justice (859/OC-CR; document PR-2002).
- 1.2 The Costa Rican judiciary is independent of the other branches of government; it is comprised of such important bodies as the Supreme Court of Justice [*Corte Suprema de Justicia*] and the other courts, which are organized nationwide into 12 judicial circuits; the Constitutional Chamber [*Sala Constitucional*]; the Public Prosecutors' Office (the office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic and the various public prosecutors' offices) [*Ministerio Público*]; the Public Defenders' Office [*Defensa Pública*]; the Judicial Investigation Bureau [*Organismo de Investigación Judicial*]; the Office of Forensic Medicine [*Medicatura Forense*]; the Judicial School [*Escuela Judicial*]; and the National Bureau of Notaries Public [*Dirección Nacional de Notariado*]. Each institution maintains technical independence in the discharge of its functions. The Ministry of Justice [*Ministerio de Justicia*] acts as the liaison for the judiciary and manages the prison system, the public registries of property and companies and other legally incorporated entities, and crime prevention activities.
- 1.3 The Public Prosecutors' Office plays a central role in criminal cases as a result of the 1998 entry into force of the new penal code, which made the office responsible for investigating and prosecuting all crimes committed in the country. This has required the judicial branch to create a new structure and increase the budget of the Public Prosecutors' Office to enable it to undertake this new duty, which it previously shared with the investigating judges in criminal cases. In addition, the Public Prosecutors' Office has the Auditor's Office [*Inspección Fiscal*] and the Supervision Unit [*Unidad de Supervisión*] under its authority, for the purpose of preventing those accused of a crime from being arbitrarily punished. It is also responsible for protecting and defending the interests of crime victims, for which the Victim Services Office [*Oficina de Atención a la Víctima*] was created. The Public Prosecutors' Office exerts operational control over the Judicial Investigation Bureau and has custody of everything related to investigations, such as physical evidence, which requires it to be organized and have sufficient space. The Public Defenders' Office, for its part, intervenes in cases in which the accused lack legal representation; while their role is no less important in criminal cases, public defenders are able to carry out their responsibilities without a particularly complex support system. The Public Prosecutors' Office manages and undertakes the

criminal investigation, while the Public Defenders' Office is only responsible for monitoring due process in matters that concern it. Consequently, the budget of the Public Prosecutors' Office is greater than that of the Public Defenders' Office; both offices are part of the judicial branch.

B. Program in execution

1. Execution status

- 1.4 The executing agency for the program is the Costa Rican Supreme Court of Justice, in its capacity as representative of the judicial branch. An executing unit reports to the Supreme Court and is composed of full-time judiciary personnel. The Ministry of Justice, the office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic, and the Law School of the University of Costa Rica have also participated in the executing unit. Even though the program execution period ends in June 2002, most of the remaining activities will reach completion in December 2001.
- 1.5 Initially, implementation of the program was slow, due to the amount of time that it took for the legislature to approve the contract and for the tendering of long-term consulting services to support program execution to reach completion. These two factors were in addition to the judiciary's initial lack of experience in executing this kind of operation. Ever since completion of the tendering procedures, progress has been satisfactory. As of 23 September 2001, 64% of program resources had been disbursed, an additional 30% committed, and 6% were available for disbursement. Program financial statements up until the 2000 fiscal year have been audited by an independent firm of public accountants.

2. Scope of the operation

- 1.6 The operation currently underway is *principally aimed at improving the management of judicial offices*. The goal is to increase their efficiency by instituting a management system that includes legal and organizational reforms, administrative restructuring, information technology, training, and procedural reforms. The system is being implemented in the 2nd Judicial Circuit of San José (Goicoechea), which has 19 offices (courts and prosecutors' offices) and 5 offices that provide them with administrative support. The 2nd Judicial Circuit is where 21.5% of the nation's judges preside and 24% of all criminal cases are tried.
- 1.7 The program helped implement the Costa Rican Legal Information System [*Sistema Costarricense de Información Jurídica*] (SCIJ), which provides access to the laws, executive decrees, regulations, and other general rules included in the National System of Current Legislation of the office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic, and is linked to the body of court decisions. Also supported under the program was the Information System for the Administration of Prisons [*Sistema de Información para la Administración Penitenciaria*] (SIAP), which covers the three largest prison facilities (50% of the incarcerated population). The SIAP is a

database for use by the Public Prosecutors' Office and the judicial system that is maintained on high-security servers. It contains records on: (i) all cases of incarceration; (ii) decisions; (iii) rulings; and (iv) legal opinions of sentencing judges.

- 1.8 The new management system designed and implemented in Goicoechea during the first phase of the program has sought to accelerate the handling and resolution of disputes by using resources more efficiently; taking advantage of economies of scale by establishing support offices that are shared by groups of courts (notification, receipt of documents, etc.); separating and specializing jurisdictional and administrative functions by creating the positions of court administrator, administrative coordinator, processing judge, and trial judge; introducing new technologies for managing cases and using statistics as a management monitoring tool, i.e. installing an automated case management system and a network of databases that contain information on current legislation, court decisions, and legal doctrine; substantially improving services provided to the public via toll-free lines, personalized service, etc.; and using automated systems that help increase access and allow greater volumes of information to be processed.

3. Evaluation of the program's first phase

- 1.9 The evaluation of the program's first phase presents concrete evidence that efficiency in the handling of cases has increased in all branches of law within the program's area of influence (Goicoechea). For example, the Civil Court of Finance [*Juzgado Civil de Hacienda*] succeeded in increasing monthly notifications by 55% between 1998 and 2000. The number of decisions issued per judge in this Court increased by 63% from 1998 to 2000. The Traffic Court [*Juzgado de Tránsito*] handled 80% more cases in 1999 than in 1998, an increase that it maintained in 2000. The productivity of the Alimony Court [*Juzgado de Pensiones Alimentarias*], measured in terms of the number of decisions per judge and per total personnel, increased as well, by 44% and 63%, respectively, from 1998 to 2000. In addition, the organizational change has helped shorten the amount of time that it takes the Court to issue a collection order from four days in 1998 to forty minutes in 2000.
- 1.10 The productivity of the Family and Domestic Violence Court [*Juzgado de Familia y Violencia Doméstica*], expressed as the number of cases dismissed and the number of decisions per judge, increased by 10% and 58%, respectively, from 1998 to 2000. The number of decisions handed down by the Court of Administrative Law [*Juzgado Contencioso Administrativo*] increased by more than 50% during the same period. The Civil Court [*Juzgado Civil*] issued 56% more decisions in 2000 than in 1998. The Criminal Court [*Juzgado Penal*] boasts increases in the number of cases dismissed per judge and per personnel as well, although they are slightly less dramatic since both demand and the number of judges and court officials has increased. Nevertheless, the percentage of cases dismissed to cases that are heard in the Court of Criminal Appeals [*Tribunal de Casación Penal*] has steadily increased from 29% in 1998 to 70% in 1999 to 88% in 2000.

- 1.11 In addition to enhanced efficiency, the evaluation points to achievements that have been made with respect to the foundation that was laid to help ensure the sustainability of the new management systems over time. Foremost among these achievements is the creation and consolidation of a case monitoring system (SIGDJ) that can be implemented and developed in all of Costa Rica's judicial offices. The creation of a judicial infrastructure that has already been tested and standardized and found to be effective for all legal branches and all levels of jurisdiction (standardizing and making all judicial documents and decisions consistent) will make it easier for the case management system to be implemented in other judicial circuits, gradually leading to the standardization of all operational procedures carried out in judicial offices. In addition to the creation of these two systems is that of the Costa Rican Juridical Information System (SCIJ), which is a powerful tool for all law practitioners as it provides information on all current legislation in the country, the body of court decisions, and legal doctrine.
- 1.12 These systems are the foundation for the creation of what will become the Legal Observatory, which will help the judiciary analyze information to improve all aspects of the managerial decision-making process and will even serve as a point of departure for guiding considerations related to gender and nondiscrimination. Another important achievement is that the judiciary has a technical team for dealing with the technological applications and developments for the management of judicial offices. The evaluation makes special mention of the successful efforts to familiarize law practitioners from judicial circuits not included in the program's first phase with the new administrative system and gain their acceptance of it.
- 1.13 This information establishes, once the lessons learned have been taken into consideration and some modifications have been made as indicated below, the advisability of expanding the program to include other judicial circuits. The evaluation states that the administrative model does not constitute the only valid model and, in fact, is not a model that could be replicated for all circuits, offices, branches of law, or levels of jurisdiction. In some cases, centralization is appropriate, while in others, for reasons of access to the justice system, maintaining a degree of geographical coverage that is able to meet rural demand is advisable. The model will thus be adapted to the various characteristics and requirements of the judicial circuits, taking into account, among other factors, access to the justice system for all Costa Ricans, economies of scale, and size.

4. Lessons learned

- 1.14 The first phase of the program has shown that modernizing the administration of justice entails a cultural change that affects all personnel who are associated with the system, in their various professions and branches of law. A well-established democratic and institutional environment is instrumental if the changes are to be successfully implemented. With this in mind, the process of change will be long and its fruits will not be entirely borne of one project. The lessons of the first phase have demonstrated the importance of the authorities' commitment to the long-term

objectives; the support of both public and private foreign entities; the separation of managerial and administrative duties from jurisdictional ones, which helps ensure that administrative positions in the judiciary are strengthened and given professional status; the sense of project ownership felt by the stakeholders; and the existence of an executing unit that is staffed with personnel from the executing agency so that they are able to lend permanence and experience to the process of change, enabling it to move forward with a great deal of effectiveness.

- 1.15 The lessons regarding the management of judicial offices that are included in the evaluation and that constitute the point of departure for the technical design of this operation demonstrate the need to: (i) actively involve the Public Prosecutors' and Public Defenders' Offices in the process of administrative change; (ii) reformulate the administrative and decision-making system of the judicial branch and strengthen the managerial capacity of every judicial circuit; (iii) continue working to separate administrative and jurisdictional functions within the framework of the new administration and automated case management model that has been undergoing implementation during the first phase of the program; (iv) further involve the system's various law practitioners by improving the way in which the process of change is managed; and (v) involve and raise awareness among external players, such as pertinent civil society organizations, the Bar [*Colegio de Abogados*], and universities.
- 1.16 The lessons discussed in the preceding paragraphs have been incorporated into the design of this proposed operation, as described later in Chapter II.

C. Current problem

- 1.17 The design of the program's logical framework was begun during the orientation mission with a two-day participatory workshop in which 50 individuals, led by the highest judicial authorities in the country, participated. Out of this workshop arose an identification of both the problems and the solutions described forthwith, which were also based on updated assessments and opinion polls (United Nations Development Programme 1999; 2001 State of the Nation report).
- 1.18 *Increase in crime.* The annual average rate of increase in the number of juvenile delinquency cases reported from 1993 to 1998 was 14.6%. The annual average rate of increase in the number of domestic violence cases reported during the same period was 61.1%. These examples of the rise in crime in Costa Rica demonstrate the compelling need to take nationwide comprehensive measures to combat it. While the judicial institutions' inability to effectively investigate and process criminal cases, as described later, should not be overlooked, there is also the problem of the absence of a preventive culture in Costa Rica, which is reflected in the lack of interagency coordination for drafting and instituting public crime prevention policies. A great deal of information on crime exists, but it is scattered among various agencies, impeding the ability of the office in charge of formulating national prevention policies and strategies, which reports to the Interinstitutional

Commission for the Prevention of Violence and Crime [*Comisión Interinstitucional de Prevención de la Violencia y el Delito*], to comprehensively analyze and scientifically manage the information in a way that would help it identify the best solutions.

- 1.19 Furthermore, out-of-court conflict resolution mechanisms are used infrequently and citizens distance themselves from police activities, which makes it difficult to achieve greater civic coexistence. To contend with these problems, the Ministry of Justice has instituted the Houses of Justice Program [*Programa de Casas de Justicia*]. Through this program, the Ministry paves the way for, promotes, and provides training for an alternative conflict resolution model that is founded on strategic alliances with municipalities and universities to ensure its sustainability and that enables the communities to find their own solutions for conflicts that can be resolved out of court. Of the cases that pass through these Houses of Justice, 70% are related to problems that affect women and the family. The Ministry of Public Security, for its part, is promoting a program, the Community Safety Model [*Modelo de Seguridad Comunitaria*], that encourages the participation of communities, as well as efforts by the police to establish closer ties with them. Under this program, the police forge strategic alliances with communities to foster trust, communication, and the exchange of ideas for combating crime and promoting greater civic coexistence.
- 1.20 *Weakness of the Public Defenders' Office.* Despite the fact that the Public Defenders' Office provides legal assistance in more than 90% of all criminal cases, the large caseload assigned to each public defender (average of 261 cases per public defender in 1999) renders the services provided by the Office discriminatory and inadequate to the task of ensuring that the legal rights of the accused are protected. The problem stems from organizational weakness, a lack of planning mechanisms, the absence of technology and of systems for case and office management to ensure efficient use of the available resources. For example, workload distribution among defenders is highly disparate, with some offices have one defender for 549 cases and others for just 49. Moreover, there is a lack of coherent planning for training and there are no strategic partnerships with the Bar Association, universities and other civil society organizations that could contribute pro bono professional services that would help the Public Defender's Office services improve service quality and timeliness.
- 1.21 *Weakness of the Public Prosecutors' Office.* In the area of criminal law, the management and institutional response capacity of the Public Prosecutors' Office falls short of what is needed to effectively deal with the increase in crime and the sophistication with which crimes are committed, as well as to enforce the new penal code, which makes the Office the lead agency for investigating and prosecuting crimes committed in Costa Rica and assigns functional management of the Judicial Investigation Agency (OIJ) to it. This institutional weakness is reflected in the absence of effective management and strategic planning tools; a management

model for public prosecutors' offices that is inconsistent with the principles of the new code in the areas of orality, swiftness, and deformalization; lack of coordination and joint preparation with the OIJ of criminal prosecution policies; a dearth of coherent training plans, especially for providing nondiscriminatory and gender-sensitive services; inadequate victim services, with only one office, located in San José, currently specialized in these services; and the lack of regulations governing the public prosecution profession.

- 1.22 *Judicial congestion.* The judicial system continues to be slow and backlogged in areas that were not part of the first phase of the program. Opinion polls on the performance of the judicial system (*Iniciativas de Comunicación para el Desarrollo*, 1997) show a high degree of confidence in terms of fair and equitable treatment (85.5%), but a lower degree of confidence regarding the relative speed with which justice is served (25.1%). The problems related to slowness in the judicial system have been fully identified and the solutions employed in the areas included under the program's first phase have already yielded positive results (paragraphs 1.9 and 1.10). Basically, the goal is to apply the experiences of the first phase to other judicial circuits and the Public Defenders' and Public Prosecutors' Offices, in order to accelerate the processing and resolution of conflicts by making the best use of resources; taking advantage of economies of scale; separating and specializing jurisdictional and administrative functions; undertaking procedural reform; resolving more cases out of court; incorporating new technologies for case management and using statistics to monitor management; substantially improving services offered to the public; improving the practice of law; and utilizing automated systems that help increase access and allow larger volumes of information to be processed.
- 1.23 *Weakness of the judiciary's administrative capacity.* The management and administration of the judicial branch is basically the responsibility of the Supreme Court justices, who form commissions to share the administrative tasks, which distracts them from their principal duty of administering justice. While a High Council [*Consejo Superior*] was established at the beginning of the 1990s to administer the judicial branch, it failed to relieve the Supreme Court of its administrative responsibilities because it lacked the appropriate organizational framework for fulfilling the strategic role of general manager. As a result, the judiciary's executive body [*Dirección Ejecutiva*] does not assume the managerial role that is incumbent upon it for making financial, administrative, and personnel decisions. Moreover, the assessments have indicated that the system's law practitioners carry out discriminatory practices in the absence of an organizational framework that would allow gender-related issues to be addressed and the respective policies drafted for their subsequent implementation throughout the system for all judicial activities.

D. The Bank's strategy in the sector

- 1.24 The Bank has been supporting the judicial systems of its member countries since 1994. The Report on the Bank's Eighth Replenishment states that the Bank may work with governments to strengthen and modernize their judicial systems (AB-1704). Furthermore, the Frame of Reference for Bank Action in Programs for Modernization of the State and Strengthening of Civil Society (GN-1883-5, 1996) establishes principles and criteria for programs in the sector. The proposed program is consistent with the Bank's strategy, deriving benefits from the experience gained over the past several years in addition to those derived from the execution of the first phase of the program. In addition to operation 859/OC-CR, financing has been provided in Costa Rica to: (i) the Ministry of Justice, for the design of sustainable Houses of Justice models, six of which are currently in operation (ATN/SG-6394-CR), and an action plan for the prevention of violence (ATN/SG-6395-CR); and (ii) the Board of Trade [*Cámara de Comercio*], for the establishment of a center for the arbitration and out-of-court resolution of trade disputes (ATN/MT-5397-CR). In addition, the Program for the Regularization of the Cadastre and Property Registry (1284/OC-CR), coordinated with the Ministry of Justice to improve legal certainty and use alternative methods for resolving conflicts related to property rights, is up for approval in the legislature.

II. THE PROGRAM

A. Objectives

- 2.1 The main objective of the proposed program is to improve the administration of justice by making it more accessible, equitable, dependable, and efficient. The specific objectives are to help: (i) improve the institutional capacity for developing crime prevention policies and projects; (ii) ensure that the legal rights of the accused are protected; (iii) make prosecutorial activities more reliable and effective; (iv) reduce congestion in the judicial system; and (v) improve the administrative capacity of the judiciary.

B. Description and structure of the program

- 2.2 The proposed program builds on the achievements made during the program's first phase in the area of efficiency in managing judicial offices and cases, which were supported by Bank operation 859/OC-CR. It also introduces new areas in accordance with the stakeholder analysis, updated sector assessments, and public opinion polls conducted. The program is composed of the following projects:

1. Project A: Institutional-strengthening for crime prevention (US\$1,923,000)

- 2.3 The goal of this project is to improve the institutional capacity for developing policies and projects to prevent crime. It is divided into the following three components:
- a. *Formulation of national crime prevention policies and strategies (US\$1,200,000).* The project will provide financing to the Ministry of Justice for technical assistance, programs, and computer equipment to: (i) development of an information system in an interagency network linking current data on crime held by the various institutions, including technical assistance for statistical management of the data and procurement of computer equipment; (ii) train staff from the office in charge of crime prevention in the areas of management and interagency coordination; (iii) draft crime maps that show which geographical areas are most vulnerable to crime in order to make the best use of prevention resources; (iv) formulate policies and strategies for crime prevention; (v) develop and conduct public crime prevention campaigns; and (vi) design a system for the ongoing evaluation of the impact of crime reduction measures.
 - b. *Advocacy of the use of out-of-court conflict resolution mechanisms (US\$505,000).* The project will provide financing to the Ministry of Justice for technical assistance to: (i) evaluate the Houses of Justice Program; and (ii) based on the findings of the evaluation: hold workshops to forge strategic partnerships with the private sector, municipalities, universities, and communities in order to

expand the program and ensure its sustainability; create six Houses of Justice at the community level, for which computer equipment, furniture, and supplies will be provided; train mediators and professionals from the community who are associated with the services provided by the Houses of Justice, which include awareness raising on issues related to indigenous groups, nondiscrimination and a gender approach; design outreach campaigns and publish materials for them; and develop a system of impact indicators that will be used for evaluation.

- c. *Improvement of community-police relations (US\$218,000)*. The project will provide financing to the Ministry of the Interior, Police, and Security for technical assistance to: (i) evaluate the community safety model and select new communities that will use the model; (ii) train and provide awareness raising to selected police officers and community members; (iii) prepare teaching materials; (iv) develop public information campaigns to promote awareness, which includes publishing materials; (v) provide audiovisual equipment; and (vi) publish information on crime prevention.

2. Project B: Strengthening the Public Defenders' Office (US\$1,547,000)

- 2.4 The goal of this project is to ensure that the legal rights of the accused are duly protected by improving the legal services provided by the Public Defenders' Office. This project is divided into two components:

- a. *Administrative and functional improvements (US\$347,000)*. The project will provide financing for technical assistance to: (i) design and institute a new organizational structure that will include the areas of planning; executive management; budget execution; the management of human, physical, and financial resources; the distribution of tasks by type and geographic area; etc.; (ii) promote strategic partnerships between the Public Defenders' Office and the private sector, universities, nongovernmental organizations, the Bar Association, and other public entities to increase its capacity; (iii) provide training in conjunction with the Judicial School for public defenders and officials, for consolidation of the system for hiring, advancing, promoting, disciplining, and dismissing personnel; (iv) develop and conduct awareness raising activities that help ensure that the Public Defenders' Office, in the provision of its legal services, does not discriminate against people because of their sex, ethnicity, nationality, creed, sexual orientation, etc.; and (v) draft proposals for making the best use of the resources available to the Public Defenders' Office.
- b. *Improved case management (US\$1,200,000)*. The project will provide financing for technical assistance and equipment in order to: (i) develop and launch an automated case management system; (ii) furnish equipment; and (iii) train personnel in the use of the new system. This system will be centrally installed in the Public Defenders' Office and in the judicial circuits that participate in project D and will be interconnected with the case monitoring system, the SCIJ and the SIAP.

3. Project C: Strengthening the Public Prosecutors' Office (US\$6,005,000)

2.5 The goal of this project is to strengthen the Public Prosecutors' Office's capacity to investigate and prosecute crimes, to help ensure that the new penal code is properly enforced. The project comprises the following four components:

- a. *Administrative and strategic planning improvements (US\$275,000)*. The project will include: (i) training and technical assistance for strengthening the administrative and strategic planning capacity of the Public Prosecutors' Office; (ii) technical assistance for developing databases; (iii) technical assistance for the development, jointly with the OIJ and other institutions involved, of criminal prosecution policies to ensure due process; (iv) technical assistance for drafting proposals for sentences that provide an alternative to imprisonment; and (v) the provision of computer equipment.
- b. *Improved management of public prosecutors' offices (US\$3,906,000)*. The project will include: (i) technical assistance for developing and installing an automated case management system that is linked to the general case management system; (ii) training for prosecutors and officials in management techniques; and (iii) the provision of equipment.
- c. *Victim services (US\$518,000)*. The project is aimed at increasing the capacity of the Public Prosecutors' Office to provide services to victims of crime, with an emphasis on gender issues. To help ensure the sustainability of these services, they will be provided in conjunction with public and private entities and multidisciplinary victims' services. This project will be carried out in the public prosecutors' offices that fall within the participating judicial circuits. It will provide financing for: (i) technical assistance for developing organizational, functional, and operational models, including the rules for their operation; (ii) training for participating officials; (iii) equipment, materials, and furniture; and (iv) consulting services for developing and conducting victim service outreach activities.
- d. *Strengthening human resources (US\$1,306,000)*. The project will include: (i) technical assistance for instituting and regulating the public prosecution profession; (ii) technical assistance for developing protocols for holding, collecting, and analyzing evidence, as well as for obtaining expert appraisals of the way in which the issue of gender is treated and the way in which officials from the Judicial Investigation Bureau and the Office of Forensic Medicine are trained in these protocols; and (iii) training for public prosecutors in investigative techniques, juridical and judicial litigation, the use of alternative methods, and issues that include environmental protection and approaches that preclude discrimination based on sex, ethnicity, nationality, creed, sexual orientation, etc.

4. Project D: Judicial efficiency in conflict resolution (US\$13,043,000)

2.6 The goal of this project is to reduce congestion in the judicial system. The project consists of the following five components:

- a. *Management of judicial offices (US\$11,120,000)*. The project will provide financing for: (i) technical assistance for continuing efforts to reorganize the modalities of work in judicial offices, including courts and the offices of public prosecutors and public defenders, by separating administrative duties from jurisdictional ones; (ii) technical assistance and equipment for expanding the automated case management system to include judicial circuits that meet the selection criteria agreed upon;¹ (iii) technical assistance for acclimatizing officials and users to the change; (iv) technical assistance for training judges and judicial officials, with an emphasis on training them to discharge their duties without discriminating based on sex, ethnicity, nationality, creed, sexual orientation, etc.; and (v) rehabilitation/expansion of the physical infrastructure of the participating judicial circuits to prepare them for the new office and case management systems.
- b. *Procedural reform (US\$268,000)*. The project will provide technical assistance for: (i) generating the consensus needed to pass procedural amendments that are designed to speed up the processing of all types of cases except criminal cases, which are already subject to new procedural regulations; and (ii) training judges, judicial officials, law practitioners, and users.
- c. *Out-of-court dispute resolution (US\$139,000)*. The project will provide technical assistance for: (i) drafting proposals for the out-of-court settlement of cases that do not justify court intervention (traffic cases, for example); and (ii) generating the consensus needed to pass the proposed amendments.

¹ The selection criteria call for the consideration of aspects such as: coverage in terms of the number of cases; coverage in terms of the population served; access to justice in areas that are far away from the metropolitan area; availability of space for the participation of the Public Prosecutors' Office and the Public Defenders' Office; express commitment made by the judges in charge of the judicial circuit to the process of change; availability of technological infrastructure in terms of electrical wiring and fiber optic lines; state of repair of the existing buildings; and the actual capacity of the judiciary to provide support in areas distant from the metropolitan area.

- d. *Legal training and the practice of law (US\$316,000)*. The project will provide technical assistance, with the participation of the Bar Association for: (i) drafting proposals to improve the practice of law, (ethics review, incentives); (ii) generating the consensus needed to pass the proposals; (iii) training and legal awareness raising for professionals who provide services to vulnerable populations, including specific training programs to raise awareness about how to discharge their duties without discriminating based on sex, ethnicity, nationality, creed, sexual orientation, etc.
- e. *Legal and judicial information systems (US\$1,200,000)*. The project will provide technical assistance and equipment for: (i) consolidating the SCIJ; (ii) consolidating the SIAP; and (iii) developing and installing a gender information and communication system for judicial system users.

5. Project E: Management capacity of the Judicial Branch (US\$636,000)

2.7 The goal of this project is to reorganize the administrative managerial system of the judiciary, which will mainly entail the separation of jurisdictional from administrative functions, with specialized professionals hired for the latter. This project comprises the following three components:

- a. *Reform of the decision-making structure (US\$55,000)*. Under this component, technical assistance will be provided for: (i) drafting a proposal to reform the decision-making structure, the main component of which will be the separation of jurisdictional functions from administrative ones, including an analysis of the effectiveness with which existing commissions of judges make administrative decisions; and (ii) providing orientation and generating consensus needed to pass these structural changes.
- b. *Reorganization of the judiciary's management system (US\$356,000)*. Under this component, technical assistance will be provided for: (i) preparing new job profiles for management-level personnel; (ii) introducing the capacity to manage change into the management system; and (iii) developing and installing information systems that support the administrative and jurisdictional decision-making process (Legal Observatory), as well as providing equipment.
- c. *Institutionalization of policies on gender (US\$225,000)*. Under this component, technical assistance will be provided for: (i) drafting a gender policy for the judicial system; (ii) placing the proposals in context in order to obtain approval for them; (iii) developing information systems and providing equipment for the coordination, tracking, monitoring, and evaluation of nondiscriminatory and gender-related training activities in the judicial branch by the Technical Unit of the Commission on Gender; (iv) conducting research on gender-related issues; and (v) drafting proposals for the creation of interagency networks to allow gender-sensitive approaches to be concurrently introduced.

C. Cost and financing

- 2.8 The estimated total cost of the program is US\$32 million, of which US\$22.4 million (70%) will be financed with a Bank loan using resources from Ordinary Capital under the Single Currency Facility and US\$9.6 million equivalent (30%) in local counterpart funding.
- 2.9 The amortization period for the Bank loan will be 25 years, with a five-year grace period. The loan will have a variable interest rate, a 0.75% credit fee, and a 1% inspection and supervision fee.
- 2.10 The consolidated budget for each project, broken down by source of financing and category of investment, is presented in the following table.

Table of costs (in U.S. dollars)

Budget Category	Total	Bank	Local total	Local Executive	Local Judiciary
A. Institution-Strengthening for Crime Prevention	1,923,000	1,346,100	576,900	576,900	0
A.1 Consulting services	430,000	427,000	3,000	3,000	0
A.2 Equipment	209,000	209,000	0	0	0
A.3 Training	463,000	457,600	5,400	5,400	0
A.4 Materials, printing, etc.	821,000	252,500	568,500	568,500	0
B. Strengthening the Public Defenders' Office	1,547,000	1,343,000	204,000	0	204,000
B.1 Consulting services	547,000	543,000	4,000	0	4,000
B.2 Equipment	900,000	700,000	200,000	0	200,000
B.3 Training	100,000	100,000	0	0	0
C. Strengthening the Public Prosecutors' Office	6,005,000	4,995,000	1,010,000	0	1,010,000
C.1 Consulting services	2,259,000	2,225,000	34,000	0	34,000
C.2 Equipment	2,200,000	1,750,000	450,000	0	450,000
C.3 Training	1,326,000	1,020,000	306,000	0	306,000
C.4 Materials, printing, etc.	220,000	0	220,000	0	220,000
D. Judicial Efficiency in Conflict Resolution	13,043,000	10,868,400	2,174,600	150,000	2,024,600
D.1 Consulting services	3,419,000	3,226,000	193,000	10,000	183,000
D.2 Equipment	4,500,000	3,691,000	809,000	90,000	719,000
D.3 Training	824,000	490,000	334,000	50,000	284,000
D.4 Infrastructure	4,300,000	3,461,400	838,600	0	838,600
E. Management Capacity of the Judicial Branch	636,000	439,000	197,000	0	197,000
E.1 Consulting services	464,000	339,000	125,000	0	125,000
E.2 Equipment	100,000	100,000	0	0	0
E.3 Training	72,000	0	72,000	0	72,000
F. Administrative Costs	5,100,000	0	5,100,000	0	5,100,000
F.1 Executing agency	5,100,000	0	5,100,000	0	5,100,000
Subtotal	28,254,000	18,991,500	9,262,500	726,900	8,535,600
G. Independent Audits	50,000	50,000	0	0	0
H. Contingencies	1,858,990	1,858,990	0	0	0
I. Finance Charges	1,837,010	1,499,510	337,500	337,500	0
I.1 Interest	1,275,510	1,275,510	0	0	0
I.2 Credit fee	337,500	0	337,500	337,500	0
I.3 Inspection and supervision fee	224,000	224,000	0	0	0
Total	32,000,000	22,400,000	9,600,000	1,064,400	8,535,600

- 2.11 The costs associated with improving the physical infrastructure of the judicial offices included in project D and providing them with equipment have been calculated based on the consultants' studies that were financed under the first phase of the program. Five judicial circuits (Alajuela, Cartago, San José I, Limón, and Pérez Zeledón) were selected as a representative sample, although the final selection will be made in accordance with the aforementioned criteria.
- 2.12 The local counterpart funds that correspond to components (a) and (b) of project A and component (e)(ii) of project D will come from the budget of the Ministry of Justice. The Ministry of the Interior, Police, and Security will provide local counterpart funds for component (c) of project A. The Public Prosecutors' Office and the office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic will each contribute 50% of the local counterpart funding for component (e)(i) of project D.

III. PROGRAM EXECUTION

A. Borrower and executing agency

- 3.1 The borrower will be the Republic of Costa Rica, which will be represented in the loan contract by the Ministry of Finance. The Ministry of Finance will transfer the loan proceeds in nonreimbursable funds to the Supreme Court of Justice, the executing agency, which will carry out program activities through the executing unit.
- 3.2 Prior to the first disbursement, the borrower will submit to the Bank for its satisfaction a copy of the agreement signed by the Ministry of Finance and the Supreme Court of Justice in which the executive branch's obligation to transfer the loan in nonreimbursable funds to the Supreme Court is established, as is the Supreme Court's commitment to provide the local counterpart resources required for program execution. The agreement will also describe the responsibilities incumbent upon the Supreme Court with respect to the technical aspects of program execution.

B. Execution and administration of the program

1. General framework

- 3.3 An implementation plan will be used to execute the program and will contain the following components: (i) the logical framework matrix, in which the hierarchy of goals, objectives, components, activities, results, and indicators is established; (ii) the itemized budget for the program; (iii) the procurement plan for goods and services; (iv) the monitoring and evaluation plan; (v) the components that should be included in the annual operating plans; and (vi) the annual independent audits.
- 3.4 The program will be coordinated and executed on three different levels, namely, political and strategic management, regular supervision, and coordination and execution of the activities called for under the program's five component projects.

2. Strategic management and supervision of the program

- 3.5 The strategic management of the program will be the responsibility of the Supreme Court, which will approve, through resolutions, the annual operating plans that it decides on with the Bank for each of the program's projects.
- 3.6 Regular program supervision will be the responsibility of the Monitoring Committee, which will be created as a condition precedent to the first disbursement. This Committee will be composed of three Supreme Court justices and the chairman of the Supreme Court's Commission on Gender. The Prosecutor General of the Republic, the Director of the Public Defenders' Office, and other public

officials will be invited as warranted by the agenda. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court will preside over the Committee.

- 3.7 The Monitoring Committee will supervise the fulfillment of program goals, the efficient use of resources, and the activities called for in the annual operating plans. It will also act as a liaison, keeping the Supreme Court informed of the status of program execution.
- 3.8 The Committee will set a schedule of regular sessions and may be convened for extraordinary sessions by the chairman or at the request of any of its members. The Director of the executing unit, as the technical secretary, and the project managers will participate in the Committee's working sessions in order to provide expert opinions on special aspects of program execution that may be required. The Committee will have reports from the executing unit as background material for its sessions.
- 3.9 In order for a gender-sensitive focus to be incorporated throughout the judiciary, which is a major element of the program, a Technical Unit will be created under the Commission on Gender to supervise, monitor, and evaluate the activities aimed at promoting nondiscrimination and gender sensitivity that are called for in the various components of the projects. To facilitate the Unit's efforts, the table of costs and gender sensitivity activities for each project can be found in the technical files. The Unit will be composed of officials from the judicial system and will have a Secretary General and an administrative assistant. The creation of the Technical Unit will be a condition precedent to the first disbursement.

3. Coordination and execution

a. Program executing unit

- 3.10 The executing unit for the program will be responsible for:
 - a. Directing, coordinating, supervising, and being accountable for the technical, financial, and administrative development of the program;
 - b. Coordinating program execution and supervising the extent to which the program is being successfully implemented by the specific operating units involved in the various program activities;
 - c. Acting as a liaison between the Bank and the Monitoring Committee, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of the Interior, Police, and Security, the Commission on Gender, the Public Prosecutors' Office, and the Public Defenders' Office for execution of the various program activities;

- d. Regularly monitoring attainment of the expected results and adherence to the timelines of projects and components, as set forth in the logical framework, schedules, and other tools for evaluating program outcomes;
 - e. Submitting disbursement requests to the Bank in compliance with the stipulations of the loan contract;
 - f. Submitting requests for local counterpart disbursements to program authorities for their consideration;
 - g. Ensuring compliance with the procedures stipulated in the loan contract and its annexes for tendering and contracting consulting services, as well as with national laws and regulations on tendering procedures;
 - h. Submitting to the Bank for its approval, before the tendering process begins, the final plans for the physical infrastructure to be repaired or constructed, tender documents, and other documents specified in the contracts for executing works, procuring goods, and contracting for services;
 - i. Ensuring the existence of a modern accounting and financial system that enables program operations and the investment plan to be properly managed;
 - j. Keeping the Monitoring Committee and the Bank apprised of the status of the program in all areas and submitting semiannual consolidated progress reports;
 - k. Keeping the information that is needed for the general coordination and monitoring of the program up to date;
 - l. Coordinating and supporting efforts to disseminate information on the goals and achievements of the program, which are proposed by the managers of each project.
- 3.11 The executing unit is currently staffed by a Director, an administrator, an accountant, a budget expert, an individual responsible for tendering procedures, a computer science advisor, and two secretaries. Under the proposed operation, the unit would be strengthened by the addition of a professional in charge of planning and monitoring project and component activities and a lawyer specialized in administrative contracts. Managers will also be assigned to the individual projects, as described below, for the technical execution of each one. The practice of consulting with advisors from the judiciary or hiring expert advisors on a short-term basis will also be continued, as required for program execution and in the areas needed. The staff members assigned to the executing unit are judiciary personnel.

b. Project management

- 3.12 The implementation of each one of the projects will be the responsibility of a manager, who will report to the directorate of the executing unit throughout program execution. Each project manager will work closely with the respective ministry officials and will be responsible for:
- a. Meeting project objectives and goals on time using the budgeted resources;
 - b. Preparing the annual operating plans, the quarterly activity and task plans, and the semiannual progress reports for the respective project, in their area of responsibility;
 - c. Supervising, coordinating, and evaluating the performance of the project task groups, in their area of responsibility;
 - d. Specifying the technical characteristics of the task groups that will be acquired and the terms of reference for contracting professional services for their project, as agreed on with the respective ministry-level authority;
 - e. Supervising the fulfillment of the terms of reference and the outputs of the consulting services, to the satisfaction of the corresponding ministry-level authority;
 - f. Coordinating the various task groups for which they are responsible;
 - g. Generating forms to obtain feedback from future internal and external users of the project's products;
 - h. Preparing regular progress reports for their project;
 - i. Transferring the outputs generated and expertise gained through their project to the areas of the judiciary in which they will be applied;
 - j. Conducting outreach activities that have been decided on with the Director of the executing unit.
- 3.13 Project managers must have professional training in the subjects related to their project, extensive experience in the administration of projects in complex organizations, and at least five years of experience in processes similar to the ones proposed herein. In addition, they should be enterprising, proactive, and goal-oriented. Project managers will be staff members of the participating entities; their appointment as full-time employees will be a condition precedent to the first disbursement.

c. Task groups

- 3.14 Each project manager will have task groups composed of staff members of the Ministries directly involved in the area that the respective project deals with. The members of the groups will report directly to the their project manager, who will be responsible for ensuring that the task groups meet their objectives and goals.

4. Project execution agreements with executive agencies

- 3.15 The Supreme Court will have to enter into agreements with the Ministry of Justice to enable the executing unit to implement project A and carry out the activities for expanding the SIAP under project D; with the Ministry of the Interior, Police, and Security for the project to improve relations between the police and communities; and with the Office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic for the consolidation of the SCIJ. These agreements will establish the requirement to transfer the local counterpart contribution of the two aforementioned Ministries, as specified in the program budget, to the program bank account. The disbursement of loan proceeds for the proposed program will be subject to evidence submitted by the executing agency to the Bank for its satisfaction that demonstrates that the aforesaid agreements are in force and that the Ministries in question have appointed a manager for project A by mutual agreement and according to the terms agreed on with the Bank. Each project may be initiated independently of the others.

5. Program outreach

- 3.16 The program will utilize both internal and external outreach tools, among which the following will be considered: (i) an informational sheet on the program, distributed on a semiannual basis to all personnel in the judicial branch; (ii) a semiannual conference presenting program achievements, in which representatives of the various sectors of the judiciary and the trade unions may participate; (iii) a semiannual conference presenting program achievements, in which representatives of civil society organizations interested in the performance of the judiciary and in crime prevention activities may participate; (iv) an informative web page for the program (<http://www.poder-judicial.go.cr>).

C. Procurement of goods and services

- 3.17 The selection and hiring of firms to provide consulting services and all the procurements called for in the program will be conducted according to Bank procedures. International competitive bidding will be required for the procurement of goods involving amounts above US\$350,000 and contracts for works involving amounts above US\$2,000,000. Procurements involving amounts below the aforementioned thresholds will initially be regulated by national legislation. In the case of consulting service contracts in amounts over US\$200,000, an international open call for proposals will be made. The annexed procurement schedule demonstrates the way in which procurements have been grouped into estimated

quantities in order to take advantage of economies of scale in the tendering process. An attempt will likewise be made to consolidate the various projects' requirements for related consulting services into a few contracts to help make organizational changes more internally coherent and to simplify their administration.

D. Revolving fund

- 3.18 A revolving fund containing up to 5% of program financing will be specially created under a separate bank account opened for the program. The executing unit will administer disbursements made from the fund. Within 60 days of the end of each calendar semester, semiannual reports indicating the condition of the revolving fund held by the executing agency will be submitted.

E. Execution and disbursement schedules

- 3.19 The execution and disbursement schedules for the program will be four and a half and five years, respectively. The disbursement schedule is based on the investment schedule developed for each of the program components and can be found in the program files.

Disbursement schedule (in millions of U.S. dollars)					
Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total
3.8	5	5.8	5	2.8	22.4

F. Accounting and audits

- 3.20 The executing agency will keep program accounting and financial records separate to enable: (i) financial transactions made with program funds to be distinguished from those made with other funds managed by the Supreme Court; and (ii) program financial statements to be prepared. The executing unit will keep the contracts and finances of all the projects centrally managed.
- 3.21 Every year, within 120 days of the end of the fiscal year, the executing agency will submit to the Bank program financial statements that have been audited by an independent firm that is acceptable to the Bank. Program funds will be used to cover the cost of the external audits.

G. Monitoring and evaluation

- 3.22 Program activities will be carried out according to annual operating plans, which are planning tools that will be developed for each project and will be agreed on with the Bank during annual monitoring meetings. In accordance with the program's logical framework, the annual operating plans will minimally contain the following: (i) an annual execution timeline with the accompanying costs; (ii) the financing

requirements for the period; and (iii) a designation of who is responsible for the expected results. Annual operating plan proposals will be submitted to the Bank in June of each year, so that they coincide with the budgetary cycle of the judiciary. Receipt by the Bank of the first annual operating plan will be a condition precedent to the first disbursement of its loan.

- 3.23 The executing agency and the Bank will hold meetings to monitor and evaluate attainment of performance benchmarks, as described in the semiannual reports, as well as to decide on the respective execution plans and make any necessary adjustments. The Bank's Country Office in Costa Rica will be responsible for the administration of the operation; this, however, will not preclude administrative missions from being conducted during program execution.
- 3.24 The aforementioned evaluations will be tied to the benchmarks, objectives, goals, benefits, and risks of the program, which will enable program outcomes to be measured, as set forth in the logical framework. The calculation of performance benchmarks for all the projects uses 2000 as the baseline year. In light of their specificity and number, the benchmarks associated with the management of judicial offices and public prosecutors' offices in projects D and C, respectively, are separately presented in the document "Management Benchmarks," which complements the logical framework and forms part of the technical file for the program. The benchmarks used to evaluate the program's impact include the management benchmarks (congestion and case resolution) that measure court/office productivity by dividing the workload by the number of judges and support personnel per court, in the case of project D, and the number of public prosecutors and support personnel per office, in the case of project C, using 2000 as the baseline year in both cases.
- 3.25 No ex post evaluation of the program will be conducted. However, the executing agency will agree to: (i) submit annual reports to the Bank until two years after program completion, ensuring continuity of the impact and performance indicators beyond the program execution period; and (ii) update the information on program progress and performance through the program web page.

IV. FEASIBILITY AND RISKS

A. Technical and institutional feasibility

- 4.1 Even though it is a court comprised of 22 justices, the Costa Rican Supreme Court is quite committed to the process of change that was initiated during the first phase of the program and to this operation, under the terms of its design. All of the stakeholders feel a strong sense of ownership over the program, as evidenced during the design and development of the logical framework.
- 4.2 The judicial branch is independent by constitutional mandate and has broad authority to determine its own internal rules and regulations and organize its work. The proposed organizational and administrative changes are not expected to require legislative reforms. In light of the experience gained and the lessons learned during the first phase, which formed the building blocks for this proposed operation, the program is expected to be successfully executed according to the terms of its design.
- 4.3 The program will help ensure that the managerial and administrative functions of the judiciary improve and achieve greater efficiency and that the Supreme Court and its commissions are relieved of nonessential administrative tasks, thereby strengthening their jurisdictional and supervisory functions. Moreover, it will enable the process of change in the management of courts and in the legal services that they provide to continue, by applying the successes of the first phase of the program, particularly in the area of relieving judges of administrative tasks by elevating these tasks to the level of a professional category and hiring administration and management specialists to handle them. The experience from the first phase of the program will also be brought to bear upon the legal services provided by the Public Prosecutors' and Public Defenders' Offices.
- 4.4 The government will initiate an interagency effort to draft public policies and national strategies on crime prevention, within the framework of carrying out pilot activities in this area.
- 4.5 The procedural reform and the initiatives to resolve cases out of court where possible, which the program will support, may require legislative amendments. However, the program is not concerned with the enactment per se of these amendments. Rather, it attempts to prompt a discussion on the changes that they would entail and supports the drafting of proposals of the highest technical quality possible as part of a process to discuss the issue and reach a national consensus. There will be no risk to the program if these reforms are not passed, since the program and its goals of improving legal office and case management have been designed in such a way that they may work under the current legal framework for

judicial proceedings and competence. However, enactment of the reforms would further enhance the efficiency of the legal offices.

- 4.6 The completed institutional analysis has helped determine that the participating judicial personnel, as well as technical personnel in administrative areas, are qualified to participate in the program. In light of the consensus reached and the identification of program participants, the motivation to continue the process of institutional improvement with a scope such as the one proposed herein clearly exists. Furthermore, the members of the executing agency are also members of the participating institutions, which indicates that the changes proposed under the program will likely be sustainable beyond the execution period. Finally, the process of strengthening the executing agency's capacity to design and manage projects has already begun, as a result of the program's first phase.

B. Financial feasibility

- 4.7 The judiciary's 2001 budget is US\$135 million (0.9% of the 2000 gross domestic product), 58.6% of which is earmarked for jurisdictional and administrative activities common to the entire judiciary (Supreme Court, courts, and the entire administrative and managerial apparatus). The remaining 41.4% is allocated to auxiliary bodies that in other countries are not part of the judicial branch (Public Prosecutors' Office, Public Defenders' Office, Judicial Investigation Bureau, Office of Forensic Medicine, Judicial School, and the National Department of Notaries Public). The budget for the judicial branch is provided for under Costa Rica's Constitution, which stipulates that it must receive at least 6% of the country's annual revenue.
- 4.8 The executive branch and the Supreme Court have given the program high priority, effectively laying the institutional foundation and making the resources needed for program execution available. The local counterpart funds that the judiciary will contribute, which equal 92.5% of the total local counterpart contribution, represent 1.2% of its annual budget. The local financing for components (a) and (b) of project A and component (e)(ii) of project D will come from the budget of the Ministry of Justice, while those earmarked for component (c) of project A will be contributed by the Ministry of the Interior, Police, and Security. The contributions from these Ministries represent 7.5% of the total local counterpart contribution, a fact that will be reflected in the loan contract with the Bank. Funds provided by the Ministries of Justice and the Interior, Police, and Security will represent 0.38% and 0.014% of their respective annual budgets.

C. Environmental and social impact

- 4.9 By strengthening the judicial system, the program will contribute to the improved enforcement of current legislation, which includes environmental provisions. The renovation works that the program calls for will be carried out in strict observance of the country's environmental regulations.

- 4.10 The program will have a positive social impact inasmuch as it will help support national efforts to speed up case processing times and improve legal services. Under the program, resources have been earmarked for activities for incorporating gender-sensitive and nondiscriminatory measures throughout the judiciary system. To institutionalize gender sensitivity in the judiciary, a Technical Unit will be created under the Supreme Court's Commission on Gender. The Unit will be responsible for coordinating with the executing unit and rest of the participating judicial institutions and implementing and monitoring the activities planned under each project component. The expected results of this investment are a gender policy that ensures that all judicial institutions consider gender issues as they carry out their ongoing duties, and monitoring systems and gender-sensitive procedures and protocols that support the aforesaid duties. This will support the efforts of the judiciary to make the administration of justice more accessible, equitable, predictable, and efficient.

D. Benefits

- 4.11 The principal benefit that the program will confer is the opportunity to continue the efforts, thus far successful, to introduce organizational and managerial change at the central management level of the judicial branch, as well as in the judicial offices that provide legal services directly to clients. The program will help ensure that these efforts are expanded to include not only the courts in additional judicial circuits, but also the offices of public prosecutors and public defenders, as a way of approaching the task of effectively enforcing the new penal code. The program makes it possible to support a process of change that is inherently long-term, a fact that is understood by the both executive and judicial authorities. The program will support expansion of the management model to five additional court circuits, thereby ensuring coverage of 85% of the cases and judicial offices in the country.
- 4.12 The establishment of a modern organizational framework for the judiciary will help administrative and managerial processes become more effective and efficient. This institutional improvement will enable a foundation to be laid for the Judiciary to involve all of the country's judicial circuits in the process of modernization and change. Under the proposed program, attempts to clear the backlog and prevent congestion in the judicial system will continue, thereby strengthening the judiciary's institutional and technical capacity and preparing the system's various constituents for a long-term process of institutional change.
- 4.13 The introduction of modern administrative systems will increase the efficiency and transparency with which the judiciary's resources are used. Relieving Supreme Court justices, judges, and public prosecutors of administrative tasks will allow the former to dedicate more time to strictly jurisdictional duties and the latter, to investigative duties.
- 4.14 The program will help launch an interinstitutional effort within the government to draft public policies and national strategies for the prevention of crime, within the

framework of carrying out pilot activities in this area. The expansion of services provided by the Victim Services Office will benefit those who are victims of crimes expressly committed to cause them physical or psychological harm.

E. Risks

- 4.15 The main risk associated with the program has to do with the scope of the proposed amendments and changes, and particularly that of administrative and procedural changes, as these entail changing the well-established practices of the various individuals that participate in the administration of justice, essentially judges, public prosecutors, high-level officials, and lawyers. This risk is mitigated by the experience gained during the first phase of the program and by the commitment shown by the Supreme Court and its members to the process of change that they have been carrying out, which includes the changes called for in this operation.
- 4.16 A possible risk associated with project E, Management Capacity of the Judicial Branch, would be that an amendment of the Basic Law of the Judicial Branch would not be passed. However, since its independence is constitutionally guaranteed, the judicial branch has legislative authority in this matter. The risk that the legislature would override a Supreme Court decision is minimized by the fact that, constitutionally, it would need a two-thirds majority to do so.
- 4.17 Another risk is the possibility that judiciary officials and law practitioners would be resistant to the use of computers and the measurement of management and performance with management control tools. This risk can be reduced by applying the lessons that were learned in this area during the program's first phase and will, in fact, be reduced by properly orienting, providing outreach on, and managing the process of change both within and without the judicial branch; conducting structured sensitivity training activities; training law practitioners who are participating in the program; and strengthening the system's mid- and upper-level offices and agencies, which will lead the process of change.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK
SECOND PHASE OF THE PROGRAM FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Narrative Summary	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
of the program			
Improve the rule of law and legal system	– Levels of human and economic development and civic coexistence increase.	State of the nation reports; economic and social indicators	Public spending commitments for the judicial system are sustained.
of the program and goals of projects			
Accessible, equitable, predictable, efficient administration of justice	Levels of public confidence in the judicial system increase.	Polls and information in the press	The level of political commitment to judicial reform is maintained.
of project A			
INSTITUTION- STRENGTHENING FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRIME: Improved capacity for developing and implementing crime prevention policies and projects	– By the end of the project, institutions are executing specific programs for crime prevention, in accordance with policy.	Progress reports	The Commission for the Prevention of Violence and Crime continues in existence and reaches agreements on preventive policies.
of project B			
National crime prevention policies and strategies formulated	– By the end of the project, the prevention policies and accompanying plan for interagency execution are in place. (Commission for the Prevention of Violence and Crime) – By the end of the project's second year, the data and analysis for formulating and evaluating crime prevention policies are available.	Progress reports Progress reports	Interinstitutional networks operate effectively. Participating entities share information on crime.
Out-of-court conflict resolution mechanisms strengthened	– (Six Houses of Justice by the end of the execution period) two in operation the second year; two more in the third year; two more in the fourth year/2,000 cases processed annually by each	Statistical reports from the Ministry of Justice's Alternative Conflict Resolution Office [Dirección de Resolución Alternativa de Conflictos]	Strategic alliances are forged and maintained.

Narrative Summary	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Police-community relations improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of communities that the Unit is able to serve increases by 200 per year over a three-year period 	Progress reports	Participating communities maintain levels of commitment, and the program with the Ministry of the Interior, Police and Security is continued.
the program			
Improve the rule of law and legal system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of human and economic development and civic coexistence increase. 	State of the nation reports; economic and social indicators	Public spending commitments for the judicial system are sustained.
ve of the program and goals of projects			
Accessible, equitable, predictable, efficient administration of justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Levels of public confidence in the judicial system increase. 	Polls and information in the press	The level of political commitment to judicial reform is maintained.
ve of project B			
STRENGTHENING THE PUBLIC DEFENDERS' OFFICE: Improved protection of the rights of accused	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> By project completion, the Public Defenders' Office is able to defend 5,000 new cases annually via strategic alliances with entities outside of the judiciary. The number of cases per public defender is better distributed by office, in accordance with the national average (261 cases per defender in 1999) 	Statistical reports	<p>The Supreme Court, the private sector Bar, universities, and nongovernmental organizations make commitments to support the Public Defenders' Office</p> <p>The responsibilities of the Public Defenders' Office do not increase. Demand grows at an average of 5,000 cases per year.</p>

Narrative Summary	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
nents			
Administrative and functional procedures of the Public Defenders' Office improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Upon project completion, the new structure for the Office is in place and all administrative personnel have been duly trained. – Administrative management benchmarks are prepared semiannually, beginning at the end of the third year – By the end of the second year, the proposal for the new structure is prepared and the training plan is underway. 	Progress reports	Officials effectively utilize new management techniques.
Case management capacity of the Public Defenders' Office improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Timely information on caseloads (case management) and the status of the cases handled by each public defender are available by the end of the second year. – Guidelines for collecting fees from users who are able to pay are prepared by the end of the project's third year. – A set of benchmarks for evaluating the quality of the work done by public defenders is prepared in the second year. (Judicial Observatory) – By the end of the third year, five strategic alliances are formed to defend cases. – The percentage of officials that are trained annually, over a two-year period, in matters concerning the Public Defenders' Office, including issues related to gender and nondiscrimination. 	Monitoring reports from the Technical Unit of the Commission on Gender	<p>Strategic alliances are functioning.</p> <p>Judges apply the criteria for collecting fees in pertinent cases.</p>

ive Summary	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
the program			
rove the rule of law and rtainty	Levels of human and economic development and civic coexistence increase.	State of the nation reports; economic and social indicators	Public spending commitments for the judicial system are sustained.
ve of the program and goals of projects			
ccessible, equitable, ble, and efficient tration of justice	Levels of public confidence in the judicial system increase.	Polls and information in the press	The level of political commitment to judicial reform is maintained.
ve of project C			
RENGTHENING THE UBLIC PROSECUTORS' FICE: ore efficient and reliable ime prosecution	Beginning with the second year of the project, management rates for participating public prosecutors' offices improve by 10% annually.	Statistical reports from the information system of each judicial circuit participating in the project, based on the quantitative measurement formulas described in "Management Benchmarks," a document that was prepared by the judicial branch in 2001. The document complements this framework and can be found in the program technical files.	The Public Prosecutors' Office conti have the mandate and responsibilities were granted to it under the penal co 1998.
nents			
Administrative and strategic lanning capacity of the Public Prosecutors' Office becomes more efficient and effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Upon project completion, the new structure for the Public Prosecutors' Office is in place and all administrative personnel have been duly trained. – Administrative management benchmarks are prepared semiannually, beginning at the end of the third year – By the end of the second year, the proposal for the new structure is prepared and the training plan is being implemented. 	Progress reports	Officials effectively utilize new management techniques.
Administration of the offices of the Prosecutor General and public prosecutors improved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The statistical information system to support the decision-making process is in operation by the end of the third year. – 100% of management-level users are 	Judicial statistics	The crime rate does not change, and offenses are not punished.

Objective Summary	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
	<p>utilizing the system for making decisions in the project's fourth year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Criminal prosecution policies are drafted by the second year. – All the prosecutors' offices in participating judicial circuits are using the management system by the end of the execution period. 		
Crime victim services included in the suite of services provided to the public	The number of victims receiving specialized services increases by 20%, based on 2000 figures.	Judicial statistics	Interagency networks and strategic alliances are functioning. Officials use victim service techniques.
Human resources of the Public Prosecutors' Office improved	By the end of the second year that regulations have been in effect, all public prosecutors will be admitted into the regulated profession of public prosecution.	Statistics on human resources	The set of regulations for establishing public prosecution as a professional category.

ive Summary	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
the program			
rove the rule of law and legal y	Levels of human and economic development and civic coexistence increase.	State of the nation reports; economic and social indicators	Public spending commitments for th judicial system are sustained.
ve of the program and goals of projects			
ccessible, equitable, predictable, cient administration of justice	Levels of public confidence in the judicial system increase.	Polls and information in the press	The level of political commitment to judicial reform is maintained.
ve of project D			
JUDICIAL EFFICIENCY IN THE SOLUTION OF CONFLICTS: duced delays in the judicial stem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The congestion rate for each participating office decreases by 10% annually, beginning with the second year of system implementation. – The percentage of cases resolved by each participating office increases by 10% annually, beginning with the second year of system implementation. 	Statistical reports from the information system of each judicial circuit participating in the project, based on the quantitative measurement formulas described in “Management Benchmarks,” a document that was prepared by the judicial branch in 2001. The document complements this paper and can be found in the program technical files.	The increase in litigiousness follows historical patterns.
nents			
Management of judicial offices mproved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 90% of officials in the participating judicial circuits use the automated management system upon completion of implementation in each circuit. – The number of notifications issued annually per court will increase by 20% upon the respective implementation of each centralized office notifications model. 	Statistical reports generated by the respective information systems of the participating judicial circuits (detailed background information on each circuit available in the program files)	The officials effectively utilize the n management model.
procedural reform initiated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The procedural reform proposals are drafted and the accompanying bill is submitted to the Supreme Court during the second year. 	Progress reports	There is agreement within the Supre Court to institute a new general proc code.

procedures for out-of-court resolution mechanisms initiated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposals for out-of-court resolution mechanisms are drafted and the accompanying bills are submitted to the Supreme Court during the second year. 	Progress reports	There is consensus in the Supreme Court to promulgate a bill for the out-of-court resolution of cases.
process of improving legal training and the practice of law initiated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposals to improve the practice of law are submitted to the Supreme Court and the Bar during the second year. 	Progress reports	The Bar makes a commitment to foster improvements in the practice of law and to use disciplinary measures.
juridical and judicial information system in operation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – All judges and public prosecutors and defenders who work in the participating judicial circuits have full access to the SCIJ, as permits the execution schedule. – All sentencing judges have full access to the information provided by the SIAP by the third year. 	SCIJ statistics Progress reports	The office of the Prosecutor General of the Republic, which is part of the Ministry of Justice, and the Supreme Court keep the SCIJ up to date.

Overall Summary of the program	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Improve the rule of law and legal system	Levels of human and economic development and civic coexistence increase.	State of the nation reports; economic and social indicators	Public spending commitments for the judicial system are sustained.
Overall of the program and goals of projects			
Accessible, equitable, predictable, efficient administration of justice	Levels of public confidence in the judicial system increase.	Polls and information in the press	The level of political commitment to judicial reform is maintained.
Overall of project E			
MANAGEMENT CAPACITY OF THE JUDICIAL BRANCH: Improved management of the judiciary	The number of Supreme Court sessions dedicated to administrative matters decreases by 50% by the end of the second year of the project.	Reports, minutes of sessions, and resolutions	The Supreme Court justices demonstrate political motivation and commitment to reach consensus in this matter.
Decision-making structure of the judicial branch amended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 50% of operational functions delegated to the competent administrative departments, based on 2001 data. – Five critical administrative processes will be reformulated and implemented. – Proposal to amend the Basic Law of the Judicial Branch by the second year of the project 	Progress report	<p>There is a consensus among the Supreme Court justices to amend the Basic Law.</p> <p>Amendments to the Basic Law are proposed.</p> <p>There is political will and agreement among the Supreme Court justices.</p>
Management system of the judicial branch reorganized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Law passed by the third year – Gender and nondiscrimination policies adopted by the Supreme Court by the project's second year 	The Official Gazette	The political commitment is sustained.
Gender and nondiscriminatory policies institutionalized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Technical Unit of the Commission on Gender in operation during the first year – Four studies (Public Defenders' Office, Public Prosecutors' Office, Management of Offices, Administration) are carried out upon completion of activities to measure the extent to which gender-sensitive measures have been adopted in the judiciary. 	<p>Minutes of the Commission on Gender and its Technical Unit</p> <p>Research studies</p>	The judiciary's budget provides financing for the staff of the Technical Unit.

PROCUREMENT SCHEDULE

ACTIVITY	AMOUNT (USD)	TYPE OF PROCUREMENT	MEANS	DATE (SEM-Y)
PROJECT A. INSTITUTION-STRENGTHENING FOR CRIME PREVENTION				
1. Design and implementation of information system for interagency network	220,000	Consulting services	ICP	I – 1
2. Formulation of crime prevention policies and strategies	75,000	Consulting services	NCP	I – 1
3. Training of staff in management and coordination	144,000	Consulting services	NCP	I – 2
4. Design of public information campaigns on crime prevention (mass media)	60,000	Consulting services	NCP	I – 2
5. Outfitting of Houses of Justice and offices for victim services	396,000	Furniture and equipment	ICB	II – 1 a II – 3
6. Mediator training	210,000	Consulting services	ICP	I – 2
7. Printing of outreach materials	30,000	Services	NCP	I – 2
8. Surveys	21,000	Consulting services	NCP	I – 2
9. Training for trainers in police-community relations	49,000	Consulting services	ICP	I – 2
10. Design and printing of materials on police-community relations	120,000	Services	NCP	I – 2
PROJECT B. STRENGTHENING THE PUBLIC DEFENDERS' OFFICE				
11. Training for defenders and investigators (substantive training specializing in forensic medicine and gender approach)	1,420,000	Consulting services	ICP	II – 2, 3, 4
PROJECT C. STRENGTHENING THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE				
12. Procurement of computer tools for crime analysis	24,000	Computer applications	NCP	II – 1
13. Formulation of policies on criminal prosecution and alternative sentencing	93,000	Consulting services	NCP	II – 1
14. Adjustment of office management system for Public Prosecutors' Office and Public Defender's Office	300,000	Consulting services	ICP	I – 1
15. Training of prosecutors and officials in management models and issues	106,000	Consulting services	NCP	I – 2
16. Design of public information campaigns on services (mass media)	24,000	Consulting services	NCP	II – 1
17. Design of prosecutor training	192,000	Consulting services	ICP	II – 2
PROJECT D. JUDICIAL EFFICIENCY IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION				
18. Technical assistance in office reorganization and implementation of office management systems in the court circuits of Cartago, Pérez Zeledón, Limón, and Alajuela (judicial offices, public prosecutor's offices, and public defender's offices)	2,800,000	Consulting services	ICP	I – 1
19. Technical assistance in office reorganization and implementation of office management systems in the court circuits of San José I (judicial offices, public prosecutor's offices, and public defender's offices)	1,856,000	Consulting services	ICP	II – 3

ACTIVITY	AMOUNT (USD)	TYPE OF PROCUREMENT	MEANS	DATE (SEM-Y)
20. Procurement of computer hardware and software for the main offices of the Public Prosecutor's Office and Public Defenders Office for the SCIJ, SIAP and office management systems in the court circuits of Cartago and Pérez Zeledón (judicial offices, public prosecutor's offices, and public defender's offices), for the Ministry of Justice (prevention) and for the gender information and communication system for judicial system users	3,758,000	Equipment	ICB	I - 1
21. Procurement of computer hardware and software for the office management systems in the court circuits of Limón and Alajuela (judicial offices, public prosecutor's offices, and public defender's offices)	1,750,000	Equipment	ICB	I - 2
22. Procurement of computer hardware and software for the office management systems in the court circuit of San José I (judicial offices and public prosecutor's offices)	2,060,000	Equipment	ICB	II - 3
23. Construction of main office for court circuits of Limón and Alajuela (judicial offices, public prosecutor's offices, and public defender's offices)	2,300,000	Infrastructure	ICB	I - 1
24. Construction of main office for court circuit of San José I (judicial offices, public prosecutor's offices, and central office of Public Defender's Office)	2,000,000	Infrastructure	ICB	II - 3
25. Conciliation of General Procedural Code and policies on alternative dispute resolution	152,000	Consulting services	NCP	II - 2
26. Training for judges and officials in the General Procedural Code	192,000	Consulting services	NCP	Ii - 3
27. Formulation, consensus-building and dissemination of best practices for the practice of law	316,000	Consulting services	NCP	I - 1 al 4
28. Adjustment of SCIJ	72,000	Consulting services	NCP	II - 1
29. Adjustment and expansion of SIAP	200,000	Consulting services	NCP	II - 1
30. Technical assistance for large-scale implementation of SIAP	320,000	Consulting services	NCP	I - 2
PROJECT E. MANAGEMENT CAPACITY OF THE JUDICIAL BRANCH				
31. Decision-making structure and delegation of authority to Judicial management	55,000	Consulting services	NCP	I - 1
32. Managerial, organizational, and administrative structure of Judicial, Public Prosecutor's Office and Public Defender's Office	374,000	Consulting services	ICP	I - 2
33. Information system for Judicial Observatory	162,000	Consulting services	NCP	II - 2
34. Procurement of equipment for Judicial Observatory	50,000	Equipment	LPN	II - 2
35. Technical assistance for policy formulation and on interagency network	125,000	Consulting services	NCP	I - 2

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

**COSTA RICA. LOAN No. ____/OC-CR TO THE REPUBLICA DE
COSTA RICA**

(Second Stage of the Justice Administration Program)

The Board of Executive Directors

RESOLVES:

That the President of the Bank, or such representative as he shall designate, is authorized, in the name and on behalf of the Bank, to enter into such contract or contracts as may be necessary with the República de Costa Rica, as Borrower, for the purpose of granting it a financing to cooperate in the execution of the second stage of the Justice Administration Program. Such financing will be for the amount of up to US\$22,400,000, from the resources of the Single Currency Facility of the Bank's Ordinary Capital, and will be subject to the "Special Contractual Conditions" and the "Financial Terms and Conditions" of the Executive Summary of the Loan Proposal.