

**OSF POST-2015 ACTIVITIES**

**Summary Sheets Describing Proposed and Existing Work**

## Table of Contents

<u>OSF Program or Foundation</u>	<u>Page #</u>
1. Latin America Program (Goal 10 & 11) .....	2
2. Open Society Justice Initiative Global Advocacy (Goal 10 & 11) .....	3
3. Open Society Justice Initiative Criminal Justice (Goal 10 & 11) .....	6
4. Open Society Justice Initiative – Bangladesh (Goal 10 & 11) .....	9
5. Open Society Justice Initiative – Pretrial Justice (Goal 10 & 11) .....	11
6. Open Society Justice Initiative – Indonesia (Goal 10) .....	14
7. TIFA - Indonesia Foundation (Goal 10 & 11) .....	17
8. Tajikistan Foundation (Goal 10).....	20
9. Tajikistan Foundation (Goal 11) .....	23
10. Open Society Initiative for West Africa (Goal 11 Central Prisons) .....	27
11. Open Society Initiative for West Africa (Goal 11 Justice Centers) .....	29
12. Open Society Initiative for West Africa (Goal 10 Freedom of Information) 31	
13. Open Society Initiative for West Africa (Goal 10 Elections) .....	33
14. Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (Goal 10 Economic Justice) .....	35
15. Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (Goal 10 & 11 Education).....	37
16. Nepal Bhutan Initiative (Goal 10) .....	39
17. Nepal Bhutan Initiative (Goal 11) .....	41
18. Soros Foundation Kazakhstan (Goal 10).....	43
19. Soros Foundation Kazakhstan (Goal 10 Education) .....	44
20. Information Program .....	45
21. Human Rights Initiative (Goal 11).....	46
22. Human Rights Initiative (Goal 11).....	48
23. Human Rights Initiative (Goal 11) .....	50
24. Fiscal Governance Program (Goal 10) .....	52
25. Open Society Foundations – Armenia (Goal 10).....	54
26. Open Society Foundations – Armenia (Goal 11) .....	56
27. Public Health Program (Goal 11) .....	59
28. Education Support Program .....	61
29. Youth Exchange .....	64

## **LATIN AMERICA PROGRAM**

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Latin America Program – Heloisa Griggs (Justice, safety and rule of law); Vonda Brown (governance)
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Reducing violent deaths per 100,000; Increasing public participation in political process and civic engagement at all levels; Guarantee the public’s right to information and access to government data.
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Brazil, Mexico, Colombia
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	LAP is working on identifying specific goals and indicators that would lend themselves to measurement and progress in Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico. LAP will focus on goals and indicators involving our current areas of focus (homicide reduction, government transparency, accessible justice systems, and accountable policing), seeking to build on existing work in a complementary manner.
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	HRI with some complementary work in Brazil; JI potential work in Mexico
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	Strong political will on the governance goals in all three countries at the national level and in large cities and/or municipalities. There are strong possibilities to work with certain state and municipal governments in Brazil, Mexico and Colombia to reduce intentional homicides and measure progress towards this target.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Strong existing civil society partners in all three countries.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Mexico: Strong relationship with national-level and Mexico City level transparency bodies. Brazil: Strong connections with the Comptroller and the Ministry of Justice, as well as with specific state and municipal governments for focus on reducing homicides. Colombia: Connections with Attorney General and President’s Office.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	There are more donors active on the governance goals, but few have the same comprehensive region-wide scope to their work as OSF. With respect to the target for reducing intentional homicides, there are no other private donors focused on this issue in Latin America. There are multilateral donors focused on broader citizen security issues, but not specifically on the reduction of intentional homicides.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for measurement	
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	While Latin American states have generally been reluctant to include justice goals in the Post-2015 process, there is some amount of interest and agreement on the need to measure reduction in violent deaths (though apparently not Brazil), and possibly on measuring perception of justice systems. Positive experiences at the state and local level in Brazil, Colombia and/or Mexico, as well as stronger civil society engagement around efforts to reduce homicides, can contribute the willingness of these three countries to include a target for the reduction of violent deaths.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	The Latin America Program’s Post-2015 focus on reducing intentional homicides will form part of a larger programmatic focus on reducing homicides currently under development, which we expect to continue beyond the Post-2015 Shared Framework. It will build on preexisting work focused on reducing violence in these three countries, including an ongoing evaluation of a state program aimed at reducing homicides in Pernambuco state in Brazil.

## OSJI – GLOBAL ADVOCACY – GOALS 10 & 11

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Aidan Harris, x8718 <a href="mailto:aidan.harris@opensocietyfoundations.org">aidan.harris@opensocietyfoundations.org</a>  Betsy Apple <a href="mailto:Betsy.apple@opensocietyfoundations.org">Betsy.apple@opensocietyfoundations.org</a>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Access to justice and legal empowerment, including and not limited to 10(a), 10(b), 10(c), 10(d), 11(b), and 11(d)
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Global.  Existing potential target countries identified by OSJI for advocacy are listed in footnote. <sup>1</sup> We will seek to refine this list based on input from other members of the network and through the charrette process.
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	The Open Society Justice Initiative will work—collaboratively with the global legal empowerment organization <a href="#">Namati</a> —to implement an advocacy strategy to promote the inclusion of justice in the post-2015 development framework.  Our advocacy activities will have both national and international objectives. Planned advocacy activities include mobilizing high-level international champions and grassroots justice organizations around shared principles on the inclusion of justice and legal empowerment in the post-2015 goals. The objectives of this strategy are to: (1) make the case for the linkages between justice and development and measurability of justice targets through the post-2015 development framework; (2) strengthen the position of partners and allies in this cause including governments and civil society to advance reform efforts; and (3) demonstrate the existence of a broad-based civil society movement seeking to join justice and development policy.

<sup>1</sup> Yellow highlighting indicates potentially persuadable; green indicates likely allies; blue indicates uncertain post-2015 stance but important to engage given regional and international stature and national policies

<b>Africa:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benin - OWG</li> <li>• Ghana - OWG</li> <li>• Liberia</li> <li>• Namibia</li> <li>• Tunisia - OWG</li> <li>• Kenya – OWG (co-chair)</li> <li>• Senegal</li> <li>• Nigeria</li> <li>• Tanzania - OWG</li> <li>• South Africa</li> </ul>	<b>Asia/Pacific</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia - OWG</li> <li>• Japan - OWG</li> <li>• South Korea - OWG</li> <li>• Thailand - OWG</li> <li>• India - OWG</li> <li>• Philippines</li> <li>• Pakistan</li> </ul>	<b>WEOG</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US - OWG</li> <li>• UK - OWG</li> <li>• Turkey – OWG</li> <li>• France – OWG</li> <li>• Germany – OWG</li> <li>• Spain – OWG</li> <li>• Norway – OWG</li> <li>• Denmark – OWG</li> <li>• Sweden</li> <li>• Austria</li> </ul>
<b>Latin America:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colombia - OWG</li> <li>• Guatemala - OWG</li> <li>• Mexico - OWG</li> <li>• Brazil - OWG</li> </ul>	<b>Eastern Europe</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hungary - OWG (co-chair)</li> </ul>	

	Namati, through the Global Legal Empowerment Network, will implement the grassroots mobilization component of this strategy, while OSJI will leverage its reach within UN processes and national governments to undertake high level national and international advocacy.
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	<p>Globally, OSJI had previously been tasked with leading efforts around justice but many national foundations are also supporting engagement at a country or regional level.</p> <p>The Fiscal Governance Program is increasing its global advocacy footprint and we have a number of shared arguments around right to information and transparency.</p>
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p>We have strong commitment from our civil partners and several UN member states.</p> <p>The International Advisory Council of the Global Legal Empowerment Network includes high profile political figures and practitioners and has endorsed this shared advocacy strategy. It has also been endorsed by the former members of the Commission of the Legal Empowerment of the Poor. We are also working closely with sympathetic government and UN agencies who share the aims of this strategy. Several government agencies have begun their own independent advocacy activities with similar aims.</p> <p>Within the Global Legal Empowerment Network, many dozens of national organizations have expressed a strong desire to advocate on this issue, and have mobilized to create the shared Statement of Principles which underlines the strategy.</p>
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Namati is leading the grassroots mobilization component of this strategy (and many dozens of national organizations through the Global Legal Empowerment Network). There is some potential for working co-operatively with other international civil society organizations that have expressed an interest in co-operation, but this remains in discussion and on an ad-hoc basis.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	OSJI has fostered a close relationship with the UK's DfID on the promotion of justice and legal empowerment. This includes exchange of information and reinforcement activities. We are also building a relationship with the US mission to the UN. We have also enjoyed official sponsorship of previous advocacy events from the governments of Benin and Indonesia. We held a meeting of interested Donor States in New York in September 2013, including Netherlands, Germany, Finland, Denmark and Sweden.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	<p>At the outset of our advocacy activities, OSJI was the primary OSF actor in New York advocating for the inclusion of justice and legal empowerment in the post-2015 goals. We are also aware that TIFA has played an active role in supporting civil society organizations to advocate around goals 10 and 11 and other network partners have played important roles regionally (e.g., OSISA).</p> <p>There are a multitude of actors at an international level, but many of these</p>

	<p>groups are arguing for specific thematic interests – e.g., legal identity or right to information. Few of the organizations working on global advocacy are as comprehensive or detailed as OSF and OSJI’s work. We believe that OSJI adds value through capitalizing on a broad but undefined desire held by several other actors, and developing this to sufficient detail to be effective and useful in the post-2015 process. Moreover, the Global Legal Empowerment Network offers a level of expertise and global credibility which cannot be matched by others, and OSJI is uniquely able to bring this forward.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>This is an inherent advocacy project, supported and informed by the other projects within our post-2015 work on justice.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>OSJI is working in other areas including strategies for national measurement of access to information, legal identity, legal participation, land and property rights, access to primary justice services and criminal justice issues. Our advocacy efforts deliberately seek to include the lessons of a variety of OSJI and OSF programs into the development framework.</p>

## OSJI – CRIMINAL JUSTICE – GOALS 10 & 11

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Justice Initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kersty McCourt</li> <li>▪ Madeleine Crohn</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Linked to HLP goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent and well-resourced and respect due process rights (11b).</li> <li>• Enhance the capacity, accountability, professionalism and of security forces, police and justice institutions (11d).</li> <li>• Reduce bribery and corruption and ensure officials can be held accountable (10d).</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Possible countries: Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru Sierra Leone, Zambia, Malawi, Indonesia and 1 country in Europe.
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p><b>A rational and exceptional use of pretrial detention is a good indicator of the fair and effective functioning of the criminal justice [CJ] system.</b> Coupled with information about police investigation and custody, availability (in law and practice) of alternatives to pretrial detention (PTD), access to legal aid, and information about case flow, this gives us <b>a diagnostic of the CJ system.</b> If these initial stages of the CJ system are efficient, facts based, and consistent with international norms, they contribute to a well-functioning set of institutions, enhance public trust and ensure that socioeconomic development and public health are not hampered (see series of <a href="#">linking paper</a> publications).</p> <p>In collaboration with CSOs partners in Latin America, Africa and Europe we have done significant work to document problems and contextual solutions (how specific changes have a positive impact); and are in the process of drafting and field testing instruments designed to measure pretrial detention and interpret data to inform public policies. We propose to utilize this research and supplement it with country studies to compile a series of <b>short reports that demonstrate “what to measure” “how you would measure it”, and “how would you interpret the findings”</b> dealing with <b>accessibility, fairness, and accountability of a criminal justice system that balances rights and public security.</b></p> <p>This would be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Advocate with the national governments</b> (in above countries) for them to support the inclusion of access to justice in their national positions on post-2015 and be able to demonstrate to other member states the ways in which justice can be measured;</li> <li>• Feed into <b>broader advocacy efforts for example at the UN, EU</b> and other regional bodies.</li> <li>• <b>Support national development plans to more effectively collect, analyse and public pretrial justice data</b> – and use in the implementation and monitoring of the post-2015 framework.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	This complements the Justice Initiative’s work on legal empowerment. Where there is an overlap of countries we will work together – but have also added some countries where we have particular expertise working in the criminal justice system.

	<p>We will also work with Human Rights Initiatives – with whom we already have a close collaboration on criminal justice work (Mary Miller-Flowers and Louise Ehlers).</p>
<p><b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)</p>	<p>In countries listed above, we have found at the national level government entities or high level public officials, or both, interested in pretrial justice related reforms (through pretrial interventions, implementation of international and regional norms – in particular access to legal aid, legislative or public policy changes) - and this information has been confirmed by our on-the ground partners. For example, our work on legal aid at police stations in Sierra Leone was recognized in the government’s justice sector strategy and in Malawi the government is implementing a custody time limits project based on evidence provided through an OSF study.</p> <p>Further, these countries are primary targets for implementation of pretrial justice reforms in the 2014-2017 OSJI strategy.</p>
<p><b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)</p>	<p>Yes – existing partners including the Latin America Network for Pretrial Justice, a continent-wide informal coalition of NGOs engaged with the ACHPR, regional and international NGOs in Europe focused on pretrial justice and detention, and OSF foundations in Asia – and specific national level organizations who are active in these networks (names and details of organizations available).</p>
<p><b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<p>Depending on the country, this can include ministries of justice, public prosecutors (or ministries of interior), law enforcement, public defenders (where the PD office is part of the government), ministries of finance and combinations thereof. Together with our partners we have good contacts in the above countries.</p>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>We have been instrumental in convening partners and encouraging donor support for pretrial justice reforms including from McArthur, DfID and USAID. Specifically on the links between pretrial development and poverty we collaborated with UNDP in Africa both on a set of studies on the socioeconomic implications of pretrial detention and advocacy to ensure the adoption and implementation of an ACHPR regional standard on pretrial detention and police custody.</p> <p>We are leading work on measurement at the early stages of the criminal justice system, but others are interested in collaborating - which will strengthen our above advocacy.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>Key areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Police and law enforcement investigative capacity and accountability</li> <li>▪ Availability of a legal aid system in law and in practice</li> <li>▪ Existence and use of alternatives to pretrial detention and their impact on unnecessary/arbitrary detention, and on safeguarding public security</li> <li>▪ Efficiency and accountability of courts</li> </ul> <p>Ways in which we will measure the success of our own initiative include through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring national positions on post-2015</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The final 2015 goals, targets and indicators</li> <li>• Improved data collection, analysis and publication in target countries</li> <li>• Specific law reforms in target countries</li> </ul>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Starting in the early 2000s, and more recently through the <i>Global Campaign for Pretrial Justice</i>, OSJI has had the lead in placing pretrial justice on the global map of key public policy issues related to governance and justice. Through its documentation of problems and potential solutions, it has attracted the attention and support of high level officials at the UN (including the SR on extreme poverty, SR on torture,) of the UNDP and of the UNODC and the council of Europe Commissioner on Human Rights. It has also enrolled the support of regional human rights entities, including the IACHR, ACHPR and EU that are all developing reports and regional standards on pretrial detention and/or defence rights.</p> <p>As mentioned above the research and data will be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Advocate with the national governments</b> (in above countries) for them to support the inclusion of access to justice in their national positions on post-2015 and be able to demonstrate to other member states the ways in which justice can be measured;</li> <li>• Feed into <b>broader advocacy efforts for example at the UN, EU</b> and other regional bodies.</li> <li>• <b>Support national development plans to more effectively collect, analyze and publish pretrial justice data</b> – and use in the implementation and monitoring of the post-2015 framework.</li> </ul> <p>At the national level there are specific advocacy opportunities (in addition to influencing the post-2015 framework) where this data may be useful – and how ultimately data and indicators will help push for more accessible/equitable justice systems. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in Sierra Leone and Malawi in relation to the implementation of newly adopted / revised legal aid laws;</li> <li>• in Malawi, Sierra Leone and Zambia as evidence to advocate for the abolition of outdated offences (such as vagrancy) which result in disproportionate and excessive numbers of poor people in detention; and</li> <li>• in a number of countries in Latin America the abolition of laws that automatically prohibit the use of alternatives to pretrial detention for drug related offences, impacting particularly on poor women.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Other relevant work is referenced above but includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Developing indicators aimed at measuring the state of pretrial justice at country levels and document results of reforms.</li> <li>▪ Developing action plans with country partners to increase access to legal aid and interventions to reduce arbitrary detention.</li> <li>▪ Transferring through active PTJ networks outcomes of these multi-faceted projects and encourage contextual replication in the 2015-2017 period.</li> </ul>

## OSJI – BANGLADESH – GOALS 10 & 11

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Peter Chapman, x3211 <a href="mailto:peter.chapman@opensocietyfoundations.org">peter.chapman@opensocietyfoundations.org</a>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Access to justice and equity in service delivery covering potentially 10c, 10d, 11b and 11d. Possibility of legal identity is also on the agenda given Namati's work in Bangladesh on this topic.
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Bangladesh
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>BRAC and the Open Society Justice Initiative (OSJI) will demonstrate how civil society and government can most effectively measure progress towards the justice themes listed above in Bangladesh. These activities will seek to improve the feasibility of incorporation and measurement of justice in a post-2015 development framework. The specific program objectives are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explore how and in what ways BRAC Human Rights and Legal Aid Services (HRLS) program can identify, develop and refine indicators to measure progress towards selected justice and development themes, and</li> <li>• use experiences in Bangladesh to produce materials to inform how justice themes can most effectively be incorporated in an international development framework.</li> </ul> <p>BRAC, with the financial and technical support of OSJI, will engage with relevant BRAC programs and where possible, BRAC will, seek to foster linkages with other civil society partners and potentially government, depending on the political environment.</p>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Not that we are aware of in Bangladesh, but would love to explore further.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p>BRAC has pioneered a multidimensional response to poverty and BRAC Director Sir Fazel Abed and HRLS Director Faustina Pereira are both firmly committed to demonstrating how justice can be included and measured in a new development framework in Bangladesh.</p> <p>Bangladesh has made significant progress towards meeting several of the existing Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly in the areas of poverty reduction, gender parity in education, maternal mortality, child mortality and combating major diseases. According to the Global Multidimensional Poverty Index that tracks multiple deprivations associated with poverty, Bangladesh has made exceptional progress towards reducing both multidimensional and income poverty.<sup>2</sup> Yet 31.6 per cent of the Bangladeshi population lives under the national poverty line<sup>3</sup> and the government, civil society and development partners acknowledged significant</p>

<sup>2</sup>"Multidimensional Poverty Index 2013", Oxford Poverty & Human Development Initiative (OPHI) at <http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/Multidimensional-Poverty-Index-2013-Alkire-Roche-and-Seth.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> 2010, Household Income and Expenditure Survey (HIES), Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics

	<p>work remains for the post-2015 development agenda, particularly in the areas of inequality, human rights and human development. The Government of Bangladesh’s Planning Commission, for example, has proposed that the new post-2015 development agenda include a goal on “good governance” with specific targets including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve transparency and strengthen accountability and integrity of state and non-state institutions;</li> <li>• Ensure rule of law, access to justice and protection of human rights; and</li> <li>• Promote equitable access to services.</li> </ul>
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> )	We are supporting BRAC with a 1 year fellow position to lead and manage this engagement.
<b>Government Partners</b> ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> ) What department? What type of engagement?	While we had potential for engagement with the Planning and Justice ministries the current political crisis has thrown government engagement into turmoil.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	DFID and UNDP both have very large justice programs in Bangladesh. BRAC is the largest non-governmental development organization in the world. We think this is an interesting place to engage given the strength of BRAC, performance of Bangladesh on the MDGs, and range of donor partners.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Yes, those listed above.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	We think this is an open question given the political instability. Nonetheless, we know that not all governments are likely to be advocates for justice in a post-2015 development framework and engagement with BRAC presents an opportunity to also explore how civil society can most effectively engage these discussions—with a government partner or not.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	OSJI has a global advocacy project, is partnering with Namati on national advocacy campaigns lead by local civil society and we will work on local measurement in three countries (Bangladesh, Indonesia and a final one to be determined following the charrette).

## OSJI – PRETRIAL JUSTICE – GOALS 10 & 11

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Justice Initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Madeleine Crohn</li> <li>▪ Kersty McCourt</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Linked to HLP goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent and well-resourced and respect due process rights (11b)</li> <li>• Enhance the capacity, accountability, professionalism and of security forces, police and justice institutions (11d)</li> <li>• Reduce bribery and corruption and ensure officials can be held accountable (10d)</li> </ul>
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Possible countries: Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Peru Sierra Leone, Zambia, Malawi, Indonesia and 1 country in Europe.
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p><b>A rational and exceptional use of pretrial detention is a good indicator of the fair and effective functioning of the criminal justice [CJ] system.</b> Coupled with information about police investigation and custody, availability (in law and practice) of alternatives to pretrial detention (PTD), access to legal aid, and information about case flow, this gives us <b>a diagnostic of the CJ system.</b> If these initial stages of the CJ system are efficient, facts based, and consistent with international norms, they contribute to a well-functioning set of institutions, enhance public trust and ensure that socioeconomic development and public health is not hampered (see series of <a href="#">linking paper</a> publications).</p> <p>In collaboration with OSF Human Rights Initiative and CSOs partners in Latin America, Africa and Europe we have done significant work to document problems and contextual solutions (how specific changes have a positive impact); and are in the process of drafting and field testing instruments designed to measure pretrial detention and interpret data to inform public policies. We propose to utilize this research and supplement it with country studies to compile a series of <b>short reports that demonstrate “what to measure” “how you would measure it”, and “how would you interpret the findings”</b> dealing with <b>accessibility, fairness, and accountability of a criminal justice system that balances rights and public security.</b></p> <p>This would be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Advocate with the national governments</b> (in above countries) for them to support the inclusion of access to justice in their national positions on post-2015 and be able to demonstrate to other member states the ways in which justice can be measured;</li> <li>• Feed into <b>broader advocacy efforts for example at the UN, EU</b> and other regional bodies.</li> <li>• <b>Support national development plans to more effectively collect, analyse and public pretrial justice data</b> – and use in the implementation and monitoring of the post-2015 framework.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	This complements the Justice Initiative’s work on legal empowerment and post-2015 global advocacy. Where there is an overlap of countries we will work together – but have also added some countries where we have particular expertise working in the criminal justice system. <p>Our pretrial justice work is an existing collaborative with Human Rights</p>

	Initiatives (Mary Miller Flowers and Louise Ehlers).
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p>In countries listed above, we have found at the national level government entities or high level public officials, or both, interested in pretrial justice related reforms (through pretrial interventions, implementation of international and regional norms – in particular access to legal aid, legislative or public policy changes) - and this information has been confirmed by our on-the-ground partners. For example, our work on legal aid at police stations in Sierra Leone was recognized in the government’s justice sector strategy and in Malawi the government is implementing a custody time limits project based on evidence provided through an OSF study.</p> <p>Further, these countries are primary targets for implementation of pretrial justice reforms in the 2014-2017 OSJI strategy.</p>
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> )	Yes – existing partners including the Latin America Network for Pretrial Justice, a continent-wide informal coalition of NGOs engaged with the ACHPR, regional and international NGOs in Europe focused on pretrial justice and detention, and OSF foundations in Asia – and specific national level organizations who are active in these networks (names and details of organizations available).
<b>Government Partners</b> ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> ) What department? What type of engagement?	Depending on the country, this can include ministries of justice, public prosecutors (or interior), law enforcement, public defenders (where the PD office is part of the government), ministries of finance and combinations thereof. Together with our partners we have good contacts in the above countries.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	<p>We have been instrumental in convening partners and encouraging donor support for pretrial justice reforms including from McArthur, DfID and USAID. Specifically on the links between pretrial development and poverty we collaborated with UNDP in Africa both on a set of studies on the socioeconomic implications of pretrial detention and advocacy to ensure the adoption and implementation of an ACHPR regional standard on pretrial detention and police custody.</p> <p>We and Human Rights Initiative are leading work on measurement at the early stages of the criminal justice system, but others are interested in collaborating - which will strengthen our above advocacy.</p>
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	<p>Key areas include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Police and law enforcement investigative capacity and accountability</li> <li>▪ Availability of a legal aid system in law and in practice</li> <li>▪ Existence and use of alternatives to pretrial detention and their impact on unnecessary/arbitrary detention, and on safeguarding public security</li> <li>▪ Efficiency and accountability of courts</li> </ul> <p>Ways in which we will measure the success of our own initiative include through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring national positions on post-2015</li> <li>• The final 2015 goals, targets and indicators</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved data collection, analysis and publication in target countries</li> <li>• Specific law reforms in target countries</li> </ul>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Starting in the early 2000s, and more recently through the <i>Global Campaign for Pretrial Justice</i>, OSJI has had the lead in placing pretrial justice on the global map of key public policy issues related to governance and justice. Through its documentation of problems and potential solutions, it has attracted the attention and support of high level officials at the UN (including the SR on extreme poverty, SR on torture,) of the UNDP and of the UNODC and the council of Europe Commissioner on Human Rights. It has also enrolled the support of regional human rights entities, including the IACHR, ACHPR and EU that are all developing reports and regional standards on pretrial detention and/or defence rights.</p> <p>As mentioned above the research and data will be used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Advocate with the national governments</b> (in above countries) for them to support the inclusion of access to justice in their national positions on post-2015 and be able to demonstrate to other member states the ways in which justice can be measured;</li> <li>• Feed into <b>broader advocacy efforts for example at the UN, EU</b> and other regional bodies.</li> <li>• <b>Support national development plans to more effectively collect, analyse and public pretrial justice data</b> – and use in the implementation and monitoring of the post-2015 framework.</li> </ul> <p>At the national level there are specific advocacy opportunities (in addition to influencing the post-2015 framework) where this data may be useful – and how ultimately data and indicators will help push for more accessible/equitable justice systems. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in Sierra Leone and Malawi in relation to the implementation of newly adopted / revised legal aid laws;</li> <li>• in Malawi, Sierra Leone and Zambia as evidence to advocate for the abolition of out-dated offences (such as vagrancy) which result in disproportionate and excessive numbers of poor people in detention; and</li> <li>• in a number of countries in Latin America the abolition of laws that automatically prohibit the use of alternatives to pretrial detention for drug related offences, impacting particularly on poor women.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Other relevant work is reference above but includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Developing indicators aimed at measuring the state of pretrial justice at country levels and document results of reforms.</li> <li>▪ Developing action plans with country partners to increase access to legal aid and interventions to reduce arbitrary detention.</li> <li>▪ Transferring through active PTJ networks outcomes of these multi-faceted projects and encourage contextual replication in the 2015-2017 period.</li> </ul>

## OSJI – INDONESIA – GOAL 10

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	<p>Sumaiya Islam  <a href="mailto:Sumaiya.islam@opensocietyfoundations.org">Sumaiya.islam@opensocietyfoundations.org</a></p> <p>Peter Chapman, x3211  <a href="mailto:Peter.chapman@opensocietyfoundations.org">Peter.chapman@opensocietyfoundations.org</a></p> <p><a href="mailto:Zaza.Namoradze@opensocietyfoundations.org">Zaza Namoradze</a>  <a href="mailto:Zaza.namoradze@opensocietyfoundations.org">Zaza.namoradze@opensocietyfoundations.org</a></p>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	<p>Legal identity (10a)          Strengthen public services delivery (10c),          Accessible and responsive justice institutions and community-based justice services(11b and d),          Community participation and transparency in land resource management(1b)</p>
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Indonesia
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>Jointly with TIFA we will focus activities on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Engagement with Indonesian Government around integrating and measuring justice and legal empowerment in development planning and contribute to the Indonesian national position on post 2015</li> <li>- Support Civil Society Organizations to strategize on ways to include justice and legal empowerment targets/themes into the next mid-term development plan and the post 2015 Indonesian position; support key partners to sustain discussions on justice and development nationally</li> <li>- Identify and support specific partners to work on research, scoping of existing and emerging sources of data on priority themes and data analysis to demonstrate the feasibility (politically and technically) of measuring justice</li> <li>- Integrating new approaches: Building on existing data and research to test/monitor measurement approaches</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	TIFA, Human Rights Initiative, and the Fiscal Governance Program
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p>The Justice Initiative and TIFA have strong relationships with the Indonesian government. TIFA and the Justice Initiative have been working already for several years on the joint strategy for a national Legal Empowerment Initiative which among others included close collaboration with the government on developing a new legal aid legislation that was adopted in 2012 making Indonesia one of the first countries globally to provide full-fledge recognition of the role of paralegals in providing basic legal aid services. We jointly organized a roundtable discussion on the sidelines of the third meeting of the High Level Panel of Eminent Persons (HLP) in Bali in March 2013. The Indonesian Presidential Delivery Planning Unit (UKP4) co-sponsored the side event. The President Delivery Planning Unit have contacted us repeatedly to promote justice in the post 2015 framework and are sending a high level delegate to attend the dinner hosted by GS on the sidelines of the OWG meeting in February.</p> <p>Nationally Indonesian Ministry of Planning (BAPPENAS) have shown keenness to work with TIFA and Justice Initiative in their next mid-term development</p>

	<p>plan. Guided by the Indonesia’s innovative and inclusive National Strategy on Access to Justice, we have engaged diverse policymakers and key actors who are interested in strategies to incorporate justice measurement into the development plan.</p>
<p><b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)</p>	<p>Existing partners include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indonesian Legal Aid Foundation (YLBHI),</li> <li>- Indonesia Legal Resource(ILRC),</li> <li>- Child Protection Center – University of Indonesia (PUSKAPA),</li> <li>- INFID,</li> <li>- Lembaga Bantuan Hukum- Masyarakat (LBH-M),</li> <li>- Erna Wiotelar (former commissioner, Commission of the Legal Empowerment of the Poor and former Special Ambassador</li> </ul> <p>Potential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Women headed households program (PEKKA),</li> <li>- Australia Indonesia Partnership for Justice</li> </ul>
<p><b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<p>Existing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to Justice and Legislation Planning Units, Ministry of Planning and Coordination (BAPPENAS)</li> <li>- Department of Law development and legal aid services (BPHN) Ministry of Justice and Human Rights</li> <li>- Presidential Delivery Planning Unit (UKP4)</li> </ul> <p>Potential:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bureau of Statistics (BPS)</li> </ul>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>AusAID is supporting a large scale project focusing on legal identity and legal aid services in partnership with the Indonesian government but not as engaged in the post 2015 advocacy. OSF’ s partnership with AusAID and partners will enable us to link the local discussion to the global discourse and our comparative experience in other contexts (and designing and implementing different models) can be helpful in informing the policy directions and activities of both state and non-state partners. Moreover, TIFA being a local foundation enjoys a strong relationship and is highly regarded by both the Ministry of Justice and BAPPENAS and can help promote the achievements of the Indonesian government in integrating justice in development planning.</p> <p>UNDP is also very active in supporting the government in the development of the mid-term development plan; however the Indonesia office is not as engaged in the post 2015 process.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>The Government of Indonesia, development partners and local civil society are currently in discussions about the structure of third phase of the mid-term development framework (2015-2019) for Indonesia. The Medium-Term Development Plan outlines Indonesia's overall development framework and identifies national priorities and focus regions. Guided by the Indonesia’s innovative and inclusive National Strategy on Access to Justice, diverse policymakers and key actors are interested in strategies to incorporate justice into the development plan.</p>

	<p>The National Socioeconomic Survey (SUSENAS) data from 2012, a series of large-scale multi-purpose socioeconomic survey, showed that nearly 24 million of the 84 million children in Indonesia did not have a birth certificates and the majority of these children belonged to poor families. There is an opportunity to integrate legal identity/birth certificate indicators (with specific targets) in the new mid-term development plan. We can help leverage baseline data on legal identity collected by Australia Indonesia partnership project to show measurability and linkages to poverty reduction strategies.</p> <p>Indonesian government is also in the initial phases of implementing the newly formulated national legal aid scheme. By supporting and measuring the impact of demonstration models in targeted local contexts, we can show the impact of community based justice services on developmental outcomes.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>TIFA and the Justice Initiative seek to support these discussions for two reasons: First, to increase the likelihood that justice plays a central role in the development framework of Indonesia. Second to demonstrate to a global, post-2015 audience that justice and development are fundamentally linked and can be incorporated in a global development framework. Justice Initiative and TIFA will support nationally-owned discussions and feed these experiences into OSF’s international work.</p> <p>Likely outputs include engaging policy discussions and the production of an advocacy note on national strategies to measure post 2015.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Indonesian legal empowerment project is part of the Justice Initiative’s community based justice services project and works closely with TIFA Foundation. The main objectives of the project include supporting the implementation of the newly passed legal aid law, strengthening capacity of legal aid organizations, building up accessible community-based justice services, demonstrate effectiveness of such models and providing technical assistance to the ministry of Justice and BAPPENAS. Justice Initiative provided technical inputs in the drafting of the law and the government regulations and working with TIFA and the Ministry of Justice to set up demonstration models and paralegal schools.</li> <li>- Justice Initiative is also supporting a large scale legal needs study in Indonesia that is collecting data across 5 provinces of Indonesia about ordinary peoples’ real legal needs and experiences and will use the results of the studies as a basis for advocacy with government. This research aims to provide valid and reliable measurement of Bottom-up justice or justice as the people in Indonesia experience it.</li> <li>- The Human Rights Initiative and TIFA are supporting a baseline study on Juvenile justice.</li> </ul>

## TIFA – GOALS 10 & 11

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Mickael Hoelman <a href="mailto:mbhoelman@tifafoundation.org">mbhoelman@tifafoundation.org</a> +62 21 829 2776
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	<b>Governance (10)</b> <b>Global finance (12)</b>
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<b>Indonesia</b>
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	Ensure the Post-2015 development goals as a priority in the development of RI Medium-term Development Planning (RPJM) and Government Work Plan (RKP) program development and monitoring by civil society organizations
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSJI/ LEP.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/ how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	President has assigned the Office of RI President for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4) to coordinate engagement with all ministries and stakeholders, including CSOs to support and assist the government on HLP Report. Currently the Ministry of Development Planning is also in consultation for integration of Post-2015 into National Med-Development Planning 2014-2019. However, there is still limited understanding in parliament and sub-national level (we aim to intervene this in 2014).
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	International Forum for Indonesian Development (INFID) is currently Tifa's existing strategic partner since 2012 (HLP London).
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Office of RI President for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4) and the President Special Envoy on MDGs for technical assistance and advisory. We are also currently working in coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (OWG) and the Ministry of Development Planning (for integration of Post-2015)
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	Tifa's distinct value-add particularly was facilitating joint support from other development partners/ donors. We encourage other entities to support INFID and the CSO Coalition. Currently development partners including, i.e. Oxfam, Save the Children, Ford Foundation, World Vision Indonesia, ICCO, and Partnership for Governance Reform. For me, it is a positive thing to align all support. There is a common understanding among development partners to strengthen CSO Coalition in advocating Post-2015 to RI Government (nationally) as well as at the global level. In my sense, advocacy is all about aligning alliances.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Civil society participation is acknowledged in budget decision-making, transparency and accountability.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	Alignment and coordination. I understand that currently there are a lot of interests going around from countries (national foundations). From Indonesian perspective for instance we are now a lower mid-income country (LMIC). Possible alignment with other LMIC will strengthen our voice, i.e. we are closely in support from South Korea. I would propose for the incoming OWG Report to align with BRICS countries (emerging economies). OSF positioned well with Post-2015 shared framework under Brazil/ LAC chairmanship. This will hopefully influence the integration of SDGs to MDGs. In addition, thematic program active role is expected to support each individual goals, i.e. Fiscal Governance for Goal 10, ESP for Goal 3, PHP for

	Goal 4, etc.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	We are working on accountability of financing Post-MDGs 2015 (social auditing, survey, evidence-based, etc.). In addition, we also support the Goal 12 particularly on tax avoidance and tax evasion.

**Background of Engagement with Post-2015  
Tifa Foundation/ OSF Indonesia  
Prepared by Mickael B. Hoelman**

**1. Engaging with the High Level Panel**

Tifa initial engagement with the Post-2015 started in 2012. Two years ago we support Indonesian CSO participation in United Nation Civil Society Roundtable High Level Panel, London, UK, 31 October – 4 November, 2012. The meeting was organized by Beyond-2015, a global civil society campaign for MDGs. The campaign brings together more than 380 organizations over the world. Tifa’s CSO partner INFID (International NGO Forum for Indonesian Development) was selected among 19 other CSO as representatives of CSOs in roundtables with the HLP. INFID is also currently an NGO in Special Consultative Status ECOSOC, Ref. No: D1035.

The meeting in London was later shared with broader Indonesian CSO in Jakarta and communicated with larger development organization which later resulted to; (a) Indonesian CSO Coalition for Post-2015 Agenda; and (b) joint-cooperation between development organizations in supporting the coalition. Some development organizations, including Tifa Foundation, Oxfam GB Indonesia, Save the Children Indonesia, Ford Foundation Indonesia, World Vision Indonesia, ICCO, and Partnership for Governance Reform.

Later in the final round of HLP meeting, March 2013 in Bali, the Indonesian CSO Coalition for Post-2015 was appointed by the Office of RI President to co-host the HLP Meeting on CSO Consultation. We work very closely with the Global Steering Committee and coordinate with the Office of RI President for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4). The HLP Meeting in Bali was also attended by George Soros who also spoke in OSJI-Tifa side event on Access to Justice and in the panel on Private Sectors Leaders hosted by the Global Compact.

Our engagement in Post-2015 can be summarized into *two-pronged strategy*; (i) involvement in the consultation processes; and (ii) influencing the outcome strategy documents. The first strategy was delivered through facilitating the Indonesian CSO Coalition and engagement with the Office of RI President for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Development Planning (Bappenas) and the office of President Special Envoy on MDGs. The second strategy was delivered through CSO Consultation, Indonesian CSO Recommendation to the Office of RI President, diplomat briefing papers and particularly consultation on HLP Report (Bali, 2012). Indonesian CSO emphasis on binding universal commitment to address inequality (both income and non-income), financing from domestic resources, and the role of social justice.

**2. Engaging with the UN General Assembly**

In the run-up to the UN General Assembly, September 2013, Tifa and Indonesian CSO Coalition again involved very closely with the Office of RI President for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4) and the President Special Envoy on MDGs to sensitize key governments on the messages and outcomes of CSO-led deliberations at the national level. Tifa and its partner INFID set up a team of RI Advisor to support UKP4 and the President Special Envoy on MDGs in the UNGA. We co-hosted two Indonesian side events on; (i) Global Partnership for 2015; and (ii) Inter-community in Reality, and supported Indonesian Ministry for Development Planning on join side event with the Global Compact on Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation.

### **3. Engaging with the Open Working Group**

With the OWG process that will going to end, Tifa and its partner INFID is under consultation with the Office of RI President for Development Monitoring and Oversight (UKP4) and the President Special Envoy on MDGs on responding to the OWG processes. Currently we are discussing a preparation to influence the last OWG meeting in February, in NY USA. There are three plan interventions as below:

- a. Side event on Openness, Transparency and Accountability.

The side event will be held in Indonesian Permanent Mission building (PTRI) on 5 February, 2014 co-hosted by RI, UK and Mexico. RSVP for permanent mission representatives, country member of OGP and CSO.

- b. Cocktail Reception on OGP

This event scheduled to be held on 6 February, 2014 at Ford Foundation HQ building. There will be no RSVP (open for public). The event will be co-hosted by RI, INFID, the Ford Foundation, and Partnership for Governance Reform.

- c. Side event on Women and Children

There will be two-separated event on this topic that are scheduled to be held on; (i) 4 February, 2014 in the UN HQ co-hosted by the Office of RI President Special Envoy on MDGs, Every Women Every Child, and the UN Foundation; and (ii) 6 February, 2014 in tbd (possible at the Ford Foundation HQ building) co-hosted by the Office of RI President Special Envoy on MDGs, UN Foundation, INFID and Women Rights Institute.

### **4. Engaging with the National Medium Development Planning**

Giving the context of general election 2014, Tifa considers that it is important to integrate the Post-2015 Agenda into RI Medium Term Planning 2014-2019. The process of drafting the development planning document has been started since late 2013 under the Ministry of Development Planning (Bappenas). In December 2013, again with its partner INFID and in join collaboration with other development organizations i.e. Ford Foundation Indonesia, Oxfam GB Indonesia, ICCO, EU, and USAID held a conference on Development for All. The conference was aimed as a consultative forum between CSO and RI government on Medium-term Development Planning. The conference focused on three main areas; (i) quality of government; (ii) the role of civil society; and (iii) addressing inequality. Minister Armida Alisjahbana (Bappenas) and Kuntoro Mangkusubroto (UKP4) was positively welcome the conference and will integrate the voice and concern from Post-2015 discussion and CSO into the Medium-term development planning document.

Note: Tifa is also in consultation with OSJI/ LEP to set up another consultation process with Bappenas, especially on the integration of Access to Justice into RI National Development Planning 2014-2019.

## **TAJIKISTAN – GOAL 10**

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Institute Assistance Foundation in Tajikistan Ms. Zuhra Halimova – Executive Director Email: zuhra.halimova@osi.tajik.net Phone: (+992) 47 441 0728
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Ensure Good Governance and Effective Institutions
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase public participation in political processes and civic engagement at all levels.</li> <li>• Guarantee the public's rights to information and access to government data.</li> <li>• Reduce bribery and corruption and ensure officials can be held accountable.</li> </ul>
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>Foundation's activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strengthening the civic engagement in electricity sector governance;</li> <li>• promoting civil society's participation in the entire budget process, ranging from public discussions to civic monitoring of budget implementation, at both national and local levels;</li> <li>• increasing public participation and dialogue in establishing the transparency in the state budget revenue received from the extractive companies;</li> <li>• supporting the civil society actors in promoting open standards and data to ensure the public sector provide full, accurate and accessible services and information at timely manner.</li> </ul> <p>Foundation uses following tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provision major institutions with capacity building grants and technical assistance, based both on their stated needs and on our assessment of their organizational capacity-building needs;</li> <li>• funding institutions in particular in developing and providing the kinds of products and services which will be useful to citizens, to other civil society actors, and to government reformers, so that they demonstrate their value and advance their prospects for sustainability.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSF Eurasia, SF Kazakhstan, SF Kyrgyzstan, OSF-Armenia, International Renaissance Foundation, OS Georgia Foundation, OSI AF-Azerbaijan, RWI, OS Fourm Mongolia
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p>The Government of the Republic of Tajikistan has become a candidate to the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative membership.</p> <p>The Ministry of Finance has publicly announced a serious commitment to the Open Budget Initiative, supported the OBI survey and the use of budget hearing guidelines by the public.</p> <p>The President's administration has expressed its interest in improving the</p>

	<p>quality of information and access to public services.</p> <p>The Government of the Republic of Tajikistan has issued a national report regarding transparency in hydro electricity and planning to issue another national report on mining sector by the end of 2014.</p> <p>The Government supports National Testing Center (NTC) for entry examinations to the universities as part of transparency and integrity in education sector.</p>
<p><b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (<i>Existing or potential?</i>)</p>	<p>Consumer Union of Tajikistan working on consumer rights and monitoring of electricity provision across the country, <a href="http://www.barqnest.tj">www.barqnest.tj</a></p> <p>Transparency for Development Coalition focusing on budget monitoring and extractive industries, <a href="http://www.tfd.tj">www.tfd.tj</a></p> <p>Public Fund Civil Internet Policy Initiatives working on building an access to information and the development of Internet policy, <a href="http://www.cipi.tj">www.cipi.tj</a> &amp; <a href="http://www.mometavonem.tj">www.mometavonem.tj</a></p> <p>Public Foundation Internet works on open data.</p> <p>Public Foundation Khoma works on data visualization, <a href="http://www.khoma.tj">www.khoma.tj</a></p> <p>NGO Anti Corruption Center coordinates civil society organizations' activities.</p>
<p><b>Government Partners</b> (<i>Existing or potential?</i>) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<p>Ministry of Finance leads the EITI national actions including development of working plan for all stakeholders, and promotes the budget hearing guidelines.</p> <p>Department of Information and Communication Technologies of the President's Administration maintains the web portal on public services and promotes open data activities at the national level.</p> <p>Local authorities are active partners in providing an open access to public services and information at the local level.</p> <p>NTC under of the Government promotes integrity in education sector.</p>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>OSI AF Tajikistan is an only organization that provides an adequate expertise and knowledge to civic participants, promotes social partnership and open dialogue among the stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>The increase of public participation and citizens' resilience in the transparency and accountability initiatives will help to increase the social capital and mobilization among the civil society actors. The empowered citizens with new knowledge will be able to coordinate their efforts more effectively to demand greater political freedom, social and legal rights.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Foundation's activities are align with UN Transparency and Accountability Initiative promoting evaluations of transparency in electricity and mining sectors, fiscal disclosure policies, voluntarily funded activities targeting at local communities with social and environmental responsibilities.</p> <p>Foundation's Extractive Industry Transparency Innovative supports the UN</p>

	<p>General Assembly's Resolution on the subject of 'Strengthening Transparency Industries'. The resolution give strong backing to the EITI by noting that Tajikistan's efforts to strengthen transparency.</p> <p>There are other mechanisms which the Foundation is using such as the Open Government Partnership, the International Budget Partnership and IMF's Fiscal Transparency.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>The creation of the web platform in the local language - Tajik, which provide instruments in data visualization.</p>

## **TAJKISTAN – GOAL 11**

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Institute Assistance Foundation in Tajikistan Ms. Zuhra Halimova – Executive Director Email: zuhra.halimova@osi.tajik.net Phone: (+992) 47 441 0728
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Ensure Stable and Peaceful Societies
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent, well-resourced and respect due-process rights</li> </ul>
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>OSIAFT is the main institution focused on Legal Empowerment of the Poor (LEP). An NGOs coalition has adequate experience and capacity to develop and monitor laws concerning legal aid. The attitude of the State is collaborative and negotiable toward civil society actors.</p> <p>Foundation's proposed work will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establishing an effective, low-cost model for legal aid in rural communities that can be piloted such that it is included as a component in the country's legal aid system. This model approach to LEP will have been tested, will be visible, will influence thinking about how legal aid should be delivered and will be included in the budget of at least several local government entities.</li> <li>• Introduction and implementation of a low cost legal aid system will decrease transaction costs and improve the quality of the legal services that, in turn, will enhance the trust to the whole field.</li> <li>• A network of local experts will exist, funded by multiple partners, focused on advancing the cause of legal empowerment of the poor across the country and capable of high level monitoring and advocacy</li> <li>• The general increase in awareness of legal rights among poor and vulnerable communities (including women, children, the disabled and labor migrants), will improve the access of the poor and vulnerable communities to economic opportunities, property rights, and safe working conditions.</li> <li>• The concept will be initially developed in the seven remote districts previously identified under the Emergency Fund program (Aini, Panjakent, Shaartuz, Kabodiyon, Djillikul, Bokhtar and Kumsangir), where poverty is endemic, legal literacy is low, large numbers of households are headed by women or the elderly, and where individuals look at migration as their likely path.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OS Justice Initiative, OSF Eurasia, SF Kyrgyzstan.

<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	The Government of Tajikistan has formally requested assistance from OSI Tajikistan in drafting a concept and law on legal aid as well as law on advocatura with focus on legal empowerment of the rural poor.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Depending on their capacities in specific regions, the Women Crisis Centers, Human Rights Center and Association of Pamir Lawyers.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Ministry of Justice in collaboration with the civil society organizations is developing a draft concept and law on legal aid. Local government authorities in selected regions will be key partners in developing and implementing of the legal aid model.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	OSI-Tajikistan assisted in development of a concept and law on legal aid not only financially but also in institutionally. Another donor organization in this field is UNDP which is in position to influence decision making bodies in the government.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	The lack of access to adequate legal aid and fair justice could trigger a social uprising and violence in a such unstable society as the post-conflict Tajikistan.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supporting economic empowerment of the poor in rural areas;</li> <li>• Facilitating developing a draft law on mediation;</li> <li>• Conducting capacity building workshops for legal aid activists;</li> <li>• An assessment of legal needs of the rural population published in 2012</li> </ul>

## **SERBIA – GOAL 10**

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Foundation, Serbia; Jadranka Jelincic, ED
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	goal 10: Ensure Good Governance and Effective Institutions.
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	By priorities: 10.d) Making the most of existing guaranties of public's right to information and access to government data; 10.e) Reduce bribery and corruption and hold officials accountable; and consequently further 10. c) Increase informed public participation in political processes.
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building additional and specific capacities of CSOs to put under scrutiny the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> branch.</li> <li>- Challenging the openness and accountability of the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> branch (watch-dogging, public hearings etc). They are entrusted important powers and provided with considerable guaranties of independence, but their accountability is seldom publicly questioned, or exposed to scrutiny, watch-dogging and the like. As a result the society is deprived of potentially powerful instruments in HR protection and fight against corruption.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developing indicators and benchmarks for openness and accountability of the respective groups of state bodies applicable in the context of EU rapprochement process and membership talks. The aim being to improve measurement against which the fulfilling of criteria either for the EU association or membership are assessed. Bearing in mind the EU involvement worldwide the other regions may benefit from improved EU measurement tools (e.g. Middle East – the EU Southern Neighborhood Policy)</li> <li>- Advocacy toward the EU to improve its respective benchmarks which proved to be insufficient in previous enlargement cycles (e.g. Bulgaria, Romania) and implementation of the EU Eastern Neighborhood Policy.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b></p>	<p>To our knowledge none of the OSF entities is involved in the similar activities or in pursuing similar goals in Serbia.</p>
<p><b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Five independent bodies belonging to the so called “4<sup>th</sup> branch” of government (namely FOI Commissioner, State Auditor, Ombudsman, Anti-Corruption Agency and Anti-Discrimination Commissioner) accepted the invitation of the OSF to establish the precedent and pro-actively expose their work to public critical consideration.</li> <li>- Listed bodies agreed to sign the Memorandum with a selected number of CSOs and engage, within their competences, in the work aimed at encouraging and challenging the remaining independent bodies entrusted with powers which concern protection of HR, curbing corruption and protection of democratic principles to introduce the standard of pro-active transparency in their work, with the aim to strengthen their openness and accountability.</li> <li>-EU officials in the Commission’s Enlargement Department demonstrated their openness toward initiatives and suggestions regarding measurement of the effective implementation of rules and policies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)</p>	<p>Transparency, Serbia; Association of Judges; Association of Public Prosecutors; Center for Applied European Studies; Toplica Center for HR, Belgrade Center for Security Policy – all of them having strong Western Balkan regional ties and intensive exchange on the EU level (through the European civil society and professional networks among which many enjoy advisory/consultative status with the EU, Council of Europe, UNDP, etc).</p>
<p><b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Partners: FOI Commissioner, State Auditor, Ombudsman, Anti-Corruption Agency and Anti-Discrimination Commissioner.</li> <li>- Exposing of their own work to critical consideration and public debate.</li> <li>- Engage with and assist CSO to challenge the remaining 11 bodies to open-up toward public and introduce pro-active attitude when transparency of their work is concerned.</li> <li>- They agreed to advocate with the EU Commission for the improvements of measurement tools to be developed throughout the membership talks. (Some of them enjoy highest respect in international circles as their work has been assessed by highest marks by competent international bodies – FOI Commissioner and Ombudsman).</li> </ul>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>The OSFS has been the first to articulate the problem. The consensus has been reached with UNDP to complement and scale up the OSFS efforts. Hopefully the Norwegian and Dutch agencies for ID will join.</p>

<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>Accountability of judiciary and the independent bodies dealing with human rights and anti-corruption. Focus on accountability of these institutions would increase their effectiveness and improve respect of human rights and effectively combat corruption.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Outcomes of proposed work will require adding the EU and CoE onto the list of OSF advocacy targets. It will enhance OSF international advocacy agenda. Presumably it will result (if successful) in a greater involvement of the EU and CoE in pursuing Post 2015 MDG.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Comparative study of effectiveness of public procurement systems to curb corruption in the Western Balkan countries. It targets, <i>inter alia</i>, improvement of the present EU indicators and benchmarks in the area of public procurement, particularly those measuring the openness and accountability of independent bodies in charge of implementation of PP rules.</p>

## OSIWA – GOAL 11 - JUSTICE – CENTRAL PRISONS

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) Afia Asantewaa Asare-Kyei; <a href="mailto:akyei@osiwa.org">akyei@osiwa.org</a> ; +221 338691024
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Justice
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	West Africa regional focus including Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p><b>Development and use of cutting-edge case management and monitoring tools in the administration of justice</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an absence of a cohesive system to track and monitor the progress of arrested persons and of criminal case files within and between criminal justice agencies.</li> <li>-The project aspires to address the urgent need for prison reforms with a view to providing access to justice, decongesting prisons and respecting the basic rights of untried prisoners in select countries</li> <li>-By ensuring an adequate methodology and practice for registering prisoners, the project will reduce “cracks in the system” which untried prisoners continuously fall through, including lost files, overlooked court dates, tardy releases, and misplacements of juvenile offenders.</li> <li>-Create and deploy an automated case management system – an electronic software that facilitates the registration processes for prisoner intake and tracking to improve operations and transparency and strengthen rights of detainees</li> <li>-Replicate work done in Guinea- Work with central prison to develop cutting edge information system for case management and monitoring</li> <li>-The manual system currently being used makes it difficult to track case development or have ready access case information and other.</li> <li>-This will reduce pretrial detention, the room for human error and discretion, enhance transparency, productivity and efficiency.</li> <li>-Additionally, defense counsel can easily access their clients files, which is critical for the development of an effective administration of justice</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSJI and HRI
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	The State (police, prisons and the courts, Legal Aid Boards) will all be beneficiaries and as such will have to be an active partner in order to make the project successful. OSIWA-OSF can fund the initial project but get the relevant states buy in to take over. This is a sustainable project but much will depend on the States willingness to allocate resources to continue with it.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	There are already CSO partners engaged in different aspects of the in the criminal justice system. Although this specific project will require very technical expertise and consultant to be brought on board to develop the case management system, local CSO will be at the forefront of the overall engagement with the state for the reform of the overall criminal justice system.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	The Police Departments, Prison Services, the Courts, Legal Aid Councils etc. are all relevant stakeholders.

<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>-Project is innovative- using cutting edge technology that will bring transparency and efficiency in the criminal justice system          -It is a sustainable strategy which will address this problem and reduce significantly the numbers of pre-trial detainees in police stations and the prisons          -The American Bar Association did this work in North Africa and OSIWA-OSF will seek to partner with them in West Africa          -Value Add- Cutting edge system which decreases back log in the judicial system.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>-Baseline of what is on the ground before the system is in place including the number of years people spend awaiting trial, the stigma attached to imprisonment even during detention and after wrongful imprisonment due to the inefficiency of the system.          -The increased number of detainee cases being processed due to the availability of information etc.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>The potential to replicate the system nationally and the accompanying benefits and advantages of an effective case management system          Support national public education and international advocacy on pre-trial reform and legal rights of detained persons.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>This work will feed into the Justice Centers and the Police Duty Solicitor Scheme project initiatives. The projects will all run concurrently as there are cross cutting issues and this will enable a proper impact assessment.</p>

## OSIWA – GOAL 11 – JUSTICE – JUSTICE CENTERS

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) Afia Asantewaa Asare-Kyei; <a href="mailto:akyei@osiwa.org">akyei@osiwa.org</a> ; +221 338691024
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Justice
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	West Africa regional focus including Ghana, Senegal , Nigeria
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p><b>Justice Centers and Police Duty Solicitor Scheme</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The over-riding goal of the Justice Centers and Police Duty Solicitor Scheme initiatives is to increase access to justice and protection of the human rights of the poor and indigent in selected police stations using paralegals. This project is to sustain an experiment on how paralegals can work to improve policing practices, reduce injustice to persons in pre-trial detentions, minimize the human rights abuses the criminal justice system inflicts on suspects, crime victims and the broader society.</li> <li>-Rationale is to address the problem of pre-trial detention/awaiting trial and meet the challenge of access to justice through legal empowerment</li> <li>-Most of the countries have Legal Aid Councils/Schemes but they are not functional due to lack of funding and human resources</li> <li>-Work with state agencies such as the Police, Prison services, the courts so that the poor can access fair trial and other civil liberties as provisioned in the access to justice legislation but not realizable on the ground.</li> <li>- Work with paralegals, law students who interview suspects and monitor their interaction with the police and how they navigate the judicial system and produce reports based on this. They then refer the cases to pro bono lawyers and the Legal Aid Council.</li> <li>-This will improve the capacity of police officers, prison officials and Magistrates to apply human rights principles in pre-trial processes; and that of lawyers to provide free legal services in police stations and prisons</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSJI and HRI.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	These projects are being implemented with the buy-in and support of the Police and Prisons services. The national legal aid councils/schemes are part of it too. In fact, in Ghana, the pilot project was in select few police stations and it is Police Services who has requested that project be rolled out in other stations. In Nigeria, the Police Duty Solicitor Scheme initiative provides 24 hours legal services in 24 stations in six states in different geo-political zones, all in collaboration with the relevant agents of the criminal justice system
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Government’s willingness and capacity to deal with this challenge has not been very effective so the need for civil society and government partnership is crucial in dealing with this challenge. OSIWA-OSF supports partners on the ground to do the work - in Ghana it is Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI), and in Nigeria its Rights Enforcement and Public Law Centre (REPLACE)
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	The Police Service, Prison Authorities, Legal Aid Councils, the Judiciary, Ministry of Justice working together to limit the abuse of rights in pre-trial processes
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	In Ghana, OSIWA/OSF is working in strategic partnership with the Ford Foundation whilst in Nigeria, it seeded this work as REPLACE is a spin-off initiative of OSIWA and OSJI. Going forward, the idea is to keep supporting but gradually decrease financial support but keep an interest in the

	investment made and the impact the project is and will continue to have
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	The projects started with some common baseline surveys and reports on pre-trial detention outlining the numbers of awaiting trial detainees. Variables such as those unduly detained as a result of missing files, police compliance with investigations, the number of cases referred for legal assistance, the overall efficiency of the management of cases etc. are all measurable indicators.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	This work will benefit greatly from advocacy for the reform of the criminal justice system and legal aid. Further advocacy could target builds national and sub-regional networks to increase the functionality of frameworks of access to justice. A concern arises with regards to state agencies’ sincerity and the willingness to implement laws as they relate to perceived criminals.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	-Project to be implemented concurrently on the development of cutting edge information system in prisons to improve the transparency in case management and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system -At the moment the case management system in most of our countries are manually administered and it makes it difficult to keep track of and manage cases. As a result a lot of people wait too long in detention awaiting trial and other are wrongfully convicted.

## **OSIWA – GOAL 10 – GOVERNANCE – FREEDOM OF INFORMATION**

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) Afia Asantewaa Asare-Kyei ; <a href="mailto:akyei@osiwa.org">akyei@osiwa.org</a> ; +221 338691024
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Governance (Economic, T&A)
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Regional focus (West Africa) Nigeria, Liberia, Guinea, Niger, Sierra Leone, Ghana, Senegal, Cote d'Ivoire and Benin
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p><b>Citizens right of access information/ freedom of information as a social accountability and governance tool.</b></p> <p>-Although it is a relative young right it leverages / drives the other rights. On the one hand government has the obligation to proactively provide information and on the other citizens have the right to demand information. This is especially crucial for fragile democracies as it builds public trust.</p> <p>-Enshrined within this right are the ideals of transparency, accountability and participation, which are the hallmarks for democracy; and as such, in the struggle towards human development and open governance, one of the practical ways to achieve this end is in entrenching the people’s right to access information in strong legislation</p> <p>-The project pushes for the adoption of Right to Information legislation and reviewing the implementation and identifying gaps in those laws in the West African sub-region.</p> <p>-Includes working with local partner organisations to review the state of implementation, looking specifically at what has worked, what has not worked and areas where gaps exists in terms of compliance and implementation in Nigeria, Liberia and, Guinea, Niger and Sierra Leone</p> <p>- Still work to sustain engagement in Ghana and Senegal to have the law passed</p> <p>- The project will expand to Cote d'Ivoire and Benin (French speaking). The two countries have access to information provision in their respective Constitutions. Although work will continue to have laws passed the new angle added will look at other existing legislation that have snippets of access to information (e.g. in Sierra Leone, the Local Government Act which provides that local council publish in accessible places and language, information on public spending and minutes of meetings held). It will assess how the citizens make use of those provisions and that will give a picture of what kind of implementation advocacy needs to be done when the laws are passed.</p>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSJI and HRI. Potentially with Information Program and Fiscal Governance Program.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p>-Country and Parliamentary level with cabinet members, progressive members of the legislature, also, select Parliamentary Committees of the National Assemblies.</p> <p>- Village and neighborhood level. There is concurrent civic education on when and how to engage with the policy makers and what is the importance of the right to access information. For example, one tactic has been encouraging members of the public/communities to engage and urge their respective member of Parliament when Parliament is in recess and they are back in their constituencies to pass the law</p>
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	-All work in this area is led by local civil society coalitions. Other national, sub-regional, continental and international organisations with similar objectives

	such as CHRI in New Delhi, Media Rights Agenda in Nigeria, Media Foundations for West Africa in Ghana, ODAC in South Africa, the African Freedom of Information Centre, Article 19 etc. will provide technical expertise and accompaniment
<b>Government Partners</b> ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> ) What department? What type of engagement?	Legislature, Cabinet, Relevant ministries e.g. Information and Justice, Attorney General's Office etc. on trainings and lobbying
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	-Yes, the World Bank, UNDP, USAID and others provide nominal support but OSIWA-OSF has been at the forefront and remains the principle agency supporting this work in the sub-region -Other partners mentioned above come on board as experts and technicians -The value-add for OSF is that this work aligns with what OSF is about and our identity. It is at the core at the open society agenda
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	-Measure implementation of laws passed -Whether citizens are aware of their rights, if they are whether they are demanding information and what they are using the information for etc. - Measure a number of governance indicators such as government effectiveness, regulatory burden, corruption, accountability, the rule of law and bureaucratic efficiency amongst others
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	- The advocacy strategies for this project include collaborating with local and international media and relevant international stakeholders to bring pressure to bear on adoption and implementation of FOI laws. -National advocacy interventions such as op-eds, appearances on TV and radio interviews are also employed
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	More transparent governments govern better and as such, this work aligns finely with ongoing work on Natural Resource governance, Anti -Corruption and citizens' monitoring of Public Service Delivery etc.

## OSIWA – GOAL 10 – GOVERNANCE - ELECTIONS

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) Afia Asantewaa Asare-Kyei ; <a href="mailto:akyei@osiwa.org">akyei@osiwa.org</a> ; +221 338691024
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Governance (Political)
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Regional Foundation (West Africa – according to electoral calendar)
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p><b>Citizens Election Situation Room</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Recognizes the central role of elections in tolerant democracies and aims to improve the transparency and credibility of elections.</li> <li>-Had Situation Rooms in Nigeria, Liberia, Senegal and Sierra Leone in accordance with country context</li> <li>-It is a citizens’ monitoring and conflict management tool, e.g. if ballots are late, information can quickly be obtain to explain reasons why and hence avert any potential for conflict or suspicion</li> <li>-The model to be used for the full stretch of election management, not just on the day of election but also before through monitoring civic education, access to the media, freedom of expression and also afterwards to hold office holders accountable to the promises they make during campaigns</li> <li>- Now looking to engage ECOWAS to adopt it as a sustainable model every country should have and slowly wean it off OSF if it is taken on board. The engagement should show the benefits of the model for civil society.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	AFRO and Africa Foundations so that it can possibly be replicated in other parts of the continent
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In Senegal for example, the President who was then a candidate visited the Situation Room and it should be interesting to see his involvement now that he is in the office come the next elections</li> <li>- Electoral Management Bodies in West Africa</li> <li>-National, Neighborhood and village level as this model relies on mutual feeding of information from the country level to communities and vice versa</li> </ul>
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	The Situation Room is a multi-stakeholder initiative but with civil society partners at the forefront. The sustainable expansion option now being proposed includes the development of a training manual/module and this will involve working with civil society partners.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	National Electoral Management Bodies and/or specific government ministries or departments charged with the management of the conduct of elections. Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	This was an OSIWA-OSF initiative and as such, OSF has the convening power to bring other players on board for a more global engagement. The initiative is broad and includes pre and post-election civic engagement. For the 2015 elections in Nigeria, OSIWA-OSF is part of a donor coordination group/development partners including DFID, UNDP, USAID, MacArthur, Ford, EU etc. This is a good thing as it ensures ownership and sustainability of the project. Should OSIWA-OSF pull out the project will continue but as an institution whose raison d’etre is governance, it makes great sense to be involve – as both a contributor and agenda setter.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduction in election related violence through the instant messaging system</li> <li>- Voter awareness of the election process and turnout</li> <li>-The availability of election related information</li> </ul>

<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>-Engaging the National Electoral Commissions in the ECOWAS sub-region (ECONEC) for the systematic use of Situation Room so as to critically assess the pre, during and post-election process</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Work being done on early warning systems re political conflict in the sub-region, work being done to promote the ratification and monitor the implementation and institutionalization of the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Good Governance</p>

## OSISA – GOALS 10 & 11 – ECONOMIC JUSTICE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	OSISA – 1. Masego Madzwamuse, Economic Justice Programme Manager <a href="mailto:masegom@osisa.org">masegom@osisa.org</a> Tel: +27 11 5875000/5041 Mobile: +27 832300946  & 2. Glen Mpani, Democracy and Governance Programme Manager <a href="mailto:glenm@osisa.org">glenm@osisa.org</a> Tel: +27 5875000 Mobile: +27 824434230
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Governance & Access to information
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<b>Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, Malawi &amp; Mozambique</b>
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>A 2 year project which supports the Southern African Parliamentary Trust (SAPST) in its efforts to strengthen the capacity of SADC parliaments to play a more effective role in anti-corruption. The project leverages the strong momentum built by the SADC Association of Parliamentary Budget Committees (SADCAPBC), a regional platform that has been successful to date in providing parliamentary budget oversight capacity to 10 SADC Parliamentary Budget Committees, that is Zambia, Zimbabwe, Swaziland, South Africa, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Botswana, DR Congo, and Angola.</p> <p>The initiative will over the next 2 years focus on deepening in-country capacity building activities in Angola, DRC, Malawi and Mozambique aimed at establishing and strengthening anti-corruption parliamentary structures.</p>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Collaboration between - OSISA Economic Justice, Democracy and Governance , Angola and DRC offices
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	Budget portfolio committees at country level have demonstrated political will and support for this initiative. Some of the project related activities have been demand driven. i.e. DRC portfolio committee requesting training on budget analysis and budget tracking tools and the Botswana National assembly seeking support to establish a Parliamentary Budget Office to ensure sustainability of project related activities.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	<p>Southern African Parliamentary Trust (SAPST) is the main partner.</p> <p>However Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM) has extended its social accountability monitoring course to members of the SADCAPBC.</p> <p>Media Institute for Southern Africa (MISA)</p>
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	<p>National Assemblies in the 10 SADC Countries with signed up membership to the Southern African Association of Parliamentary Budget Committees.</p> <p>Finance and Budget Portfolio Committees in Zambia, Zimbabwe, Swaziland, South Africa, Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Botswana, DR Congo, and Angola</p>

<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>The World Bank supports some of the activities in this initiative which is positive as they bring long term technical backstopping support. OSF brings CSOs voices to a space that would ordinarily be dominated by Government and Donors.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>It's too early to tell as Post 2015 governance indicators and targets are still subject to much discussion. But the project presents an opportunity to track targets on the (especially in Angola, DRC, Malawi and Mozambique) ;  d)guarantee the public's right to information and access to government data;  and e) reduce bribery and corruption &amp; ensure officials can be held accountable</p> <p>Apart from contributing to the goal framework this work would be valuable for discussions on means of implementation as Parliaments are part of institutions that are crucial for monitoring</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Parliaments are key stakeholders with an important role to play in ensuring goals are implemented at the national level. They play critical roles in linking citizens with government, and in ensuring broad—based and democratic ownership of national development agendas.  Given their oversight role, they will be invaluable in designing and developing an accountability framework for the post 2015 development agenda both at the national, regional and global levels.</p> <p>The MDGs were criticized for being a top-down. Engaging parliaments in the formulation phase improves legitimacy of the process and ensures that citizens contribute to global and national policy processes.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Through collaboration with the Independent Research Forum for Post 2015 OSISA is developing an initiative aimed at providing technical and analytical support to national parliaments in the efforts to deepen their engagement in the post 2015 &amp;SDG agenda. Support will be provided to Zambia, Angola, Malawi &amp; Mozambique as well as the Pan - African Parliament and the SADC Parliamentary Forum.</p> <p>OSISA will build on existing initiatives where we are supporting the Southern African Parliamentary Trust to build the capacity of parliaments to play their oversight role more effectively. Key interventions will include;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Facilitating the participation of members of parliaments and support offices in the formulation, negotiation, planning and domestication, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the Agenda,</li> <li>2. Create awareness on post-2015 development issues through its leadership role and through participatory processes identify needs of the majority and vulnerable groups.</li> <li>3. Support and strengthen the capacity of relevant committees in the Parliaments (i.e. environment, finance and budget, educations etc) to engage in the MDGs/Agenda.</li> <li>4. In line with the oversight role of parliaments contribute to the design and development of the governance and accountability frameworks for the post 2015 development agenda both at the national, regional and global levels</li> <li>5. Facilitate the sharing of regional success stories, lessons learned and experiences among African countries.</li> </ol>

## OSISA – GOALS 10 & 11 – EDUCATION

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	OSISA – 1. Masego Madzwamuse, Economic Justice Programme Manager <a href="mailto:masegom@osisa.org">masegom@osisa.org</a> Tel: +27 11 5875000/5041 Mobile: +27 832300946  & 2. Wongani Grace Nkhoma, Education Programme Manager <a href="mailto:gracen@osisa.org">gracen@osisa.org</a> Tel: +27 5875000 Mobile: +27 826530951  3. Glen Mpani, Democracy and Governance Programme Manager <a href="mailto:glenm@osisa.org">glenm@osisa.org</a> Tel: +27 5875000 Mobile: +27 824434230
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Governance
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<b>Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe &amp; Swaziland</b>
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>This is a three year initiative by national civil society education coalitions to hold governments accountable for the delivery of quality services in education. The project monitors budget allocation to the education sector and implementation of the budget. The project brings together civil society to advocate for adequate resource allocation to education and effective and efficient use of the resources by tracking the flow of the resources from central government to schools.</p> <p>This work leverages on the commitments by governments to achieve quality education for all by 2015 and focuses on monitoring commitments through the use of budget transparency tools as well as ensuring broad participation in budget processes. From 2014 this work will look at an additional dimension of addressing corruption in the education sector.</p>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	This work is being coordinated by the OSISA Education Programme and the corruption work will be done in collaboration with the Democracy and Governance, Economic Justice Programmes and the OSF Education Support Programme (ESP)
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	Grassroots communities have been involved in the work to monitor school budgets and at the national level, civil society has worked with parliamentary committees on education by holding Ministries of Education accountable to the findings of the budget tracking exercises. Donor partners at country level have supported this initiative and have used findings of the budget tracking exercise to inform their discussions with the Ministry of Education.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	National Education coalitions at the country level have been the main partners – these are coalitions of civil society focusing on the right to education.

	Potential partners include Economic Justice networks in the target countries , Centre for social Concern in Malawi, Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection in Zambia and regional partners like AFRODAD, and the Public Services Accountability Monitor
<b>Government Partners</b> ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> ) What department? What type of engagement?	Parliamentary Committees on Education and Finance and Budget committees in the countries involved; and possibly Anti-Corruption Agencies.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	ActionAid, DFID, Trocaire are some of the partners involved in this work. They also provide financial and technical support for this initiative. This is a positive thing as it allows the pulling together of resources and amplifies the voice for accountability in the delivery of education services
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	In countries like Malawi, results of budget monitoring exercises have revealed malpractices in the education sector leading to prosecution. Such an initiative has also led to increased transparency of education budgets and availability of simplified information on the budget allowing for increased civic participation in the process  Parliamentary committees have also used findings of the budget tracking exercise in their sessions with Ministries of Education.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	Civil society education coalitions have over the years played a critical role at the national, regional and international level to advance education for all in accordance with the MDGs and Education for All (EFA) goals. Their work on budget monitoring adds a strong local voice for increased transparency and accountability in the education sector; aid effectiveness discourse as well as on governance of finance for development.  Looking forward, there is increased attention on education financing in the proposals for the post 2015 development framework. This call focuses on use of domestic resources to finance education. Work on budget monitoring and corruption will be critical if this is to be addressed and this work can be used to feed into the proposals for the post 2015 frameworks.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	Civil society is playing a critical role in the development of the post 2015 development agenda. OSISA is building on existing work to support civil society to engage in the post 2015 processes.  Key interventions will include; 1. Facilitating the participation civil society in the evaluation of the current 2015 goals as well as the formulation of the post 2015 goals, 2. Creating awareness on post-2015 development proposals on education that have been put forward by various institutions to add civil society voice to such proposals 3. Development of policy briefs on key issues that need to be included in the post 2015 development agenda like for instance on Early Childhood Development and Education (ECDE). 4. Engaging in discussions on innovative finance for development with particular focus on education

## NBI NEPAL – GOAL 10 - GOVERNANCE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Alliance for Social Dialogue, Hari Sharma, <a href="mailto:hsharma@asd.org.np">hsharma@asd.org.np</a> Nepal & Bhutan Initiatives, Martin Hala, <a href="mailto:martin.hala@opensocietyfoundations.org">martin.hala@opensocietyfoundations.org</a>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	<b>Governance</b>
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<b>Electoral Integrity, Public Accountability and Expanding Civil Space</b>
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Demanding Elections and Electoral Integrity:</b> In the post-conflict scenario, periodic elections (national and local) function as the first entry point for the wider participation of the public. Despite the recent remarkably clean general elections, local elections have not been held in Nepal in more than a decade.</li> <li>• <b>Policy Contestation of Public Issues:</b> Public policy and decision making process are major areas of civic engagement which have been either dysfunctional or occupied by small group of elites. We promote stronger engagement of the public in policy space and decision making process through forums for evidence-based policy contestations.</li> <li>• <b>Strengthening Accountability Mechanisms:</b> In the absence of periodic elections, with the policy space occupied by a small group of political elites, accountability has become weak. To make institutions more responsive, accountability monitoring mechanism will be formed along with active mobilization of grass root organizations, youth groups and social media.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	<b>Think Tank Fund (TTF)</b> (initial engagement)
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	All major political parties have committed to complete the promulgation of Constitution within one year. Political parties have also committed to holding local elections at the earliest. Both have been included in their political manifestos. However, politics of convenience (collusion) still prevails in most local institutions to exclude people's participation.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Network of grass-root organizations facilitated by ASD. Policy Networks at national level
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Coalition group of Member of Parliament and Committees of Parliament: for consultation and Discussion on diverse policy issues Interface with constituency Election Commission: for policy consultation National Planning Commission: for forum for policy contestation
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	International IDEA, NDI, UKAID, UNDP, World Bank  The existing donors bring their expertise, while we work on creating capacity at the local level. Moreover, we have the wider reach at local level contributing in developing local leadership of civic activists. The existing donors suggest options based on their experience, while we provide forum for exploring different options. In some cases, local policy engagement needs to be done in opposition to major donors who often monopolize policy

	research and formulation at the national level.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Electoral policies: Existing policies and what could/should be changed Public Policy processes: Policy making process and level of participation of different stakeholders Corruption/Accountability : Data / Corruption Index Periodicity of local elections
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	There are global campaigns for clean election and corruption eradication. However, there is not always good coordination with local actors on the ground. There needs to be increased collaboration and networking among international actors supporting advocacy along with increased understanding of the local context and dynamics that does not always fully correspond with international experience. (e.g. understanding of ‘consensus’; understanding of ‘traditional’ and ‘progressive’ forces – how the understanding interplays in Nepalese socio-political scenario)
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	

## NBI NEPAL – GOAL 11 - JUSTICE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	ASD, Hari Sharma - Director, <a href="mailto:hsharma@asd.org.np">hsharma@asd.org.np</a> NBI, Martin Hala – Regional Director <a href="mailto:martin.hala@opensocietyfoundations.org">martin.hala@opensocietyfoundations.org</a>
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	a. Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent, well resourced and respect due process rights. (Goal 11- b) b. Enhance the accountability of the security forces, police and judiciary. (Goal 11-d) c. Provide free and Universal legal identity, such as birth registrations
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Transitional Justice and Legal Empowerment
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	ASD and NBI focus on channeling demands for justice from violent direct action to systemic rule of law and legal empowerment for the underprivileged. In this process, we see transitional justice and legal empowerment as two sides of the same coin: violence, including ideologically motivated political violence, has to be punished, and legal alternatives promoted.  Specifically, we support national and local level organizations to advocate for access to justice, assist people to obtain legal identity, and register complaints to the concerned agencies. On the other side, we work with conflict victims to demand justice and reparation for conflict-time abuses through the AWC and other partners. We also advocate for relevant policies to address issues of transitional justice especially in light of the recent breakthrough Supreme Court verdict.
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Justice Initiatives/ Women Rights Program/ LGBTI
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<p><b>Country level:</b> Civil society engagement in matters of justice, election results from recent elections, the SC verdict against impunity for political violence.</p> <p><b>Parliament level:</b> parliamentary debates on issues of justice of women, marginalized community, political representation and transitional justice. Passed bills on women's representation and issuance of national identity cards, passed act on Caste-based Discrimination and Untouchability Crime Elimination and Punishment</p> <p><b>Village level:</b> Grass-root activism, engagement of paralegal on matter related to access to justice.</p>
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Existing Partners: Dalit Non-governmental Federation (DNF), Forum for Women, Law and Development (FWLD), Alliance for Peace and Democracy (PAPAD), Accountability Watch Committee (AWC), Advocacy Forum (AF) and Local level human rights grantee (15 local NGOs in the Districts).  Potential partners: Nepal NGO Federation
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	<p><b>Existing partners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Women, Children and Social Welfare</li> <li>• Women Commission</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Potential partners:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministry of Peace and Reconstruction</li> <li>• Ministry of Home Affairs</li> <li>• Ministry of Defense</li> </ul> <p>What types of engagement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to governmental archives</li> <li>- Insurance of effective implementation of policies, acts, by- laws pertaining to justice.</li> <li>- Active engagement of security agencies to ensure justice at all level.</li> <li>- Collaborative effort of civil society and government agencies in generating relevant policies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>Yes. (DFID, UNDP, UNCHR, WC, FWLD, LAAC, ICJ, ICTJ, Nepal Bar Association (NBA))</p> <p>It is a good thing because it has created the space for the engagement of multiple stakeholders/agencies working in different levels. This allows OSF to connect ideas, experiences, and recommendations from different levels and thus, address the issue of justice in Nepal. Most of these agencies are restricted to certain frameworks and issues. OSF has the flexibility for immediate actions on issues of justice. We also have a more comprehensive approach linking transitional justice to legal empowerment.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>a. Representation of women/marginalized communities in the parliament.  b. Statistical data on the number of citizenship cards and birth registration.  c. Number of cases filed in different levels of judiciary.  d. Prosecutions for war-time abuses</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Justice denied on non-derogable rights at the local level can be addressed by international agencies by raising issues in international forums such as HR commissions, sending cases to special rapporteur at the UN. Regional engagement and collaboration with international non-governmental organizations such as Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International. International advocacy in donor countries against impunity.</p> <p><b>Concerns</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- need for conducive environment for international organization to work in Nepal.</li> <li>- flexible operational policies for international organizations.</li> <li>- Effective implementation of recommendations by governmental agencies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Policy papers on issues of justice.</li> <li>- Scholarships on HR and specialized areas such as Disability Rights.</li> <li>- Human Rights education efforts for the sensitization on issues related to HR and justice.</li> <li>- Dialogue and interactions with community level stakeholders for demanding state accountability on justice.</li> </ul>

## KAZAKHSTAN – GOAL 10 – GOVERNANCE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Soros Foundation Kazakhstan, Anton Artemyer <a href="mailto:aartemyev@soros.kz">aartemyev@soros.kz</a> +7 777 229 0024
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Governance
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Kazakhstan
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	- Research and the production of advocacy data which is published in accessible and meaningful language for the citizens (Budgets, Revenue) - Enhance the capacity of citizens to read this data and act on it both at the local, national and regional level
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Fiscal Governance Program
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	The Ministry of Energy considers the Foundation as an expert partner as it pioneered the work on good governance in the extractive industry
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	National Budget Network of Kazakhstan which Soros Foundation Kazakhstan is a member. The network has 8 organizations
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Offers expertise to the Ministry of Energy, a relationship emanating from the Foundation's work in advocating for good governance in the extractive industry.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	OSF has a good reputation and expertise on the governance of natural resources and the extractive industry. It also pioneered this important work
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Not yet
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	This work raises awareness at the national level on the targets that the government needs to meet and creates citizen demand of information.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	-Also working on effective palliative care in the HIV and AIDS sector. -Poverty reduction work closely linked to ensuring that revenue from the national resources extractive industry benefits the citizens and is used to reduce poverty.

## KAZAKHSTAN - EDUCATION

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Soros Foundation Kazakhstan, Anton Artemyev <a href="mailto:aartemyev@soros.kz">aartemyev@soros.kz</a> +7 777 229 0024
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Inclusive Education
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Kazakhstan
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	- National and regional advocacy through developing mechanisms of proper implementation to meet this goal. -The Foundation has direct contact with the person (please provide name) representing Kazakhstan on the OWG. There is a good entry pointy for advocacy
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Education Support Program
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	The Ministry of Education is willing to work with Soros Foundation Kazakhstan to develop mechanisms of proper implementation of this goal
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Coalition for inclusive Education which comprises of 10 organizations and the Soros Foundation Kazakhstan is part of the network
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	The Ministry of Education is willing to work with Soros Foundation Kazakhstan to develop mechanisms of proper implementation to meet this goal
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	OSF has the advantage of adequate capacity to carry out this work in terms of financial resources and local staff expertise.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Current work on social inclusion and the promotion of the rights of people with mental disabilities in the education system could be considered.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	Using the Post 2015 platform strengthens/ makes stronger arguments for national advocacy on inclusive education.
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	- Soros Foundation Kazakhstan is also working on developing mechanisms for proper implementation of other MGGs not included in the shared framework such as Education and others.

## INFORMATION PROGRAM

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Human Rights Initiative, Elizabeth Eagen <a href="mailto:elizabeth.eagen@opensocietyfoundations.org">elizabeth.eagen@opensocietyfoundations.org</a> 212-548-0616 x 1616
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>The information program doesn't have a specific workplan right now dedicated to this. We work broadly and globally on issues related to governance, safety, justice and rule of law in the digital sphere but none that I think would point the charrette in a particular country direction. I think we're happy to continue conversations and participate where necessary but at this point I'd want to keep us at that level to see where we would best fit. As I mentioned in the call, I'm most interested in a very narrow question as to whether OSF can contribute to making better and more dynamic metrics than the standard indicators generally employed. To that end I think the group should splinter off section thinking about data and indicators, and we should have an outsider possibly lead us through deciding what those might be: how to measure granularly; how to prevent measurement from doing "cross-country-comparative" work. There are important debates right now about whether indexes that develop that cross-country comparison have any utility, and I think their use is questionable. People mentioned the usefulness of "shorthand indicators" in conversations, and I think OSF does not have a unified take on that. However, the Info Program is a bit overstretched to lead or manage that conversation.</p>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	

## HRI – GOAL 11 – JUSTICE – MALAWI

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Louise Ehlers, Human Rights Initiative Louisee@osisa.org; +27 11 587-5010 Alternative contact: Mary Miller Flowers, Human Rights Initiative <a href="mailto:Mary.millerflowers@opensocietyfoundations.org">Mary.millerflowers@opensocietyfoundations.org</a> ; 202 721 5642
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Justice
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Malawi
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	In 2011, a consortium of civil society groups working closely with OSF completed an audit of case flow management and conditions of detention in Malawi. The audit found significant backlogs in the criminal justice system in terms of the transfer of cases from police to prosecution or from magisterial to high court jurisdictions, a widespread lack of legal aid for defendants, the excessive use of police and pretrial detention, arrest and detention for antiquated or colonial-era offenses such as loitering or being a “rogue,” among other things. Since the completion of the audit, consortium members are working on the implementation of the audit’s recommendations with particular focus on developing a process for adherence to custody time limits, increasing access to legal advice and assistance by proposing legislative and policy reforms allowing for paralegals to assist indigent defendants, and working for the repeal or reclassification of antiquated offenses, among other things. Research has also been conducted to measure the impact of paralegal services on the reduction of pretrial detention in target locations and the adherence of justice sector actors to due process rights. This work could be developed to support aspects b) and d) of goal 11: ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent and well-resourced and respect due process rights; and enhance the capacity, accountability, professionalism and of security forces, police and justice institutions.
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSISA, Justice Initiative
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	The above work is being done in partnership with the Directorate of Public Prosecutions and Legal Aid Department in the Ministry of Justice and both have both are committed to ongoing collaboration as evidenced by a recent high-level policy briefing on the work hosted by the Solicitor General.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	PASI Consortium (Paralegal Advisory Services Institute, Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, Center for Human Rights Advice and Assistance, Centre for Rights and Rehabilitation and Chancellor College Faculty of Law at the University of Malawi.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Directorate of Public Prosecutions, Legal Aid Department, Ministry of Justice
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	OSF is co-funding the implementation of part of this work with the EU Democratic Governance Programme. Dfid is also a key player in this work. Staff and partners all have strong relationships with these donors and would see their engagement as positive.

<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>Impact of paralegal services on release rates from detention (which would seek to show the impact of early access to legal advice and assistance on adherence to due process rights), adherence to statutory custody time limits (which would show the efficiency of the system both in terms of processing people before they reached the end of the statutory period and releasing those whose who are being detained illegally on expired warrants ), etc.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Malawi has signed on to the Open Government Partnership and has an administration that is anxious to show positive gains in development and rights agendas. Malawi is one of very few countries that allows representation by NGOs at the African Court and this lends itself to litigation at the regional level if appropriate.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>We will be ramping up efforts to reform the Penal Code to remove or reclassify antiquated or colonial-era offenses that result in unnecessary arrests and incarceration of marginalized groups. The Southern Africa Litigation Centre has been supported to do foundational research on this.</p>

## HRI – GOAL 11 – JUSTICE - ZAMBIA

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Louise Ehlers, Human Rights Initiative <a href="mailto:Louisee@osisa.org">Louisee@osisa.org</a> , +27 11 587 5010 Alternative contact: Mary Miller Flowers, Human Rights Initiative <a href="mailto:Mary.millerflowers@opensocietyfoundations.org">Mary.millerflowers@opensocietyfoundations.org</a> ; 202 721 5642
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Justice
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Zambia
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	As in Malawi, grantees and OSF collaborated to undertake an audit of pretrial detention focusing on caseload management in Zambia, completed in 2011. In Zambia, this work was led by the Zambian Human Rights Commission. As a follow up to the audit, the Commission is undertaking a review of bail and bond practice in the country with the view to developing guidelines to standardize its use and educational materials on bail procedures in police stations, courts and prisons. It is also working to design a process to expedite the committal and transfer of cases from subordinate to High Courts.
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSISA
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	The Zambian human Rights Commission is legally mandated to visit places of detention for oversight purposes and to report directly to parliament. Additionally, the ZHRC has a close working relationship with the Access to Justice Programme in the Ministry of Justice which has stated its commitment to supporting this work.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Zambian Human Rights Commission, Prison Care and Counselling Association, Caritas Zambia, Paralegal Alliance Network, Legal Resources Foundation.
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Home Affairs, Zambian Prison Service, Legal Aid Department
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	GIZ and the Royal Danish Embassy have been working in Zambia for many years to promote justice sector reform, particularly through the Ministry of Justice and the development of the Communication Coordination and Cooperation Initiative (CCCI), an inter-agency coordination initiative of the Access to Justice Programme under the Ministry of Justice. They would be supportive of further engagement on these issues.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	The Zambian government is committed to devolution and decentralization of justice services which in theory should shorten the time for cases to be transferred between courts. In addition, the legal aid policy draft has been completed and is due to be finalized in the coming month, facilitating improved access to justice for detainees. Finally, the new Constitution making process creates the space for provisions relating to the rights of detainees.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	The research related to disability and criminal justice has the potential to be groundbreaking and would be ripe for international advocacy. It also potentially links closely with development goals.

<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	HRI is working with OSISA and the Zambian Ministry of Home Affairs to survey the interface between people with psychosocial and intellectual disabilities and the criminal justice system and the data gathered through this work could feed into other attempts to measure pre-trial justice.
---	--

## HRI – GOAL 11 – JUSTICE - BRAZIL

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Mary Miller Flowers Human Rights Initiative <a href="mailto:Mary.millerflowers@opensocietyfoundations.org">Mary.millerflowers@opensocietyfoundations.org</a> ; 202 721 5642
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Justice
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Brazil
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	Grantees in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo have collected data measuring the impact of a recently adopted law on alternatives to pretrial detention (12403/2011). The research seeks to show the impact of the law on the number of people allowed to await trial in liberty and the behavior of various governmental/judicial actors in relation to the law (police, magistrates, public defenders). Grantees have also collected significant data in recent years on access to legal aid, the impact of early access to legal aid on the frequency and duration of pretrial detention, and the differences in requests for habeus corpus, case processing duration, and sentencing for criminal defendants with regular access to quality criminal defense counsel. Some of this work is research-based while some is litigation-focused. This work could be brought together to support measurement of progress on HLP targets b) and d) under goal 11: Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent and well-resourced and respect due process rights; and Enhance the capacity, accountability, professionalism and of security forces, police and justice institutions.
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Not at present, although collaboration with LAP and JI could be envisioned depending on how the work is conceptualized.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	Political will is evident at the parliamentary level and in key ministries, such as the Ministry of Justice. The National Council of Justice is also a key ally, as is the Brazilian Supreme Court, and the state and national-level offices of the Public Defense.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Instituto Sou da Paz, Center for the Study of Citizenship and Security, Institute in Defense of the Right to Defense, Institute in Defense of Human Rights Defenders, Institute for Land Work and Citizenship, the National Prison Pastoral Ministry, Conectas Human Rights, Association of Judges for Democracy
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Ministry of Justice, National Council of Justice, Sao Paulo Public Defenders Office, Rio de Janeiro Public Defenders Office, others
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	OSF has recently recruited new donors to criminal justice reform efforts in Brazil, namely the Oak Foundation, the Brazilian Fund for Human Rights, and the Lafer Family Foundation
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Frequency with which pretrial detention is requested and requests are granted and/or the frequency with which defendants are allowed to await trial in liberty (would show us something about pretrial detention being used as a measure of last resort and the safeguarding of the presumption of innocence); impact of early access to counsel on adherence to due process rights, reduction in incarceration, reduction of pretrial detention for cases in

	<p>which there is little evidentiary basis, application of rights for defendants and convicts under the law; the number of defendants who are detained pretrial only to receive a non-custodial sentence and/or the frequency with which detention is used for minor offenses or drug possession (would tell us something about the “legitimacy” of that detention, and potentially public confidence in the justice system to rationalize its resources for those most deserving of incarceration, might tell us something about police capacity of investigation, arbitrary arrest and detention); etc.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Could promote the inclusion of justice targets in the post-2015 MDGs by showing the ways in which changes in the justice system could be measured, and illustrating the impact of problems in the criminal justice system on the rule of law, public security, increasing criminality due to exposure to incarceration, etc.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>We are supporting grantees in Brazil to advocate for an oral custody hearing to determine the legality of pretrial detention which could provide a new opportunity to contest the use of pretrial detention. We are also supporting some work analyzing the effectiveness of the Public Defense in Brazil, and the impact of drug policy on incarceration rates. We have a full-time advocacy office in Brasilia and an active Criminal Justice Network which stays abreast of these and other issues.</p>

## FGP – GOAL 10 - GOVERNANCE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Fiscal Governance Program, Julie McCarthy, <a href="mailto:Julie.mccarthy@opensocietyfoundations.org">Julie.mccarthy@opensocietyfoundations.org</a> , 1 212 548 0683
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Governance
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	<b>Possible countries:</b> Liberia, Kenya, Ghana, Tanzania, Indonesia, Brazil, Mexico
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiating a number of intensive country-level pilots focused on engaging civil society, government the private sector, academics, etc... in dialogues around the most important governance issues in their countries and how current progress can be accelerated and measured; building on these conversations in some instances to actually work with government agencies and local partners to initiate programming to this effect and; drawing on these conversations to inform/stimulate regional and international advocacy around governance/post 2015</li> <li>• Supporting African CSOs (very broadly defined) to develop a Pan-African citizens’ response to the AU Common Position on the Post 2015 Framework, which will likely marginalize governance (and justice), in contrast to high priority citizens have given these areas in all existing survey work. Focus would be on breaking open isolated consultations amongst a small group of political elites in Addis through mobilizing a broad coalition of African citizens who can, in various ways (collective statements, days of action, op-eds, petitions, delegation visits/exchanges, etc...) demonstrate clear political support for prioritizing governance concerns in the Post 2015 framework and highlight how out of touch their leaders are</li> <li>• Work with and through the Open Government Partnership (particularly its Steering Committee) to pressure participating countries to openly champion the inclusion of governance concerns in all Post-2015 related debates at nat, reg and local levels</li> <li>• Hire a NY-based consultant to help OSF and Transparency and Accountability Initiative donors identify ongoing opportunities for influence (bringing southern stakeholders to NY for key debates, informing local partners of ongoing conversations/positions being articulated at the UN, arranging meetings for private foundations and our grantees to engage with relevant member state reps and UN agencies, helping donors link conversations about HLP recommends on issues such as financing and a “data-revolution” back to core governance concerns, etc...) and conduct direct advocacy where appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSIWA, OSIEA, OSISA, LAP, TIFA, OSJI
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	For all of the African countries, these are contexts where civil society has already demonstrated an active interest in promoting the inclusion of governance in the post 2015 framework—for Tanzania and Liberia, the government likewise has come out publicly in support—Kenya is much more on the fence, but plays an important role as co-chair of the open working group, and Ghana is generally an ally but has been less directly vocal on this

	<p>issue to date. In Indonesia, the government has been very proactive in organizing consultations, discussions and even international advocacy opportunities on this issue, and Brazil and Mexico have expressed their general support through their role as OGP Steering committee members, though the opportunity for specific country level engagement/strong government advocacy for governance and post 2015 remains unclear.</p>
<p><b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)</p>	<p><i>International:</i> IBP, Restless Development, the Rules/Purpose.com, RWI, Transparency International, DFID, UNDP, Open Government Partnership (OGP)</p> <p><i>National:</i> Cental, Policy Forum, Twaweza, Fundar, ISODEC, Ghana Integrity Initiative, INESC, Ibase</p>
<p><b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<p>Indonesia: UKP4, Liberia: President’s Office and Post 2015 High Level Advisor, Tanzania: President’s office, anti-corruption commission, revenue authority, parliament, Ghana: unclear, Brazil: Comptroller General’s Office, Mexico: Cabinet Office</p>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>UNDP and the North South Institute may separately be planning pilot projects around national level consultations on post 2015/governance, developing more country specific forms of measurement, targets and indicators, and in UDNP’s case, piloting reform acceleration and measurement programs in the governance realm that closely resemble OSF’s own vision. UNDP has not identified its countries yet and FGP is in consultation with them on this front. In certain countries UNDP will not be a welcome or effective convener on these issues despite their good intentions, though they seem unaware of this—Liberia and Kenya would be two examples of this.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>Not clear without further conversations and scoping, this is the point of the exercise (to work with local counterparts to understand their priorities for reform and measurement). Broadly speaking, there is a need to balance the current emphasis on third party indicators with an effort to explore what kinds of national level data can be collected and analyzed by governments on governance concerns to assess post 2015 performance—related areas include budget transparency, natural resource governance, illicit financial flows, contracting, service delivery monitoring</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>To be effective at the local level, these efforts need to be nationally led and owned, there cannot be an “international” face on them, especially in Africa. But we need to have strong mechanisms for feeding information about these efforts back into international conversations, and also ensuring that stakeholders in country are well informed about latest intelligence coming out of international processes in NY and elsewhere, which has been a weakness to date.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Support for OGP, work with OGP countries (US, UK, Indonesia), TAI donors and CSOs to create an OGP caucus for governance and post 2015 (including convening outreach/advocacy events in NY and Asia region), support for intl NGOs like IBP, RWI and the Rules that have interest and capacity to engage</p>

## ARMENIA – GOAL 10 - GOVERNANCE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Foundations – Armenia, Larisa Minasyan <a href="mailto:mlarisa@osi.am">mlarisa@osi.am</a> ; +374 10 533862; +374 10 536758
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Goal 10: Ensure Good Governance and Effective Institutions
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	The specific focus will be on guaranteeing the public’s right to information and access to government data under (d) and focus on ensuring officials can be held accountable under (e)
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>OSF – Armenia’s work towards meeting the specific objectives mentioned above will be streamlined along the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Using budget analysis effectively to reveal misuse of public funds; A particular focus here will be given to education governance and funding of the public education system, formation of budgets for universities and schools. Given the number of existing and pending funding from WB and European Union, civil society will also be focusing on assessing the effectiveness of direct budget support by donors and accountability of local institutions receiving and disbursing the funds. OSF – Armenia will engage IBP for methodology sharing and replication.</li> <li>- <b>Supporting investigative journalism to reveal corrupt practices of government officials, including conflict of interest issues, misuse of public funds, etc.</b> OSF – Armenia will support a leading journalistic organization “Asparez” Journalists’ Club to use the FOI Law to reveal information on spending of public funds. Hetq investigative journalists will work on producing a series of investigative articles.</li> <li>- <b>Monitoring of Armenia’s implementation of international obligations under OGP and providing civil society’s vision for this process</b> Our two key partners – Asparez and Transparency International Anti-Corruption Center – will continue their engagement with OGP. Additionally, OSF – Armenia will mobilize civil society to voice concern with Armenia’s implementation of obligations and build pressure on the government for more accountability and institutional reform.</li> </ul>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Fiscal Governance Program
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	Armenia joined the OGP in 2011 thus showing political will for increasing transparency of government work. Unfortunately, within this scheme, the Armenian government mostly focuses on e-governance issues and avoids addressing institutional issues, such as conflict of interest issues, monopolies, lack of public participation in decision-making. These were also the civil society recommendations involved in the OGP process, but were refused by the government. A new Anti-Corruption Strategy is currently under development, with involvement of civil society actors.

<p><b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)</p>	<p>Transparency International Anti-Corruption Center, Asparez Journalists Club, Hetq Investigative Journalists, Community Finance Officers Association– all these organizations will be supported by OSF-Armenia to build a strong transparency and accountability field, OSF – Armenia also plans to engage IBP to build capacity and mentor national organizations working on budget transparency. There are also potential partners among young civic activists and young transparency movement that is just emerging, in terms of taking and using the data generated by NGOs. OSF – Armenia supports a number of online media outlets (<a href="http://www.aravot.am">www.aravot.am</a> <a href="http://www.lragir.am">www.lragir.am</a> <a href="http://www.ecolur.org">www.ecolur.org</a> ) and several TV programs which will be used to disseminate information to general public.</p>
<p><b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<p>OSF – Armenia’s partners are engaged in several intergovernmental working groups focusing on corruption issues as independent experts as a balancing mechanism between government authorities and governmental NGOs.</p>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>Transparency and accountability work is relatively new in Armenia and Foundation’s support has been critical to developing capacity of national organizations for RTI work and budget monitoring initiatives. Most of the local donor community works very closely with the government, thus the Foundation and partners are in a unique position to expose critical information on unaccountable practices.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Armenia can be used as a case study to show how lack of accountability damages the objectives set under the MDGs, specifically education goals. This evidence and rational can provide good basis for formulating advocacy with large multi-lateral donors such as the WB in its lending strategy and programs in education worldwide. Our exposure of lack of accountability in education governance can be replicated by other countries.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>Through one of its concepts, OSF – Armenia will also be engaged in mobilizing communities around issues of community importance, empowering key community members with tools necessary to push for accountable and transparent decision-making at local level.</p> <p>OSF – Armenia has commissioned a research conducted by CEU Higher Education Observatory focusing on governance in higher education, which has revealed excessive control by the authorities and corruption as main reasons for stagnant reform.</p>

## ARMENIA – GOAL 11 - JUSTICE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Open Society Foundations – Armenia, Larisa Minasyan <a href="mailto:mlarisa@osi.am">mlarisa@osi.am</a> ; +374 10 533862; +374 10 536758
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Goal 11: Ensure stable and peaceful societies
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	b) Ensure justice institutions are accessible, independent, well-resourced and respect due-process rights by focusing on protection of rights in the criminal justice system (penitentiary and pre-trial) and advocacy for institutionalization of mechanisms for access to justice, securing legal guarantees for recognition of the needs of marginalized and vulnerable groups and their protection
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>OSF – Armenia’s engagement is proposed through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support NGOs to reveal human rights abuses in criminal justice system OSF – Armenia will support two civil society monitoring boards that have access to penitentiary institutions and police detention facilities to identify the systemic human rights issues and abuses. Additionally, the Foundation is working on establishing a working group of criminal justice experts that will assess the data coming from civil society actors and will formulate solutions to the identified problems.</li> <li>- Conduct advocacy for securing legislative and practical guarantees against torture The data, assessment and recommendations by the criminal justice group will be used to formulate civil society’s recommendations for inclusion in the justice reform agenda and processes</li> <li>- Provide legal support and representation for vulnerable communities – religious minorities, LGBT community, women OSF – Armenia will work with and support key human rights organizations to provide them a possibility for access to justice through provision of legal aid. Although there is state supported legal aid service, civil society monitoring reveals that it is highly ineffective. Moreover, the policy research conducted with OSF – Armenia’s support reveals an alarming level of bias among the legal community towards vulnerable groups, particularly LGBT community.</li> <li>- Monitor implementation of reform processes, provide feedback and civil society’s policy solutions to the existing problems OSF – Armenia plans to mobilize the best capacity among civil society and legal professionals to assess the effectiveness of reform implementation. As part of such assessment, OSF – Armenia’s partners will develop objectives indicators and measurement schemes so as to avoid reform manipulation by the authorities</li> <li>- Advocacy of civil society recommendations through local and international avenues The Foundation and partners will use a number of existing leversages to push for adoption of civil society’s recommendations 1) Through the working group that OSF – Armenia and partners are members of at the Ministry of Justice, 2) Through the already existing working relationship with several Standing Committees at the National</li> </ul>

	Assembly 3)By bringing on board other international donors working in Armenia 4) by utilizing the UN mechanisms such as UPR review
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	OSJI, HRI
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	A number of very important reforms are being implemented in Armenia – judicial reform, Criminal Justice Reform, Police Reform; Amendments to the Constitution are underway. All of these reform initiatives are considered by civil society to be opportunities to push for better legislative and practical guarantees for the number of issues that they have been witnessing for the past decade – torture in criminal justice system, lack of access to justice for most vulnerable groups. Despite the fact that the Armenian government is very skilled in reform manipulation, pressure from national organizations and international donor community can play a crucial role for ensuring process integrity.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> )	There are a number of partners working in this area that we can rely on and draw from their resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monitoring Boards over Penitentiary Institutions (adjacent to Ministry of Justice) and Police Facilities (adjacent to RA Police)</li> <li>- OSF – Armenia key partners in human rights and rule of law– ground work/grassroots/resource; academia; (engaged in OSF – Armenia Field support)</li> <li>- Partnership for Open Society Initiative (coalition of NGOs) – local and international advocacy;</li> <li>- OSF – Armenia’s experts within the Strategic Litigation Project</li> </ul>
<b>Government Partners</b> ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> ) What department? What type of engagement?	Ministry of Justice – invites and is open to civil society’s participation in judicial reform process that it leads, OSF Armenia and a number of partners are members of the civil society consultative body National Assembly – OSF – Armenia and partners have a good working relationship with several Standing Committees of the National Assembly and regularly hold meetings with them to suggest civil society’s recommendations for legislative improvements
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	A number of donor organizations – OSCE office, CoE, EU, WB Office, ABA/ROLI are involved in promotion of justice reform in Armenia. At the same time, in many instances, their involvement is limited either to technical support or their work is to supportive of government’s agenda. The distinct value-added from OSF’s engagement is the fact that our insight of the processes comes from civil society partners that work on the ground and possess information on the real implementation of the reform, and through exposure to a wide array of stakeholders can objectively assess whether the reform has positive impact on the ground. There are risks posed by the financial aid from multi-laterals and primarily the WB because often times in the past they would pursue their own agenda with large funding attached which makes any civil society advocacy often based on commitments and conditionality of other funding by the EU or USAID ineffective.

<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>We are not sure we understand the question</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>Our work on the ground will be done to show how justice is critical for development, and how lack of justice institutionalized poverty. We will aim to show how lack of justice leads to lack of access for vulnerable groups, degrades education, and rights protection standards, all of which ultimately stalls development. Towards this aim OSF – Armenia will support research and policy development.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>OSF – Armenia is supporting a legal empowerment research that is currently in the process of finalization. A number of partners produce shadow reports on issues of justice within the framework of the UN system – UPR, CAT, CRC.</p>

## PHP – GOAL 11 - JUSTICE

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Public Health Program, Ralf Jürgens (917-365-6549)
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	Justice (ensure all people have access to justice institutions and civil, administrative and criminal legal aid services that are affordable, fair, and timely)
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	Kenya, South Africa, Indonesia
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>PHP has supported participatory and inclusive approaches to access to justice for socially excluded and criminalized populations in Kenya ((people with mental disabilities, people in need of palliative care, people living with HIV, sex workers and people who use drugs), South Africa (sex workers and people in need of palliative care) and Indonesia (people who use drugs). Our work has included support for street lawyers who design services in partnership with homeless sex workers and people who use drugs, legal professionals who embed themselves in trusted community health organizations operating in a rights-based and harm reduction framework, and trained paralegals drawn directly from the groups they serve. We have done this as a complement to other PHP work in partnership with socially excluded and criminalized groups to advance their health and human rights and have emphasized the participation of these groups in design and delivery of the services, in response to the often marginalizing impact of traditional legal aid approaches. Having experimented with and refined such approaches for the last years, we are now in a position to: (i) analyze this body of work, document what has worked and what has not, help forge a consensus on models of good practice of increasing access to justice for socially excluded and criminalized groups, and tell compelling stories about the impact of increasing access to justice for socially excluded and criminalized populations, including health impacts; and (ii) develop and help implement a research agenda to further increase the evidence base for the public health outcomes of access to justice interventions.</p>
<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	This work has been, and would continue to be, undertaken in close collaboration with OSIEA, OSF-SA, TIFA, and OSJI.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	UNAIDS has included access to justice in its list of seven key human rights interventions that should be included in each national AIDS program, and the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria has included human rights as a key objective in its new strategic plan. Access to justice is attracting more attention in broader development discussions and being identified among donor priorities. PHP's contribution to this larger donor discussion lies in (1) our focus on particular socially excluded and criminalized populations; (2) our focus on building the evidence of the health benefits of access to justice interventions; and (3) our focus on telling compelling stories of the health and other human rights benefits of these interventions, as part of an effort to build or increase political will at local, regional and national level to address the specific needs of socially excluded and criminalized populations, as part of broader efforts to increase access to justice.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	In each of the countries, we work in close collaboration with civil society partners in the health sector that can and should become strong advocates for an access to justice goal in the post-2015 development framework.

<p><b>Government Partners</b> (<i>Existing or potential?</i>) What department? What type of engagement?</p>	<p>In each country, we will work to ensure that participatory and inclusive access to justice projects for socially excluded and criminalized populations, where possible, are included in government plans.</p>
<p><b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?</p>	<p>Very few, if any, other donors are currently funding access to justice interventions for sex workers, people who use drugs, people living with HIV, people with mental disabilities and people in need of palliative care, as health-related human rights interventions. Part of the challenge will be to document and clearly spell out the lessons PHP has learned from funding this work, including what works and what does not work and the values that should guide this work; and to tell a compelling story. Another challenge will be to help develop a realistic and feasible research agenda aimed at further increasing “hard data” on the public health impact of such access to justice interventions and to ensure that the agenda will indeed be implemented within the next couple of years.</p>
<p><b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.</p>	<p>Efforts to measure progress towards justice should include a specific effort to measure progress towards justice for socially excluded and marginalized populations.</p>
<p><b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?</p>	<p>To date, health advocates have not rallied behind an access to justice goal. Telling compelling stories of the health impact of access to justice interventions and further increasing the evidence base of the health impact of such interventions through rigorous, participatory research, would well complement existing advocacy efforts.</p>
<p><b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b></p>	<p>PHP undertakes similar work in other countries and for one other socially excluded population: Roma. In a few, selected countries, including Kenya, we are also starting to explore combining social accountability with legal empowerment approaches, to benefit both access to justice and public engagement goals.</p>

## ESP - EDUCATION

<p><b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b></p>	<p>Education Support Program, Hugh McLean (hugh.mclean@opensocietyfoundations.org   x8243); Dierdre Williams (dierdre.williams@opensocietyfoundations.org   x1997)</p>
<p><b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)</p> <p><b>Note: Highlighted portions are most relevant for focal areas of governance, justice etc...</b></p> <p>You will see we shared the full draft education goal and highlighted what we believe might be the most relevant portions for the shared framework. Providing only the highlighted portions would have given an incomplete picture.</p> <p>The core of our argument is that education is important both as a standalone goal as well as a cross-cutting concern in the new development agenda. Education is fundamental as a basic right and central to all other development concerns, including health, nourishing of human potential, sustainable development and access to justice.</p>	<p><b>Goal: “Ensure universal free quality education”</b></p> <p><b>Target 1: By 2030, every child completes a full cycle of continuous, free quality early childhood, primary, lower and upper secondary education, which enables them to achieve their potential as human beings and to contribute positively as active members of society.</b></p> <p><b>Target 2: By 2030, all young people and adults have equitable access to quality post-secondary education and lifelong learning, enabling them to acquire knowledge, skills and competences to achieve their full potential and participate positively in society and in the world of work.</b></p> <p><b>Indicators:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of children and young people who participate in and complete early childhood, primary, lower and upper secondary education to the appropriate national standards, disaggregated by disability, gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic status, among others;</li> <li>• Percentage of children and young people who demonstrate learning achievement broadly- defined and determined through multiple measures and consistent with national standards, disaggregated by disability, gender, ethnicity, and socio-economic status, among others;</li> <li>• Percentage of educational institutions that are publicly financed, do not charge fees and are not for profit;</li> <li>• Percentage of children and young people taught by qualified teachers with an appropriate student to qualified teacher ratio;</li> <li>• Percentage of educational institutions that have safe and adequate infrastructure, facilities, resources and learning materials for all students;</li> <li>• Percentage of educational institutions that have adequate numbers of education support personnel, as well as food, transport, health and psychological services;</li> <li>• Breadth of curriculum, including an evaluation of gender-sensitive, non-discriminatory content, teaching resources and materials;</li> <li>• Breadth of curriculum beyond literacy and numeracy to include an evaluation of its global citizenship and life skills content.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Specific Country Focus</b></p>	<p>Malawi, Pakistan, South Africa, Zambia</p>
<p><b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b></p>	<p>Efforts focused on identifying effective means of measuring skills and competencies (beyond literacy and numeracy) required to achieve full potential and participate positively in the world of work.</p> <p>There is a risk that if effective measures of these higher order skills are not identified that the focus of the new goals will be exclusively on literacy and numeracy.</p>

<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	Not certain of specific efforts
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	<b>At the country level:</b> Governments of the countries identified here are signatories to the <a href="#">Commonwealth Recommendations for the Post-2015 Development Framework on Education</a> which adopts a similarly broad framing of the education goal language and related framework. (See also the next section on civil society partners)
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> )	Education workers at the local levels (local affiliates of ESP's key partner <a href="#">Education International</a> ) are also engaged in advocating for a broad framing of an education goal in the terms expressed above and have been working towards gathering evidence of existing gains under the current Millennium Development Goals as well as advice for changes required going forward.
<b>Government Partners</b> ( <i>Existing or potential?</i> ) What department? What type of engagement?	Main government partners in these countries are Ministries of Education. These have been engaged in sensitizing governmental partners (from other countries) of the existence and importance of the Commonwealth Recommendations and related education framework to which they are also signatories. There is also the potential for Ministries of Education who are attuned to the demands of a broad development agenda to draw connections with their colleagues in ministries with related development concerns e.g. Health, Finance and Justice.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	OSF's value-added in this space must be two-fold: (i) to raise concerns about the risks of a narrow development agenda; and (ii) to facilitate connection and activation of a far-reaching coalition of actors who desire a broad development agenda. The overarching aim is to ensure that the final formulation of new development goals is aspirational, ambitious and equitable (leaves no one behind) and that it is driven by the end users and key actors at the country, parliamentary, neighborhood, and village levels rather than by top-down 'donor consensus.'
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Identifying effective means of measuring skills and competencies (beyond literacy and numeracy) required to achieve full potential and participate positively in the world of work.
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int'l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	We see this on-the-ground work as integral to international advocacy since governments must vote in multilateral spaces (e.g. the UN) in accordance with the demands and agitations of a critical mass of key actors on the ground. Evidence that support the positions advanced as well as highlights potential risks can serve to strengthen the legitimacy of claims made in the international advocacy space. Two key issues to be addressed in order to optimize advocacy are: (i) Ensuring that on the ground coalitions advancing evidence or a particular position are broad and representative; and (ii) Linking the advocacy and evidence gathering work on the ground with advocacy in supra-national spaces e.g. targeting regional blocs of countries e.g. E-9, G-77, BRICS etc. as well as multilateral organizations, e.g. UNESCO, whose efforts inform the larger global development processes
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	ESP utilizes tools, including grant-making, advocacy, technical support and convening of actors, in order to secure a standalone education goal in the Post-2015 framework that reflects a shared global commitment to promoting the right to education; has relevance for all countries; and supports a commitment to human rights and sustainable development in the wider development framework.  We are also seeking to catalyze a commitment to a new education framework

that builds on the current unfinished Education for All (EFA) agenda. This is important since many children remain out of school, do not consistently attend classes throughout the school year, or fail to achieve learning outcomes that will enable them to meaningfully engage in their communities and the changing global context.

To achieve these ends, ESP has focused our interventions on amplifying the voices of important constituencies which do, or should, have a legitimate stake in the Post-2015 process. We have forged partnerships with organizations and groups that operate in an open, consultative and democratic manner, providing space for their members to reach agreement on priorities. These groups include:

- Education International: a global federation of teacher organizations representing 30 million education employees from about 400 organizations in 170 countries and territories.
- The Commonwealth: a voluntary association of 53 member states, including 18 from Sub-Saharan Africa
- Global Campaign for Education: Representing civil society organizations from around the world concerned with education
- UNESCO, the only UN agency with an explicit mandate for education and that currently steers the EFA movement
- UN Women who we have recently begun partnering with to draw out cross-cutting issues in the new development agenda
- Additional civil society groups working on formulating education goals and whose ultimate aspirations are similar to OSF's, including civil society organizations working on education in emergencies and civil society organizations working on promoting inclusive education.

## **YOUTH EXCHANGE**

<b>Name of OSF Entity &amp; Contact Person</b>	Maryanne Olson & Gladys Onyango (OSF Youth Exchange)
<b>Specific Post-2015 Goal</b> (focused on governance, justice, safety or rule of law)	<p>Overall goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support participation of youth &amp; consideration of their perspectives in the development of post 2015 indicators related to governance &amp; justice</li> <li>• Support participation of youth in monitoring on the ground implementation of post-2015 goals related to governance and justice</li> </ul> <p>Specific Objectives:</p> <p>i) Governance : Given demographic shifts/ predicted youth bulges especially in the global south, important to have inclusively developed &amp; effectively implemented youth policies be among governance indicators that are developed; or indicators related to strides made by governments in tackling youth unemployment in their countries which has been acknowledged as a global crisis by the UN &amp; the World Bank</p> <p>ii) Governance &amp; Justice: Youth supported with access to information &amp; tools to increase their participation and civic engagement; monitor that justice institutions are accessible, independent, adequately-resourced and respect due-process rights.</p>
<b>Specific Country Focus</b>	As the Youth Exchange is neither a grant making entity nor a unit driven by a specific strategy/mandate, we have the potential to facilitate connections with youth-specific projects and identify strong youth-led organizations/partners/and alliances working in a variety of geographies and issue areas. We have strong partnerships already in Western Africa, South Africa, Colombia, and Kenya; some partnerships in Nepal and see particular potential to support TIFA this year to deepen youth engagements in Indonesia.
<b>Brief Description of Proposed Work</b>	<p>We see a few key entry points for youth in this shared framework:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Working with youth innovators in data collection that were involved with the MyWorld survey that is informing the general post 2015 process on the collection of more specific data to inform both the development of indicators and the implementation of recommendations (specifically Restless Development and YouthPolicy.org, and also both organized networks of youth including the YMCA network, and Girl Guides and informal networks of young people in new regions)</li> <li>2) Continuing work with UN contacts (UN Special Envoy on Youth, UN Habitat, UNICEF) on putting pressure onto member states in regards to developing youth-friendly indicators. The UN Special Envoy on Youth office will be releasing a new crowd-sourcing platform for youth on February 18.</li> <li>3) Identifying youth grassroots organizations (particularly marginalized youth communities) to support advocacy around post-2015 and ensure that momentum of post-2015 efforts does not die out with the “publication” of final goals/indicators</li> <li>4) We spoke with Julie McCarthy on plans in Africa to develop a “popular response” platform to the UN which could involve youth. We have partnerships with the Pan African University Debating Championship network which reaches university students and could potentially be a part of this platform.</li> </ol>

<b>Are there other OSF entities working in this space?</b>	To our knowledge there are no other OSF entities advancing youth- specific perspectives in this space.
<b>Evidence of Political Will?</b> (Where/how political will been demonstrated? At the country level, parliamentary level, neighborhood level, village level?)	Most political will is being driven primarily within the UN system and other international alliances including the EU and the Commonwealth states. They are at the stage where engagement on the local/small level is critical and while there are advocates for increasing this work, OSF could play a stronger role in linking high-level decisions back to the community particularly in regards to youth.
<b>Civil Society Partners</b> in this work? (Existing or potential?)	Restless Development, Girl Guides, YMCA networks, European Youth Forum, youthpolicy.org, youth with disabilities networks organizations in Latin America and Africa
<b>Government Partners</b> (Existing or potential?) What department? What type of engagement?	Ministers of Youth in target countries. In particular regional blocs forums of Youth Ministers exist that are convened regularly by the UN and other regional/multilateral agencies. National level responsibility for youth-related policy making and implementation rests in these ministries which makes such fora potential spaces for useful programming in the development of indexes and other tools to assess governance performance vis-à-vis responsiveness to youth.
<b>OSF value-add in this space?</b> Are there other donors/partners already active in this space? Is this a good thing or a bad thing?	The value-add is our ability to work with grassroots organizations and particularly to support work being done by the most marginalized youth communities to ensure that indicators are meaningful to youth and that youth/youth-led organizations are encouraged to engage in activities beyond 2015 agenda. Plans around the access to justice goal have been identified by partners as a gap in current efforts around youth and the post-2015 agenda work where OSF could play a larger part moving forward.
<b>Measurement:</b> Are there specific issue areas that are ripe for, or would benefit from, measurement in the local context.	Youth employment and its relationship to governance, implementation of national youth policies, tracking of hostile interactions between youth and institutions of law and justice
<b>Advocacy</b> implications – How do you see this on-the-ground work align with or support int’l advocacy? What questions or concerns need to be addressed to optimize advocacy?	Continuing friendly partnerships with UN agencies will ensure that work that has already begun on including youth on the post 2015 agenda continues – the missing link/questions lie around the participation of Ministers of Youth and country buy-in around youth policies
<b>Briefly describe any other relevant existing work that you are doing that relates.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A developed framework for auditing implementation of national youth policies (this needs to be reexamined in local contexts but is still a valuable starting point and has been popular among a variety of stakeholders);</li> <li>• Work with the Ethnic Profiling Team on data collection/youth advocacy around stop and search;</li> <li>• Capacity-building with youth organizations in Tunisia, Africa and Uruguay on constitution-writing and policy change advocacy</li> </ul>