

**Australia Indonesia
Partnership for Justice (AIPJ)**

2011 Annual Work Plan

October 2011

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	1
2. Introduction	3
3. Rationale for AIPJ Direction in 2011	3
3.1 AIPJ Scope, Goal and Outcomes	3
3.2 AIPJ Direction in 2011	4
3.3 Process of Identifying Activities in Support of National Stakeholders	4
4. Proposed 2011 Activities	5
4.1 Outcome 1: Improved Judicial Dispute Resolution Systems for Marginalised Groups (including the Poor, Women and People with a Disability)	5
4.1.1 Outcome 1, Activity 1: Continuing Support for Supreme Court Judicial Reform	5
4.1.2 Outcome 1, Activity 2: Supporting the Implementation of the Chamber System in the Supreme Court	6
4.1.3 Outcome 1, Activity 3: Mediation Training for Religious Court Judges.....	7
4.2 Outcome 2: Prosecutorial Agencies Better Able to Process Corruption Cases	8
4.2.1 Outcome 2, Activity 1: Supporting the Selection Process of KPK Commissioners (2011-2015)8	
4.2.2 Outcome 2, Activity 2: Supporting the AGO’s Bureaucratic Reform Program.....	9
4.2.3 Outcome 2, Activity 3: Strengthening Organisational Capacity and Capability of the Prosecutorial Oversight Commission	13
4.3 Outcome 3: Increased Public Access To and Use of Legal Information, Particularly Relating to Human Rights (including Women’s Rights) and Anti-corruption	14
4.3.1 Outcome 3, Activity 1: Trainings for Religious Court Information Desk Staff.....	14
4.3.2 Outcome 3, Activity 2: Assessment of Court Websites.....	15
4.4 Outcome 4: Improved Framework and Delivery of a Legal Aid System	16
4.4.1 Outcome 4, Activity 1: Advocacy on Management of Legal Aid Bill and Research on Implementation of Legal Aid at the Local Level	16
4.4.2 Outcome 4, Activity 2: Access to Justice for Female Heads of Households through Advocacy and Paralegal Work	17
4.5 Outcome 5: Increased Capacity of Civil Society Organisations and National Commissions to Support Indonesian Law and Justice Sector Reform Efforts	18
4.5.1 Outcome 5, Activity 1: Core Funding to Strengthen PEKKA’s Governance and Independence through Improvements to Financial Management	18
4.5.2 Outcome 5, Activity 2: Core Funding to <i>Komnas Perempuan</i>	19

<i>4.6 Support for Partnerships between Australian and Indonesian Institutions</i>	19
<i>4.7 Monitoring and Learning System</i>	20
<i>4.8 Inception Report and Operations Handbook</i>	21
<i>4.9 Outcomes Work Plan, Gender and Disabilities, Capacity Development and Communications Strategies</i>	21
5. Implementation Strategy	21
6. Implementation Schedule	23
Annex 1: Budget	26

1. Executive Summary

This 2011 Annual Work Plan ('2011 AWP') is presented to AusAID and the National Planning Development Agency ('BAPPENAS') for their consideration and approval, as required under the governance structure of the Australia Indonesia Partnership for Justice ('AIPJ').

The 2011 AWP outlines the work program of AIPJ from September through December 2011, including activities for which AIPJ seeks approval to support over this period and, in some cases, in 2012.

Given AIPJ is still in its mobilization phase, the focus of this AWP is to complete introductory planning and strategy work and support a smaller number of government and civil society partners and smaller scale activities. One component of the 2011 AWP is a continuation of support to partner activities commenced under earlier AusAID law and justice programs.

The 2011 AWP will support the following law and justice sector stakeholders:

- Supreme Court of Indonesia and the Religious Court jurisdiction under the Supreme Court (through *Badilag*);
- Attorney-General's Office, Indonesia ('AGO');
- *Komisi Kejaksaan* (Prosecutorial Oversight Commission);
- The reform teams at the Supreme Court and the AGO – the Judicial Reform Team ('JRT') and the Prosecutorial Reform Program Office ('PRPO') respectively;
- Various non-government organisations ('NGOs') active in progressing reform in the law and justice sector, including *Pusat Studi Hukum Kebijakan* ('PSHK'), *Lembaga Independensi Peradilan* ('LeIP'), *Masyarakat Transparansi Indonesia* ('MTI') and *Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia* ('YLBHI');
- *Pemberdayaan Perempuan Kepala Keluarga* ('PEKKA', Women Headed Households Empowerment); and
- *Komnas Perempuan* (National Commission on Violence against Women).

Activities listed under this AWP accord with AIPJ's purpose of "assisting Indonesian law and justice institutions improve the provision of quality legal services and information" and with its five outcomes, as summarised below:

Outcome 1: Improved judicial dispute resolution systems for marginalised groups (including the poor, women and people with a disability)	
Stakeholders	Supreme Court of Indonesia; Religious Court jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; LeIP
No activities	Three
Total budget	AUD 542,829 / IDR 4,885,463,162
Outcome 2: Prosecutorial agencies better able to process corruption cases	
Stakeholders	MTI (by supporting the Selection Committee for Commissioners for the Corruption Eradication Commission); AGO; <i>Komisi Kejaksaan</i>
No activities	Three
Total budget	AUD 932,994 / IDR 8,396,946,000

Outcome 3: Increased public access to and use of legal information, particularly relating to human rights (including women’s rights) and anti-corruption	
Stakeholders	Religious Court jurisdiction of the Supreme Court; PSHK
No activities	Two
Total budget	AUD 248,740 / IDR 2,238,667,529
Outcome 4: Improved framework and delivery of a legal aid system	
Stakeholders	YLBHI; PEKKA
No activities	Two
Total budget	AUD 219,579 / IDR 1,976,210,000
Outcome 5: Increased capacity of civil society organisations and national commissions to support Indonesian law and justice sector reform efforts	
Stakeholders	PEKKA; <i>Komnas Perempuan</i>
No activities	Two
Total budget	AUD 170,893 / IDR 1,538,040

AIPJ’s approach involves a strong commitment to strengthening existing and developing new partnerships and promoting policy dialogue between Indonesian and Australian law and justice sector institutions and agencies. This is in recognition of the growing Australian whole-of-government interest in building partnerships with counterparts in Indonesia, and the fact that some of the most successful activities under previous Australian assistance to the sector involved peer-to-peer linkages. Accordingly, in 2011 AIPJ will support and seek to strengthen the following existing partnerships:

- the memorandum of understanding between the Federal Court of Australia, the Family Court of Australia and the Supreme Court; and
- the memorandum of understanding between the Corruption Eradication Commission (‘KPK’) and the Australian AGD, the Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity (‘ACLEI’), and the Australian Public Service Commission (‘Australian PSC’).

AIPJ will also support the development of a new partnership between the Australian Human Rights Commission (‘AHRC’) and *Komnas Perempuan*.

Support for Partnerships between Australian and Indonesian Institutions	
Stakeholders	Supreme Court of Indonesia; KPK; <i>Komnas Perempuan</i>
No activities	Three
Total budget	AUD 133,728 / IDR 1,203,548,400

The combined total of all activities under the 2011 AWP is AUD **2,248,764**¹ – see detailed budgets at Annex 1.

AIPJ acknowledges the importance of effective reform management practices by national justice sector actors, including the Supreme Court, as supported by the JRT, and the AGO, as supported by the PRPO. In 2011, AIPJ intends to better inform itself of the role and internal workings of the JRT and PRPO through a review of these entities. AIPJ will also support fundamental institutional (bureaucratic) reforms of the Supreme Court and the AGO that are essential to working towards the AIPJ’s outcomes.

¹ Using exchange rate of 1 AUD = 9,000 IDR and includes some 2012 activities where mentioned in Part 4.

Other key work AIPJ will undertake / complete in 2011 includes the following:

- Monitoring and Learning System;
- Indicative Outcomes Work Plan;
- Inception Report inclusive of the Operations Handbook, evaluability assessment and contractor performance assessment criteria;
- Gender, Capacity Development and Communications Strategies;
- AIPJ Working Committee meeting to consider and approve the 2011 AWP; and
- 2012 AWP.

2. Introduction

From 2004-2009, AusAID's support to the law and justice sector in Indonesia was through the Australia Indonesia Legal Development Facility ('LDF').

In 2010, AusAID implemented AIPJ Transition ('AIPJt') as a short-term measure to support the sector while it finalised arrangements for AIPJ.

AIPJt concluded in December 2010 and was followed from January to 31 August 2011 by the Bridging Program which provided support to the Supreme Court and the AGO as a short-term measure while waiting for AIPJ to commence. The Bridging Program was managed by AusAID's Democratic Governance Unit in Jakarta with administrative support from LeIP.

AIPJ formally commenced on 10 June 2011 and is AusAID's current five-year commitment to further supporting the law and justice sector in Indonesia. The AusAID-recruited Program Director began work in February 2011, before the formal commencement of AIPJ, with the rest of the AIPJ team joining the program progressively after 10 June.

3. Rationale for AIPJ Direction in 2011

3.1 AIPJ Scope, Goal and Outcomes

The focus of AIPJ is on working with national-level law and justice institutions and agencies to transform the high-level reform commitments made by Indonesia into concrete improvements in the way the community interacts with the sector. AIPJ's ultimate goal is currently stated as "[i]ncreased access to better quality legal information and services" or more particularly the "strengthening of Indonesia's leading law and justice sector institutions to become more effective and eventually provide more cost-effective, accessible and predictable legal services and information."²

The Design Document states that AIPJ's goal is informed by Indonesia's:

- Long-term Development Plan (2007) which seeks the "Entrenchment of the rule of law and enforcement of human rights, based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution, and a legal system that is truthful, just, accommodative and reflective of public aspirations" within the next 20 years; and
- Medium-term Development Plan (2010-2014) which seeks to achieve a legal system that offers fair, accessible, transparent and predictable decisions and rules for all.

The Design Document also articulates the AIPJ outcomes as follows:

- Improved judicial dispute resolution systems for marginalised groups (including the poor, women and people with a disability);

² AIPJ Design Document, pages 18-19.

- Prosecutorial agencies better able to process corruption cases;
- Increased public access to and use of legal information, particularly relating to human rights (including women's rights) and anti-corruption;
- Improved framework and delivery of a legal aid system;
- Increased capacity of civil society organisations and national commissions to support Indonesian law and justice sector reform efforts.

AIPJ recognises that effective reform management practices by justice sector actors, including the Supreme Court as supported by the JRT, and the AGO as supported by the PRPO, are essential to achieving the program's purpose and outcomes. AIPJ will therefore support fundamental institutional (bureaucracy) reforms that key stakeholders, especially the Supreme Court and the AGO, are undertaking.

3.2 AIPJ Direction in 2011

AIPJ commenced on 10 June 2011 with a commitment to begin implementation of activities under this AWP by mid-September through to December.

Given the short time frame between the periods June and mid-September for the preparation of the 2011 AWP, and between mid-September and December for implementation, AIPJ is proposing support to a smaller number of stakeholders and activities in 2011. This will allow AIPJ to develop long-term planning and strategies for the program while continuing to provide support to core partners and time-critical activities in the short-term. Once its introductory work is completed, however, AIPJ intends to gradually increase the number partners supported and, where possible, to focus on longer term, larger, integrated programs of activities.

The stakeholders proposed for support under this AWP are limited to:

- long term AusAID partners that have demonstrated successful work and have a continued focus in areas consistent with AIPJ's purpose and outcomes; and
- those proposing activities to support institutions and agencies of strong interest to AusAID and the Government of Australia more generally.

Activities listed in this AWP:

- are aligned with AIPJ's overall purpose and one or more of its outcomes;
- support the reform programs of partners, especially the Supreme Court and the AGO; and
- build on previously successful initiatives, are urgently required to be completed in 2011 to meet institutional priorities, are a continuation of work commenced under earlier AusAID programs, and / or will establish the platform for longer term activities and programs for support under subsequent AIPJ annual activities work plans.

3.3 Process of Identifying Activities in Support of National Stakeholders

In April 2011, the Program Director began preparations for the 2011 AWP by meeting with selected national law and justice sector stakeholders to explain:

- the rationale for AIPJ, its objective and outcomes, and cross-cutting issues, and the operating principles by which it will adhere, as guided by the Design Document;
- the process by which activities are identified and developed; and
- the date for finalisation of activity planning – that is, 22 July 2011.

Between April and end July 2011, there was a continuing consultation process during which AIPJ and partners met to discuss potential activities for support under the 2011 AWP. The activities were then agreed on, developed and refined over time through further meetings and discussions. The AIPJ team assisted in this regard from mid-June.

As part of the consultations, stakeholders were provided with an expected activity statement format and sample activity statements. It was explained to stakeholders that they were required to write activity statements themselves following the consultation process to ensure that both they and AIPJ had a common understanding of the activities and their expected outcomes. AIPJ also explained to stakeholders that it would provide support and assistance where necessary in writing the statements.

Stakeholders were also informed that written activity statements and budgets were required by 22 July 2011 to ensure that AusAID and the Working Committee had sufficient time to review the 2011 AWP and for supported activities to commence by mid-September. However, delays in several of the planning processes have affected the timing of the AusAID and Working Committee’s review of the AWP.

AIPJ has been careful to ensure that activities nominated for support under this AWP do not overlap or duplicate activities funded by other donors. In this regard, AIPJ and the USAID-funded Changes for Justice (‘C4J’) program met in June and July 2011 to exchange information about their respective areas of focus and work plans. AIPJ has also had meetings with the European Union, the Dutch government and a number of international Non-Government Organisations active in the law and justice sector.

AIPJ, through the Program Director, has kept the Director of Law and Human Rights at BAPPENAS and the Counsellor, Democratic Governance, Policy and Public Affairs, AusAID, informed of consultations with stakeholders and of the likely stakeholders and activities AIPJ will propose for support in 2011.

4. Proposed 2011 Activities

Summaries of activities proposed by AIPJ and law and justice sector partners for implementation under the 2011 AWP are set out below.

4.1 Outcome 1: Improved Judicial Dispute Resolution Systems for Marginalised Groups (including the Poor, Women and People with a Disability)

AIPJ will continue to support the Supreme Court in its implementation of the 2010-2035 Blue Print for Judicial Reform for the remainder of 2011. The majority of the activities outlined below were commenced under the Bridging Program and are demand driven (once the Supreme Court had determined its priorities for 2011, AusAID was requested to support particular activities. Not all requests were supported bearing in mind the direction of AIPJ outlined in Part 3.2 above. In subsequent years, AIPJ aims to make the process increasingly consultative). Prior to the commencement of these activities, the AIPJ team will continue to work with the Supreme Court to further refine the details of each activity. This information will then be shared with AusAID and BAPPENAS, as appropriate.

4.1.1 Outcome 1, Activity 1: Continuing Support for Supreme Court Judicial Reform

Outcomes	Activities
1. Trainees understand purpose, content and application of Supreme Court Decree as explained in the training received.	1. Training for 30 Jakarta based court officials related to the Supreme Court Decree on handling claims regarding decisions from the Commission on Public Information.

2. Compliance with reporting system by First Instance and Appellate Courts.	2. Simplifying the reporting system of First Instance and Appellate General Courts by reducing the number of reporting forms that must be completed. This will then be followed by trainings on use of the new forms, assistance in using the forms and monitoring reporting compliance by PSHK, the NGO engaged by the Supreme Court to carry out the work.
3. Certified judgment templates approved and guidelines on their use prepared.	3. Finalisation and certification of Court judgment templates, including guidelines on their usage.
4. More accurate data available for use by Supreme Court.	4. Audit of Supreme Court cases to identify differences in electronic and hard copy data and use findings to rectify / correct differences.
5. Administration standards available for use by Anti-Corruption Court.	5. Development of administration standards for the Anti-Corruption Court. ³
6. IT support to the satisfaction of Supreme Court.	6. Maintenance and support of IT applications according to needs.
7. Information on Supreme Court reforms disseminated to public through newsletter and website.	7. Information dissemination on Supreme Court reforms through newsletter and website (part of JRT's communication strategy).
8. JRT continues its work in donor coordination and implementation of the Supreme Court's Blue Print. (Note that in 2011 AIPJ plans to conduct a lessons learned and strategic planning evaluation of the JRTO)	8. Salary / administrative / office support to JRT.
Budget: AUD 288,912 / IDR 2,600,210,000	
Duration: September - December 2011 (except for number 5: September-February 2012)	

4.1.2 Outcome 1, Activity 2: Supporting the Implementation of the Chamber System in the Supreme Court

The Supreme Court is in the process of implementing a chamber system intended to increase consistency of decision making, reduce case backlog and promote expertise among Supreme Court judges. Once

³ When the Corruption Courts were still regulated by the KPK Act, the administration standards and manual used by the Courts referred to that of the general (non-corruption crimes) courts. At the time this raised no issues because the Corruption Courts were only in Jakarta, with a limited number of judges and cases. However, the new Corruption Courts Law requires the Supreme Court to regulate all matters regarding the Corruption Courts, including the formation of special registration procedures, the composition of panels of judges, and the selection of ad hoc judges. The Corruption Courts should be distinguished from courts that hear general criminal cases, and have many distinguishing features including procedural aspects (such as the timeframe for proceedings and the concept of compensation (uang pengganti)) as well as more practical aspects (such as the recording of court proceedings which is done by both the Courts themselves and the KPK).

completed, it will fundamentally alter the structure and administration procedures of the Court. This will in turn need to be reflected in the laws governing the Supreme Court.

Once established, each chamber will receive specific cases, according to its expertise and jurisdiction. To support the work of the chambers, and further promote consistency of decision making, this activity will start the process of developing an index of Supreme Court judgements, grouped according to the jurisdiction of each chamber. This is an on-going activity and, in 2011, will involve establishing a framework methodology for preparing the index. In subsequent years, judgements will be collated and presented according to this framework.

In implementing the activities outlined above, AIPJ will work together with LeIP. Several staff from LeIP are members of the Supreme Court’s chamber system working group and have contributed, amongst other things, to the preparation of the Supreme Court Decree on the chamber system. LeIP also administered the AIPJ Bridging Program (January-August 2011).

Outcomes	Activities
1. Recommendations on amendments to Supreme Court Law to ensure the amendments reflect the chamber system reforms presented to National Parliamentarians.	1. Meet National Parliamentarians to discuss possible amendments to the Supreme Court Law that reflect the chamber system reforms.
2. Methodology for collating and indexing judgements presented to Supreme Court to assist decision making under the chamber system.	2. Develop a methodology for collating and indexing judgments to assist decision making under the chamber system.
3. Working group apply lessons learned and best practices from the application of the chamber systems by Dutch Courts.	3. Participate in a working group meeting in the Netherlands, considering the application of the chamber systems by Dutch Courts. ⁴
Budget: AUD 42,795 / IDR 385,160,000	
Duration: September - December 2011	

4.1.3 Outcome 1, Activity 3: Mediation Training for Religious Court Judges

Mediation is compulsory in all Courts in Indonesia, including the Religious Courts. Before a couple may seek a divorce, the judge is compelled to require the parties undergo mediation, either conducted by the judge (which is free), or through a third party (for which the parties must pay). Where both parties are present, the majority select mediation conducted by judges. Judges of the Religious Courts follow general mediation training for judges but there is no specialised training for family law matters including child custody and division of assets. The training envisioned will provide specialist training in mediation on family law issues and an understanding of the Supreme Court’s code of ethics for mediators. The activity was specifically identified by *Badilag* as an area where Religious Court judges require continued learning as the standard and sensitivity of mediations conducted was considered in need of improvement.

⁴ One of the activities that AIPJ will support is LeIP’s participation in a working group meeting in the Netherlands. The Government of the Netherlands will fund the costs of the Supreme Court members of the working group associated with the meeting (but not those of LeIP, as the civil society representative on the working group.) LeIP’s participation is critical to ensure it is fully involved in the working group (thereby maximizing its contributions) and that civil society is represented at all working group meetings.

In early October 2011, a preparation workshop will be conducted in Jakarta to determine a schedule and venues for the trainings, the material to be developed for and utilised in the trainings, presenters, and other relevant matters. At this stage, it is envisaged the trainings will have a particular focus on mediation involving child custody and division of assets, as well as gender sensitive mediation and mediation involving people with disabilities. The trainings themselves will be held in 2012. After each training, the materials will be further developed and refined. The trainings will combine theory and practice, utilising simulation (role play) and the use of a video illustrating daily situations and best practices. The video (and its scenario) will be designed and recorded prior to the training.

This activity will be conducted pursuant to the memorandum of understanding with the Federal and Family Courts of Australia and the Supreme Court, and focuses on continuing the good relationship between the Family Court and *Badilag*.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Planning workshop held. 2. Training materials developed.	1. In 2011, planning workshop with <i>Badilag</i> , the Family Court, an international consultant and several judges to determine content of training, participants, location training.
3. Religious Court judges understand mediation techniques and skills presented in trainings. 4. Religious Court judges sensitive to gender and disabilities.	2. In 2012, three mediation trainings for a total of 90 Religious Court judges utilising a combination of theory and practical application.
Budget: AUD 208,977 / IDR 1,880,793,162 (for 2011-2012 activities)	
Duration: September - December 2012	

4.2 Outcome 2: Prosecutorial Agencies Better Able to Process Corruption Cases

4.2.1 Outcome 2, Activity 1: Supporting the Selection Process of KPK Commissioners (2011-2015)

Public perception of the KPK as an anti-corruption agency is on the whole positive although in recent times its credibility has been questioned⁵ and proposals have been made to remove its prosecutorial powers⁶. As the tenure of four KPK Commissioners expires at the end of 2011, replacement Commissioners must be nominated for the period 2011-2015 and presented to the National Parliament for subsequent selection. The quality and suitability of KPK Commissioners has a significant influence on how the KPK manages and prosecutes corruption cases. The appointment of new Commissioners in 2011 is therefore an opportunity for the KPK to re-affirm its position as an effective anti-corruption agency through fresh and strong leadership.

In the past, the Selection Committees for KPK Commissioner positions have been supported in carrying out their duties by a team of NGOs and others. These duties include carrying out background checks of candidates, reviewing of papers written by candidates and an interview process. AIPJ was approached by a coalition of NGOs, led by MTI, to support the coalition in providing assistance to the 2011 Selection Committee.

⁵ For example, the conviction of the former chair of the KPK for murder, claims of extortion and bribery made against two current Commissioners of the KPK (Bibit and Chandra) and claims made by Muhammad Nazaruddin, who is currently being investigated by the KPK, of inappropriate conduct by its Commissioners.

⁶ See for example, comments made by high profile lawyers, such as OC Kaligis, that the KPK is an *ad hoc* body that should gradually be disbanded, as well as the recent draft laws on the KPK and anti-corruption that proposed removing the prosecution function of the KPK.

Law No.30/2002 on the KPK requires the nomination and election of its members to be ‘transparent’ – the law defines a ‘transparent’ process as one which allows the public to participate in the nomination and election of KPK members. The involvement of third parties also provides an effective system of checks and balances for the selection process and reduces the large workload of the members of the Selection Committee.

AIPJ obtained early approval from AusAID and the Working Committee to support MTI in providing technical assistance to the Selection Committee under this AWP. This was because the selection process began in June 2011 and the work of the Committee was completed by August.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Ensuring the selection process for the nomination of candidates for the KPK Commissioner positions is conducted in a transparent and accountable manner according to law.	1. Support the Selection Committee by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - managing public communications by the Committee through the media; - managing public participation in the selection; - tracking / tracing candidates’ histories (including verification of records) and referral of results to the Profile Assessment phase of the process.⁷
2. Recommendations on improving subsequent processes for the nomination of candidates for the KPK Commissioner positions are made available.	2. Hold a workshop to discuss lessons learned from the selection process and recommendations for improving subsequent selection processes.
Budget: AUD 88,688 / IDR 798,200,000	
Duration: June - September 2011	

4.2.2 Outcome 2, Activity 2: Supporting the AGO’s Bureaucratic Reform Program

Similar to the Supreme Court, the AGO’s work is central to the administration of law and justice in Indonesia. AusAID has been a long-term partner of the AGO, supporting, amongst other things, the implementation of its bureaucratic reform initiatives. In addition to promoting the AGO as a professional and transparent agency, these initiatives will have positive flow-on effects for its substantive work, including the prosecution of corruption cases. In addition to its own reform agenda, the AGO is guided by the Government of Indonesia’s National Strategy on Corruption Eradication (*Stranas PK*) released in December 2009, Presidential Regulation No.81/2010 on the Bureaucratic Reform, and the Regulation of the Minister for State Apparatus Empowerment and Bureaucratic Reform No.20/2010 on the Roadmap for the Implementation of Bureaucratic Reform.

The majority of activities outlined below are a continuation of previous activities, commenced either under AIPJt or the Bridging Program. The majority are also demand driven, and previous programs have had little influence over the content or method of implementation of the activities. There are many reasons for this. The AGO has in the past proven resistant to reform, and the PRPO has been working tirelessly to promote the reform agenda and provide effective support to the AGO leadership. Supporting requests for reform is intended primarily to encourage strong relationships, good communication and trust with the AGO and its reform team. The PRPO also must balance competing priorities of engendering support for its

⁷ The Coalition of NGOs approached the Selection Committee with an offer of support. The Committee identified particular areas of the selection process it felt it needed support which are outlined here.

role, providing assistance as requested, and providing objective critique of requested assistance. One aim of AIPJ in the long term is to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the bureaucratic reform process and to increase its ability to provide effective and targeted contributions to strategic planning, work plans and activities conducted through the bureaucratic reform process.

Prior to the commencement of the activities outlined below, the AIPJ team will continue to work with the AGO to further refine the details of each activity as well as the rationale for the activities. This information will then be shared with AusAID and BAPPENAS as appropriate.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Final draft of Bureaucratic Reform Proposal Document in accordance with Permenpan – Bureaucratic Reform No. 7/2011 on the Guidelines for Drafting Documents on Bureaucratic Reform Proposals for Line Agencies and Final Draft Document of the Roadmap for Bureaucratic Reform in accordance with Permenpan – Bureaucratic Reform No. 9/2011 on the Guidelines for Drafting Bureaucratic Reform Roadmaps for Line Agencies.	1. Update Bureaucratic Reform Proposal Document in accordance with Permenpan – Bureaucratic Reform No. 7/2011 on the Guidelines for Drafting Documents on Bureaucratic Reform Proposals for Line Agencies and Final Draft Document of the Roadmap for Bureaucratic Reform in accordance with Permenpan – Bureaucratic Reform No. 9/2011 on the Guidelines for Drafting Bureaucratic Reform Roadmaps for Line Agencies.
2. Envisioning and change management workshop held.	2. Conduct envisioning and change management workshop, including redefining a vision for the AGO, mission and strategy. Participants will be the Attorney-General, Deputy Attorneys-General, Echelon I officials and limited Echelon II officials. The Echelon II officials will be the Bureaucratic Reform focal points and chosen by the Attorney-General.
3. Consolidation workshop for Eschelon II held.	3. Conduct workshop to consolidate the outcomes of the envisioning workshop. Participants will be the coordinators of reform implementation (Echelon II officials).
4. Strengthening organisational structure: a. Assessment of business processes and review of main standard operating procedures in the (6) divisions of the Attorney-General’s Office conducted; if required, amend the business processes in accordance with findings; amend standard operating procedures to reflect business processes; b. Job descriptions (based on the assessment and review above) take account of each task and function of that job; c. Workshop on preparation of Annual Performance Accountability Report for Government Agencies (LAKIP); instructions for preparing LAKIP reports drafted and tailored to AGO specifics; dissemination sessions of the LAKIP drafting instructions.	4. Strengthening organisational structure: a. Assessment of business processes and review of main standard operating procedures in the (6) divisions of the Attorney-General’s Office; b. Revision of job descriptions on the basis of the assessment and review above; c. Workshop on preparation of Annual Performance Accountability Report for Government Agencies (LAKIP) – AIPJ to cover final day only as other days covered by state budget. Final day will cover technicalities of collecting information and compiling the Report; development of instructions for drafting LAKIP that are appropriate for AGO context (and not generic as per the Permenpan standards); dissemination of the instructions
5a. Map of AGO internal regulations;	5a. Mapping and assessment of AGO internal

<p>5b. Standard operating procedures on drafting internal regulations;</p> <p>5c. Database of internal regulations.</p>	<p>regulations;</p> <p>5b. Development of a standard operating procedure on how to draft AGO internal regulations;</p> <p>5c. Development of a database of AGO internal regulations.</p>
<p>6. Strengthening IT management practices:</p> <p>a. Intensive Assistance will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data entry without continued assistance from consultants; • General Crimes data able to be uploaded offline; • Development of an email communication system, tested at the Eschelon II level; • Development of help desk centre system and an increase in the number of users; • Development of standards for service by vendors; <p>b. IT Blueprint for AGO;</p> <p>c. SIMKARI standard operating procedures for: data centre, network, on vendor's quality service (network & applications development); data entry for general crimes and special crimes, data security and emailing;</p> <p>d. Training module for training SIMKARI operators; 50 SIMKARI operators trained and carry out their duties according to trainings;</p> <p>e. Report on needs assessment for e-procurement; standard operating procedures; progress report on the implementation of e-procurement;</p> <p>f. New format of e-reporting for Pidum, Pidsus, Was, Datun, BIN, Intel (general crimes, special crimes, the supervision unit, State Attorney unit, development, intelligence); standard operating procedures for e-reporting.</p>	<p>6. Strengthening IT management practices:</p> <p>a. Intensive Assistance to AGO IT Unit (Pusdaskrimti);</p> <p>b. Developing an IT Blueprint;</p> <p>c. Drafting of standard operating procedures for SIMKARI;</p> <p>d. Developing and conducting trainings for 50 SIMKARI operators (to address previous high turnover issues);</p> <p>e. Development of an e-procurement system, followed by an early draft of standard operating procedures for e-procurement;</p> <p>f. Continuing the development of e-reporting.</p>

<p>7. Strengthening human resources practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 100 Echelon II officials are assessed according to pre-determined criteria; results of assessment used by AGO leadership for determining promotion and transfer; b. Draft talent management system developed for 100 Echelon II officials assessed; c. IPKJ (instruments for measuring work practices) are available and applied; d. All personnel data is available in SIMKARI; linked application of data in the Units of Advancement and Supervision. 	<p>7. Strengthening human resources practices:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Competency assessment of AGO's Echelon II officials; b. Development of a talent management system based on the results of the competency assessment; c. Assessment of AGO's performance management system; d. Development of Personnel Database through SIMKARI.
<p>8. Strengthening Supervision Mechanism and Public Complaints:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. AGO inspectors understand internal discipline issues and how to process complaints; b. Draft concept on how to implement SPIP and implementation of system; c. Development of training module; 60 APIP inspectors trained. 	<p>8. Strengthening Supervision Mechanism and Public Complaints:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Continuation of trainings for AGO inspectors on investigating complaints against AGO officials, the internal mechanisms of AGO, and internal discipline issues; b. Implementation of Government Internal Control System (SPIP); c. Training for 60 APIP inspectors.
<p>9. Improvement of AGO Public Service:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Document outlining minimum standard of public service; b. Relevant PPID staff (Information and Document Management and Information Desk staff) trained; Information Desk application installed at the nominated offices; help desk centres for Desk staff is available; c. Monthly report of AGO's website performance produced; website standard operating procedures drafted; training conducted for 5 staff of Puspenkum (Centre for Legal Information). 	<p>9. Improvement of AGO Public Service:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Development of a minimum standard of public service; b. Establishment of Information Desks at selected district and provincial level offices; c. Continued improvement of AGO websites through monthly reporting on its performance, drafting of standard operating procedures, and training in website operation is conducted for 5 staff from Puspenkum (Centre for Legal Information).
<p>10. Promoting AGO's Public Accountability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Annual Report produced and publicly launched. 	<p>10. Promoting AGO's Public Accountability:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop and launch Annual Report.
<p>11. Implementation of Presidential Instruction No. 9/2011:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Database on the execution of corruption cases developed; b. AGO trainees understand basics of asset tracing and recovery as per training; 	<p>11. Implementation of Presidential Instruction No. 9/2011:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Development of database on the execution of corruption cases; b. Two trainings on asset tracing and recovery for 30 persons each training;

c. 90% compliance rate in the 4 offices..	c. Assistance in completing Personal Wealth Report in 4 offices in 2 regions (regions with the lowest compliance rate)
12. PRPO continues its work in donor coordination and implementation of the AGO's reform agenda. (Note that in 2011 AIPJ plans to conduct a lessons learned and strategic planning evaluation of the PRPO)	12. Salary and office support to PRPO. Capacity building training for PRPO based on needs assessment.
Budget: AUD734,341 / IDR 6,609,076,000 ⁸ (for 2011-2012 activities)	
Duration: September 2011 - December 2012	

4.2.3 Outcome 2, Activity 3: Strengthening Organisational Capacity and Capability of the Prosecutorial Oversight Commission

The Prosecutorial Oversight Commission is responsible for investigating public complaints made against the AGO staff and officials (original powers on establishment) and for monitoring and evaluating the internal workings of the AGO (new powers conferred in March 2011). During the first period of its establishment, the Commission did not perform its functions effectively (primarily due to a lack of will) and very few members of the public even knew that it existed.

In March 2011, new leadership was appointed and new powers were granted to the Commission, providing it with an opportunity to establish itself as an effective oversight body of the AGO. Effective oversight of both the conduct of AGO officials and of the internal workings of the AGO will ideally contribute to the AGO's ability to perform its substantive work, including the prosecution of corruption cases. However, the expanded mandate of the Commission was not matched by sufficient budget allocations.

One issue that has plagued a number of other national commissions is a lack of unity among the commissioners and a lack of common vision and strategy. Given the Prosecutorial Oversight Commission has new leadership (from various backgrounds including the AGO itself, academia and advisers to the Government of Indonesia) and in its early stages has already begun to indicate signs of miscommunication among certain Commissioners, improving the communication and unity of the leadership is vital. One way to achieve this is to ensure the Commissioners have the same vision and strategy for the Commission during their term in office and a clear understanding of each of their roles (and division of responsibilities).

Outcomes	Activities
1. Commission uses tools / documents (road map, job descriptions, job performance indicators, operating procedures, etc) produced to perform and / or inform its work and future development in a	1. Develop: - roadmap for the Commission (how to achieve its recently defined vision and mission statement); - job descriptions and job performance

⁸ The wages/contracts for consultants recruited for the activities listed above are net (does not include PRPO).

consistent and unified manner.	indicators for Commission personnel based on this roadmap; - operational procedures for the Commission to follow; - annual work plan; and - develop the Commission's public complaints handling mechanism.
2. Commission uses two expert staff to assist develop its organisational capacity and capability.	2. Salary and office support for two expert staff to assist the Commission develop its organisational capacity and capability.
Budget: AUD 109,963 / IDR 989,670,000	
Duration: September 2011 - December 2011	

4.3 Outcome 3: Increased Public Access To and Use of Legal Information, Particularly Relating to Human Rights (including Women's Rights) and Anti-corruption

4.3.1 Outcome 3, Activity 1: Trainings for Religious Court Information Desk Staff

One of the goals of the Supreme Court's Blue Print for Reform (2010-2035) is to improve access to justice and increase the credibility and transparency of the judiciary. In line with this goal, in 2011 the Supreme Court issued Decree no. 1-144/KMA/SK/I/2011 on Guidelines for Information Services in Courts.

The Religious Courts have begun the process of setting up Information Desks in the Courts to provide basic information to justice seekers about the Courts, administrative procedures, and other issues. However, to date the Desks have not been functioning in an optimal manner (for example, staff are not present, do not have information available, or simply hand over personal mobile numbers of Court staff involved in the particular case at hand to answer the question).

The Director General for Religious Courts has recognised these problems and, in July 2011, finalised an instruction on the purpose and operation of Information Desks. His team will also conduct visits to the regions during the second half of 2011 to gain a better understanding of the problems faced.

Badilag also requested AIPJ to support trainings relating to effective operation of Information Desks under the 2011 AWP. As there are a large number of Courts and Information Desks, *Badilag* requested the training be done as a training of trainers ('TOT').

In early October 2011, a preparation workshop will be conducted in Jakarta to determine a schedule and venues for the training, the material to be developed for and utilised in the trainings, presenters for the workshop, and other relevant matters. The first trainings will be held in November or December 2011, followed by two additional trainings in 2012. After each workshop, the training material will be further developed and refined. The training will combine theory and practice, utilising simulation (role play) and the use of a video illustrating daily situations and best practices. With the exception of the first training in November 2011, the video (and its scenario) will be designed and recorded prior to the training.

This activity will be conducted in cooperation with the Family Court of Australia under the framework of the memorandum of understanding between the Federal and Family Courts of Australia and the Supreme Court.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Cadre of Information Desk trainers delivers training to colleagues on Information Desks in accordance with the training materials and methods.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 2011, planning workshop with <i>Badilag</i>, the Family Court, an international consultant and several court staff to determine content of training, participants, location training. 2. (Three) TOT workshops for a total of 90 staff, focusing on the effective operations of Information Desks⁹, the first conducted in late 2011 and the remaining two in 2012.
Budget: AUD 203,268 / IDR 1,829,417,529 (for 2011-2012 activities)	
Duration: September 2011 - December 2012	

4.3.2 Outcome 3, Activity 2: Assessment of Court Websites

Following the Supreme Court's 2007 Decree on Freedom of Information in the Judiciary, Indonesian Courts have worked towards improving access to information by the public, including through their websites. An assessment of Court websites in 2010 by the National Legal Reform Program ('NLRP'), particularly on the extent of compliance with the Supreme Court Decree and the Freedom of Information Law, was highly regarded by the Courts and other stakeholders such as the Judicial Commission and BAPPENAS. One key outcome of the assessment was that it incentivised the Courts to improve their websites and thus public access to Court information. In discussions with AIPJ, *Badilag* indicated that regular assessments of Court websites would maintain pressure on Courts to improve their websites (and transparency) and requested AIPJ support in this regard under the 2011 AWP.

The assessments will primarily use the new Supreme Court Decree 1-144 on Guidelines for Information Services in Courts as its reference point, and will assess the websites of all Courts in all jurisdictions, including the Supreme Court. It will also assess information provided on the websites of the three Directorates General (that is, the Religious Courts, General Courts, and Administrative and Military Courts). The assessments will determine issues such as compliance with the Decree, the type of information that most commonly appears, improvements to websites from the previous assessment, and which websites are the best according to the assessment criteria. Staff from NLRP who conducted the assessment of Court websites in 2010 are now working for PSHK and it is proposed, therefore, that PSHK conduct the website assessment in 2011.

Outcomes	Activities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Findings and recommendations from the assessment of Court websites (in the form of a book) produced according to terms of reference and assessment criteria. 2. Subsequent surveys of court websites indicate a continued improvement in websites according to assessment criteria. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preliminary workshop involving the Supreme Court, the three Directorates General and other stakeholders to explain the assessment and seek feedback on assessment criteria. 2. Assessment of Court websites, including recommendations on how to increase accessibility of websites for all users (such as people with disabilities), and on additional information that might improve services for women (women being a particular focus group for both the Supreme Court and AIPJ). 3. In 2012, PSHK will produce a book on their

⁹ As there are about 360 Courts under the Religious Courts branch, training of trainers will be provided to selected staff.

	findings and recommendations for distribution to the President, Vice-President, senior court figures and others, for action on the findings and recommendations.
Budget: AUD 45,472 / IDR 409,250,000 (for 2011-2012 activities)	
Duration: September 2011 - June 2012	

4.4 Outcome 4: Improved Framework and Delivery of a Legal Aid System

4.4.1 Outcome 4, Activity 1: Documenting Advocacy Experiences on the Legal Aid Bill and Research on Implementation of Legal Aid at the Local Level

The establishment of a state-funded legal aid system is a priority for the Government of Indonesia. Following delays primarily due to disagreement over the management of the legal aid system, the legal aid bill was passed in October. With AusAID support, YLBHI has in the past monitored the progress of the bill, and lobbied to influence its content, with a particular focus on developing a legal aid bill that is in the best interests of poor and marginalised communities. YLBHI was also a member of the Government's Team (Tim Pemerintah) on the bill. YLBHI will document its experiences as well as lessons learned regarding advocacy on the bill for inclusion in the study outlined below. This will provide a context for which the study may be subsequently used (including lobbying and advocacy regarding the implementation of the Legal Aid Act).

YLBHI will conduct a study on lessons learned and best practices from local government legal aid initiatives in Jakarta, Makassar, Padang, Palembang, Palu, Semarang and Surabaya. With support from AIPJ in subsequent programs, YLBHI intends to use the study for two purposes in subsequent years – the first is to work with and lobby the entity responsible for legal aid management and implementation under the Legal Aid Act, to promote effective and efficient practices. The second is to use the study to lobby for and develop more local government initiatives on legal aid. A decision on which local governments to lobby will be determined after a needs assessment and enquiries into amenable local governments. The study will be formally written up and presented at a national conference in 2012.

Outcomes	Activities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Written notes on experiences and lessons learned, in preparation for a formal report to be written in 2012. 2. Methodology finalised, research conducted, stakeholder FGDs held and written notes prepared on initial findings in preparation for a formal report to be written in 2012. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documenting experiences and lessons learned from legal aid bill advocacy work (including collating minutes from various meetings and interviewing parliamentarians). This will also involve outlining YLBHI's advocacy strategy in regard to the bill. 2. Design methodology and conduct field research on the establishment and implementation on local government legal aid regulations. Stakeholder FGDs will then be held to test research findings.
Budget: AUD 45,151 / IDR 406,360,000	
Duration: September 2011 - March 2012	

4.4.2 Outcome 4, Activity 2: Access to Justice for Female Heads of Households through Advocacy and Paralegal Work

PEKKA is a long-term AusAID partner which has demonstrated success in its work promoting economic empowerment and independence for female-headed households, including through improving access to justice for women¹⁰. The activities proposed below are intended to continue to support PEKKA's paralegal and legal aid data collection work, as well as its continued advocacy in the field of family law. The activities are also in preparation for lobbying local governments to increase budget support for legal aid.

Noting that PEKKA receives support from several donors, AIPJ will ensure that assistance it provides is based on a genuine need and not duplicative.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Paralegals provide legal services on family law and related issues in accordance with training.	1. Trainings for 60 paralegals on family law matters (recognition of marriage and divorce). The trainings will be conducted in areas where PEKKA has established offices (where previously trained paralegals have moved or are otherwise unable to continue providing services, or additional paralegal are required), and in areas where PEKKA has recently expanded and therefore has no trained paralegals.
2. PEKKA uses information collected for the purposes of budgeting and monitoring the implementation of legal aid and provides such information to Badilag.	2. Collection of information / data through documentation of cases for PEKKA's own use and use by <i>Badilag</i> for budgeting and monitoring the implementation of legal aid.
3. The discussions and dialogues are held. (Discussions and preparations for the dialogues will determine the regions where the discussions are held)	3. National level roundtable discussion with stakeholders (such as the Department of Religious Affairs and Department of Internal Affairs, BAPPENAS) to pursue issues and solutions to challenges faced by women, particularly in relation to the registration of births, marriages and divorce. PEKKA will also conduct discussions and roundtable forums at the local level with community leaders, government stakeholders and PEKKA paralegals. (The discussions and forums are in preparation for subsequent lobbying and advocacy work by PEKKA for policy change in the field of family law and population registration, as well as for increased budgeting by local government for legal aid).
4. PEKKA paralegals meet regularly to discuss relevant issues.	4. Regular meetings amongst PEKKA paralegals through funding transport costs.

¹⁰ See for example, "Indonesia – Australia Legal Development Facility, AidWorks Initiative Number INF 753: INDEPENDENT COMPLETION REPORT", John W S Mooney and Budi Soedarsono; 30 May 2010, and "Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Justice – Transition: Program Completion Report"; 9 February 2011.

5. PEKKA uses equipment and Internet at centres in Aceh, Jawa Barat, Jawa Tengah, Kalimantan Barat, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Nusa Tenggara Timur, Sulawesi Utara.	5. Equipment and Internet support to PEKKA centres in Aceh, Jawa Barat, Jawa Tengah, Kalimantan Barat, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Nusa Tenggara Timur, Sulawesi Utara.
6. Public seeking legal services use PEKKA as a result of viewing materials about its work.	6. Produce and show / disseminate video and manual about PEKKA and its access to justice work. This video and manual will advertise and promote its work especially in the nine provinces where PEKKA has recently commenced operations. While PEKKA has produced 'how-to' guides and other advisory-type materials, it has not produced materials about its work and the services it provides.
7. PEKKA national secretariat performs its functions, including in relation to developing action plans, supervising field work, and monitoring and evaluating work.	7. Support PEKKA national secretariat, including to develop action plans, supervise field work, and monitor and evaluate work.
Budget: AUD 174,427 / IDR 1,569,850,000	
Duration: September 2011 - December 2011	

4.5 Outcome 5: Increased Capacity of Civil Society Organisations and National Commissions to Support Indonesian Law and Justice Sector Reform Efforts

4.5.1 Outcome 5, Activity 1: Core Funding to Strengthen PEKKA's Governance and Independence through Improvements to Financial Management

One of PEKKA's key objectives is to enhance economic empowerment and independence for female-headed households. A number of approaches are used by PEKKA to achieve its objectives, including the implementation of locally-based savings and loans schemes. PEKKA has established a new financial reporting procedure for local schemes to report to its national secretariat. The secretariat then aggregates the reports to present an overall picture of PEKKA's position. The process includes a requirement for local schemes to ensure the quality of data they compile.

Although the local schemes are effective in helping PEKKA to achieve its objectives, the quality of reports has, to date, not been satisfactory. Managers of local schemes have limited experience with financial management and reporting. The financial management system is also very complex. Both of these factors undermine the accountability and accuracy of the financial reports.

Improving PEKKA's financial management practices will be necessary to ensure that it can sustain its effectiveness, expand its services, maintain its credibility with donors, secure future funding, allocate its own resources effectively, and maintain financial stability.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Development of a new finance management and reporting system for micro finance program. 2. PEKKA uses new financial management and reporting system for micro-finance program.	1. Assessment of financial management and reporting system for micro-finance program. 2. Design a new financial management and reporting system for micro-credit program. 3. TOT for 20 PEKKA staff members on new

	<p>system.</p> <p>4. Develop roll-out plan for implementation of the system, including how the trainers will deliver the training.</p> <p>5. Support PEKKA to implement the system, including through a consultant visiting a selection of PEKKA centres to identify issues in implementation and provide advice, as necessary.</p>
Budget: AUD 176,393 / IDR 1,587,540,000 (for 2011-2012 activities)	
Duration: September 2011 - June 2012	

4.5.2 Outcome 5, Activity 2: Core Funding to Komnas Perempuan

AusAID recognises the critical role that *Komnas Perempuan* ('KP') plays in Indonesia and the parties have an existing partnership. Pursuant to this partnership, AusAID provided core funding to KP which expired in June 2011. As not all funds were expended, and KP had a number of activities to complete, AusAID agreed to roll-over unused funds through to December 2011.

Outcomes	Activities
1. KP uses AusAID funds to support its work.	1. Core funding provided to support core activities.
Budget: No AIPJ funds required (unused core funds provided under Bridging Program rolled over to December 2011)	
Duration: July 2011 - December 2011	

4.6 Support for Partnerships between Australian and Indonesian Institutions

The Federal Court of Australia and the Supreme Court of Indonesia have been collaborating on technical assistance activities since 1999. This collaboration was formalised in 2008 with the signing by the parties of a memorandum of understanding that included the Family Court of Australia. In September 2011, the AIPJ will support a visit to Indonesia by the Honourable Patrick Keane, Chief Justice of the Federal Court, and the Honourable Diana Bryant, Chief Justice of the Family Court, to sign amendments to the memorandum of understanding on judicial cooperation between both these Courts and the Supreme Court. The parties will also sign a new annex to the memorandum of understanding which is updated annually, and details areas for cooperation in 2012. Two officials from both Courts will also attend the signing ceremony and conduct visits for three days on either side of the signing ceremony to carry out activities pursuant to the memorandum of understanding (Federal Court from 26-28 September 2011 and the Family Court from 3-5 October).

In October 2011, AIPJ will support a meeting in Indonesia of the Joint Working Committee of the KPK, the Australian AGD and ACLEI. The Australian PSC has indicated it will not attend the meeting as the areas proposed for discussion at the meeting (foreign bribery laws and mutual legal assistance) are not within its portfolio. The Committee was established pursuant to a memorandum of understanding signed by the parties in 2009 for the purpose of strengthening practical cooperation and developing institutional capacity to prevent and combat corruption. The meeting in October is for the Committee to finalise activities for collaboration between the parties in 2012 which AIPJ will support under its 2012 AWP.

Based on an improved understanding of KP, and as identified by KP itself, one area nominated for support under the 2011 AWP and beyond is the development of KP's ability to conduct targeted advocacy work. Currently one of KP's strengths is its extensive data collection and excellent field research. However, KP often does not translate this into concrete outcomes. KP has therefore identified advocacy as an area that requires development. In particular, KP has identified the protection and promotion of the rights of women with disabilities as an area of particular concern and interest. Women with disabilities are generally acknowledged as a particularly vulnerable group in Indonesia that has received little attention. In this regard, KP expressed an interest in working with the Australian Human Rights Commission ('AHRC') which has demonstrated experience in advocacy work both nationally and internationally, in particular in relation to people with disabilities. AHRC has reciprocated this interest.

AIPJ will support a workshop in 2011 for the parties to explore future cooperation in this area for 2012 and beyond.

Outcomes	Activities
1. Memorandum of understanding updated as agreed between the Federal and Family Courts of Australia and the Supreme Court.	1. Visit of Federal and Family Courts of Australia to sign amendments to the memorandum of understanding on judicial cooperation between both these Courts and the Supreme Court.
2. Australian AGD, ACLEI and KPK finalise activities for collaboration in 2012 pursuant to memorandum of understanding between the parties.	2. Visit of the Australian AGD and ACLEI to hold a Joint Working Committee meeting with KPK to finalise activities for collaboration in 2012 pursuant to memorandum of understanding between the parties.
3. AHRC and KP agree on and plan joint activities in 2012	3. Initial planning meeting between AHRC and KP to discuss and plan joint activities in 2012.
Budget: AUD 126,610 / IDR 1,139,490,000	
Duration: September - December 2011	

4.7 Monitoring and Learning System

The 2011 AWP includes the development of a Monitoring and Learning ('M&L') System which is to be finalised by 10 November 2011.

The design of the M&L System is to be informed by an evaluability assessment of AIPJ which commenced in early August by an M&L specialist who visited Indonesia for this purpose. The assessment considered, among other things, the continuing relevance of AIPJ's stated objective and outcomes. It is therefore also intended to refine the stated AIPJ outcomes, as appropriate, and to ensure that expectations of AIPJ's likely contribution to the outcomes are realistic. The assessment intends to maintain the current strategic directions of AIPJ but will consider the effect of developments in the sector since the design process was completed in 2009 and the lessons learned from AIPJt. The assessment will also seek to highlight the importance of effective reform management practices in the sector, as well as the necessary support for the reform agendas as determined by law and justice sector partners. Major AIPJ partners and stakeholders were consulted by the M&L specialist during his in-country visit to ensure the assessment was informed by relevant parties.

The report on the evaluability assessment will be finalised by mid-September 2011.

While the M&L System will not be finalised until early November, AIPJ is working with its partners and the M&L specialist to ensure that the outcomes of activities proposed for support under the 2011 AWP are appropriately crafted. This will facilitate effective monitoring and evaluation, including in the period between implementation of activities from mid-September 2011 and the finalisation of the M&L System in early November. Further details on how AIPJ will report on the activities against the M&L System will be provided to AusAID once the System is finalised.

4.8 Inception Report and Operations Handbook

The 2011 AWP includes the preparation of the Inception Report by 12 September 2011. The Inception Report will include the Operations Handbook, the evaluability assessment report, and the final version of the Contractor Performance Assessment Criteria.

The Inception Report will summarise the work undertaken to establish and launch AIPJ and the 2011 AWP while the Operations Handbook will outline, amongst other things, the finance and administration and risk management guidelines, processes and procedures for AIPJ, the selection criteria and procedures for activities to be funded under AIPJ, the guidelines and procedures for the procurement of services, and tendering / contract procedures.

The Inception Report is being prepared in close consultation with AusAID.

4.9 Outcomes Work Plan, Gender and Disabilities, Capacity Development and Communications Strategies

The 2011 AWP includes the preparation of the indicative three-year Outcomes Work Plan and the Gender and Disabilities, Capacity Building and Communications Strategies by 10 November 2011.

The Outcomes Work Plan will provide an indicative 'road map' and strategy for achieving the AIPJ outcomes over a three-year period.

The three strategies will detail AIPJ's approach in terms of the following:

- gender and disabilities, especially how gender and disabilities are to be mainstreamed across AIPJ's work, including the activities to be implemented under the 2011 AWP and subsequent Annual Work Plans;
- capacity building, including within the AIPJ team and partner organisations, and with a focus on maximizing the sustainability of the results / impacts of AIPJ activities and with particular attention given to capacity building for people with disabilities; and
- communications with all stakeholders, including the Australian and Indonesian public generally.

External specialists will be engaged by AIPJ to work in close consultation with AIPJ team members and AusAID to develop these strategies.

5. Implementation Strategy

AIPJ will work in partnership with AusAID and stakeholders in 2011 and for the life of the program, with the strategic direction, development and maintenance of relationships continuing to be led by the Program Director.

AIPJ will assist partners in the implementation of activities, and will be responsible for managing administrative arrangements such as sourcing and recruiting consultants. AIPJ will provide technical and

management support where appropriate and oversight a number of the activities, together with its partners. AIPJ will not assume ownership or carriage of the activities.

To manage risk in implementing the 2011 AWP, AIPJ has:

- limited the number of partners and activities it proposes to support, especially in view of short time frame between the periods June and mid-September for the preparation of the 2011 AWP and between mid-September and December for implementation;
- ensured, through extensive consultations, that activities proposed for support are aligned to priorities and / or reform programs or agendas that partners have formally committed to implementing in 2011;
- allocated personnel from AIPJ to monitor the implementation of activities and work closely with partners in this regard; and
- ensured partners' ownership by having them lead the process of identifying and designing activities proposed for support.

To ensure sustainability, AIPJ has proposed activities that are aligned to partners' priorities and / or part of their broader reform programs or agendas to which there is formal high-level commitment to implement. AIPJ continues to strongly adhere to a partnership approach. AIPJ will also work to strengthen the capacity of partners to implement activities and more effectively undertake reform. In this regard, capacity development activities will be based on sound analysis and appropriate to their institutional context. Strategic, multi-faceted approaches to capacity development will also be applied.

Monitoring and learning will inform implementation of the 2011 AWP. There will be regular reviews of implementation and lessons learned will be fed to both AIPJ and its partners for incorporation into how work is undertaken.

6. Implementation Schedule

Part 1: Activities in Support of National Law and Justice Sector Partners																			
Outcome / Activity	June 2011	July 2011	Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug 2012	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
AIPJ Outcome 1:																			
Improved judicial dispute resolution systems for marginalised groups (including the poor, women and people with a disability)																			
<i>Continued Support for Supreme Court Institutional Reform (in accordance with Supreme Court Blue Print 2010-2035)</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011												
<i>Support for Implementation of the Chamber System in the Supreme Court</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011												
<i>Mediation Training for Religious Court Judges (preparation workshop)</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug 2012	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
AIPJ Outcome 2:																			
Prosecutorial agencies better able to process corruption cases																			
<i>Supporting the Selection Process of KPK Commissioners for 2011-2015</i>	June 2011	July 2011	Aug 2011	Sept 2011															
<i>Supporting AGO Bureaucratic Reform Program</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug 2012	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
<i>Strengthening Organisational Capacity and Capability of the Prosecutorial Oversight Commission</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012											

Outcome/ Activity (continued)	June 2011	July 2011	Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug 2012	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
AIPJ Outcome 3:																			
Increased public access to and use of legal information, particularly relating to human rights (including women's rights) and anti-corruption																			
<i>Trainings for Religious Court Information Desk Staff</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug 2012	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
<i>Assessment of Court Websites</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012						
AIPJ Outcome 4:																			
Improved framework and delivery of a legal aid system																			
<i>Advocacy on Legal Aid Bill</i>			Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012									
<i>Research on Implementation of Legal Aid by Regional Governments</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012									
<i>Access to Justice for Female Heads of Households through Advocacy and Paralegal Work</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011												
AIPJ Outcome 5:																			
Increased capacity of civil society organisations and national commissions to support Indonesian law and justice sector reform efforts																			
<i>Strengthening PEKKA's Governance and Independence through Improvements to Financial Management</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012						
<i>Core Funding to Komnas Perempuan</i>		July 2011	Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011												

Part 2: Other Key AIPJ Work																			
Work	June 2011	July 2011	Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011	Dec 2011	Jan 2012	Feb 2012	Mar 2012	Apr 2012	May 2012	June 2012	July 2012	Aug 2012	Sept 2012	Oct 2012	Nov 2012	Dec 2012
<i>Consultations with stakeholders to identify activities for support under 2011 AWP</i>	June 2011	July 2011	Aug 2011																
<i>Mobilisation of Services and Quality Management Plan</i>	June 2011	July 2011																	
<i>Preparations of 2011 AWP</i>	June 2011	July 2011	Aug 2011	Sept 2011															
<i>Working Committee Meeting for 2011 AWP</i>				Sept 2011															
<i>Visit of Federal and Family Courts of Australia to sign MoU with Supreme Court of Indonesia and to conduct activities pursuant to the MoU</i>				Sept 2011	Oct 2011														
<i>Inception Report and Operations Handbook</i>				Sept 2011															
<i>Meeting of the Joint Working Committee of the KPK, the Australian AGD and ACLEI</i>				Sept 2011															
<i>Monitoring and Learning System</i>			Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011													
<i>Outcomes Work Plan, Gender and Disabilities, Capacity Development and Communications Strategies</i>			Aug 2011	Sept 2011	Oct 2011	Nov 2011													

Annex 1: Budget