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INTEGRITY WATCH AFGHANISTAN
Since its inception, Integrity Watch Afghanistan has focused on the role of communities in holding service providers accountable to the public. Our community-based approach to monitoring of infrastructure projects has become a model for involving the public in improving transparency and accountability at the local level. Expanding on this idea, we have started using this model in other sectors, including the extractive industries and the courts. Our Court Trial Monitoring Program has been developed with the objective of building public trust and confidence in the formal justice system by bringing more transparency and accountability to the public at the local level.

The building of justice institutions in Afghanistan has been an enormous undertaking over the last decade or so. Despite many efforts, to a large extent public confidence in the formal justice system has not been restored. In Afghanistan, more than 50% of all disputes are resolved in the so-called “informal” sphere. While the use of informal or community-based dispute resolution is not inherently negative, a central reason why the population does not typically use formal courts is that they do not trust them to be fair or accountable. Greater trust and use of formal courts would assist in enhancing the rule of law in Afghanistan. Furthermore, entrenching the role of the government in providing critical services to the community would contribute to the legitimacy of state.

The Supreme Court of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan faces many challenges in restoring that trust, including lack of mechanisms and resources to ensure independent oversight of the courts. While court trial monitoring by communities is quite a new idea for the Afghan justice system, it is proving to have the potential to provide constant and low-cost independent oversight on the courts—especially in remote areas where government access is limited.

Although the courts in Afghanistan are open to the public in theory, in practice few people systematically and directly observe proceedings. Monitoring of courts by communities can therefore assist in increasing accountability, ensuring adherence to procedural laws, facilitating fairer adjudication of disputes, and ultimately instilling greater trust in courts as a government institution.

While the program has had both successes and difficulties, several key impacts have been identified in this assessment. These include increased transparency in judicial decision-making, increased awareness of the official rule of law system, citizen empowerment, and collection of valuable data that can help promote higher integrity in the judiciary. We recommend this assessment report to policymakers in the Afghan justice system, donors, journalists, and students of law for use as a reference in identifying alternatives for independent oversight of the courts.

By Yama Torabi, Phd

Executive Director of Integrity Watch Afghanistan
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIHRC</td>
<td>Afghanistan Independent Human Right Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Community Based Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Community Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAU</td>
<td>Cooperation for Peace and Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTM</td>
<td>Court Trial Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDLO</td>
<td>International Development law Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td>Integrity Watch Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Local Monitor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This report presents a review of the court trial monitoring program (hereafter CTM) in two provinces, Kapisa and Bamyan, covering the first six months of 2012. CTM is a community-based initiative that utilizes indirect engagement of citizens with judicial authorities. It is based on the assumption that daily observation of the formal judiciary by local monitors with the ability to report and comment on the decision of the judicial officials will result in a change in the attitudes and behaviour of the judiciary. In order to do so, Integrity Watch (1) mobilizes the community by selecting local monitors to oversee the trial in their communities; (2) conducts trainings to build their capacity in terms of understanding legal issues and monitoring techniques; and (3) interprets and disseminates the data gathered by local monitors to address the concerns related to judicial institutions.

The first section provides a brief contextual analysis of the justice system at subnational level. The second section explains the CTM concept and practice. The third section examines the key findings in four areas—the project relevancy to the context of Afghanistan, the initial results, project management and methodology, and sustainability of the project. The findings in this report demonstrate that the project is relevant to (re-)building a fair justice system in Afghanistan and that it fills an important gap threatening the state’s legitimacy, especially at the subnational level. In spite of the challenges the project was facing at the early stages, there have been a number of positive improvements of the justice system in target areas, such as changing the perception of judges in acknowledging the citizen’s right to participate in an open trial, conducting public trials, and holding court officials accountable in districts where formal justice was virtually non-existent.

The project management has significantly improved compared to last year. The project management team has taken important steps to address the challenges that project was facing at initial stage. Additionally, the training component of the project seems to have had a mixed impact in two provinces. In Kapisa, the local monitors were satisfied with the training; however, in Bamyan additional training is required to better equip the local monitors in order to perform their tasks properly.

The paper also examines the future of the project by looking at the sustainability of CTM practices and provides recommendations for future expansion. The key recommendations are addressed to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, civil society organizations and international community to support bottom-up interventions in order to hold the courts accountable at subnational level.

This report is the result of two weeks of fieldwork in Bamyan and Kapisa and a review of program documents. The fact that it is early to define the impacts of the project was an important consideration while designing the methodology. Initial results, however, can be identified through the gathering of a large amount of first-hand data from the field and stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences. The detailed methodology is presented in Annex Number Two.
1. Framework

1.1 Context Analysis

Rebuilding Afghanistan’s justice system has been a huge task for the international community and Afghanistan’s Government in the post-Taliban era. Soon after the Bonn Conference (2001), the international community came together in Geneva and later Berlin to discuss a comprehensive security sector plan, of which rebuilding judiciary bodies was an integral component. As a result, the Law and Order Trust Fund was established. In order to coordinate the efforts, the international community divided each pillar of Security Sector Reform amongst the ‘Lead Nations’: United States undertook creating the army; Germany supported the police; Japan financed “disarmament and demobilization and reintegration”; UK was in charge of counter-narcotics; Italy took on reforming the justice system. Since then, massive amounts of funds and technical assistance have been deployed to all aspects of the security sector. However, funding and political support to judiciary bodies was extremely low. Only after the Rome conference in July 2007 did the judiciary receive more significant support.

A diverse range of interventions took place to reform the justice system in order to reshape and institutionalize rule of law based on democratic values, e.g. passing and reforming a formal, legal framework, providing technical assistance, building infrastructure. Promoting rule of law and improving the rule of law in judicial institutions is also outlined as a key priority in the Afghanistan National Development Strategy. Yet, despite all these efforts, rule of law and access to justice has remained extremely poor and limited. It is accepted by many researchers that a majority of local disputes in Afghanistan today are resolved through “informal” mechanisms – within families or by local community leaders.1

Regarding corruption, the corruption survey conducted by Integrity Watch (2010) ranked the justice sector as the most corrupt sector threatening the legitimacy of the state and creating a gap between citizens and state.2 It also further marginalizes and places an undue burden on the poor, who usually do not have the necessary social and political connections to survive. Corruption is an immense challenge for the government at the subnational level (district and provincial courts and attorneys), which is where the majority of people interact with the judiciary.

An explanation for why the justice reform interventions have been ineffective and why corruption is endemic in the justice sector could be the fact that the existence of accountability mechanisms – the court hierarchy, investigation and control department in the Supreme Court - does not ensure integrity and transparency in the performance of judicial personnel and in safeguarding “the right of access to justice” for Afghan citizens at the subnational level. In other words, the horizontal accountability mechanisms seem to be dysfunctional. There is a need to explore alternative opportunities in order to improve the justice system in Afghanistan.

---

1 USIP, “The Clash of Two Goods.”
A very limited number of bottom-up initiatives have been carried out that aimed at ensuring the participation of ordinary citizens in the justice system such as community policing, community dispute resolution projects etc. However, systematic and direct observation takes place on a very limited basis. For instance, media reporting on court proceedings has been virtually non-existent so far. Civil society organisations have little participation in monitoring the justice system’s performance. A large number of CSOs are facilitating these capacity building initiatives in the justice sector, and this has diverted their attention from playing a key role in holding law enforcement institutions accountable to citizen demands. One of these rare bottom-up initiatives is Integrity Watch’s pilot Court Trial Monitoring (CTM) Program that is currently being implemented in two provinces—Bamyan and Kapisa. CTM’s design was based on the lessons learnt from the Community Based-Monitoring Program that mobilizes citizens to participate as monitors in reconstruction projects in order to improve the quality of projects and increase transparency and integrity in the infrastructure sector.

1.2 Challenges associated with formal justice system at the sub national level
The community’s broken trust in the judicial system appears to be the most challenging issue at the subnational level. The existence of corruption is an undeniable reality. It is the most vexing factor that widens the gap between communities and the justice system. There are various types of corruption: e.g. bribery, nepotism, and cronyism. The findings of this report demonstrate that citizens are not satisfied with the judiciary’s performance. In many instances, the interviewees have repeatedly expressed their frustration at the systematic and widespread corruption in the formal justice sector. However, there is confusion regarding the existence and prevalence of corruption in different rule of law and justice institutions. The findings show that a large amount of corruption takes place in the police department, the attorney’s office and Huquuq, which seriously affects the court’s decisions. This confusion leads to the public perception that court officials commit the majority of abuse and corruption in the justice sector. Consequently, this creates the perception that the judiciary is the most corrupt institution, although this is not necessarily the case. A fair trial thus requires transparency in the performance of all actors involved in the justice sector.3

In addition to corruption, the lack of professionalism of the actors in the rule of law sector is an obstacle to delivering justice for Afghan citizens. This issue was communicated in several interviews conducted in Bayman and Kapisa provinces. A judge stated, “the professional and fair performance of judges in the court directly depends on the police and attorney department performance.”4 According to Integrity Watch surveys in Bamyan and Kapisa, only 48% of the staff in various law enforcement institutions has a high school education. Only 38.9% hold a university degree and 3% a masters’ degree.5 As Mr. Farzam, head of Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission at central region (AIHRC) stated:

“The first challenge in the justice institution is the lack of professional personnel, and this is why their performance and decisions are unprofessional and unlawful. For example, we witnessed this problem in police crime investigation department, attorney directorate and even in the court. They

3 Mr. Panahi , Interview –July 2012, Bamyan.
4 Mr. Panahi , Interview –July 2012, Bamyan.
5 Integrity Watch, Project Start-Up Survey 2011.
don’t have personnel graduated from law schools with expertise and skill in both legal field and criminal investigation.”

A decision in the court usually considers the primary evidence gathered by the police and presented by the lawyers from the attorney’s office. If there is something lacking or plainly incorrect in this evidence, it can negatively influence the court decision.

A judge in Bamyan Court, Mr. Pahnai, said:

“...We have tremendous problems with prosecutors and police departments. In most of the criminal cases, unfortunately, the police criminal investigation team is very weak. In many instances they do very poor investigation at primary stage of gathering evidence of a crime which is extremely crucial.... Even in some cases – if they are bribed – they destroy the evidence.”

The education of judges is also a concerning issue. Judges have either graduated from the Shariyat (Islamic Studies) School or law school. There is a difference between these two types of education and degrees. Those who have graduated from law school intensively study Afghanistan’s legal framework, criminology and other technical subjects. Judges that have graduated from the Shariyat School have a rigorous education in sharia law and relatively little education on technical issues and Afghan law, and this leads to contradictory or very different outcomes for judge performance in the court. This is a fundamental problem in the judicial recruitment system. All judges should have the same type and level of expertise.

The findings show that the lack—or at times, absence—of personnel at the district level is a huge challenge for the community. This is particularly visible in remote and insecure districts. For instance, there were no judges posted to Yakawlang district in Bamyan for almost six months.

In insecure areas, judges cannot attend their job regularly, which undermines the presence of formal justice systems in those areas. A resident of Tagab district stated, “The judge comes only twice a week. He travels to the district only when military caravan goes there.” Alternatively, the community uses traditional dispute resolution mechanisms and sometimes the Taliban justice system, which further undermines formal justice mechanisms. This does not, however, mean that local residents prefer the Taliban’s justice system to formal mechanisms. Consider the residents of Tagab, who are dissatisfied with the Taliban’s presence in their community due to their egregious acts of violence. An interviewee explained:

“People do not like Taliban as well. They recently did a suicide attack in the local market and eight civilians were killed. All people were poor and innocent.”

The lack of judges has placed people who have cases that need to be resolved in court in a quandary, where in the absence of judges they must rely on informal justice mechanisms.

---

6 Mr. Farzam Interview , July 2012, Bamyan.
7 Mr. Pahnai, Interview – July, Bamyan.
8 Mr. H Interview – July, Kapisa.
9 Mr. K Interview – July, Kapisa.
2. DESIGN OF THE PROJECT

2.1 Summary of project

Integrity Watch’s Court Trial Monitoring project, as a pilot, was started in January 2010 in Bamyan and later expanded into Kapisa in October 2011. The project’s core objective is “to address the concerns Afghans have about their courts.”

As it was mentioned, CTM is a community-based initiative which utilizes indirect engagement of citizens with judicial authorities. It is based on the assumption that daily observation of the formal judiciary by local monitors with the ability to report and comment on the decision of the judicial officials will result in a change in the attitudes and behaviour of the judiciary. In order to do so, Integrity Watch first mobilizes the community and engages with local officials by selecting local monitors to oversee the trial in their communities. Then Integrity Watch staff conducts trainings to build their capacity in terms of understanding legal issue and monitoring techniques. And the data gathered by local monitors to address the concerns related to judicial institutions are interpreted and gathered. The following diagram illustrates the process of court trial monitoring.

Process of Court Trial Monitoring

- Engagement of gov officials Community mobilization
- Authorization & access
- Election of monitors
- Baseline of judiciary & people's perceptions
- Data to measure progress within perceptions
- Training of local monitors & judiciary
- Technical capacity of LM; awareness of SA; access of LM with gov
- Reporting back to communities
- Ensure legitimacy & change of perceptions
- Monthly & Quarterly meeting in Kabul & province
- Data to measure progress within perceptions
- Court visits, discussion with customers and judges
- Reports of trial monitoring on basic procedures; trial
- End line
- Advocacy for policy change
- End line
2.2 Two selected projects

Project in Bamyan
In January 2011, the project was set up in Bamyan Province in the centre and in the districts of Waras, Panjab and Yakawlang. Bamyan was selected due to its security, its proximity to Kabul and pre-existing research on the relation between formal and informal justice systems in the province. Almost all planned activities for 2011 have been accomplished, including initial arrangements to start up the project, selecting local monitors, and monitoring the trials. The monitoring of the trials began in early August, 2011. Sixty-five cases were monitored by June 2012, including sixty-one criminal cases and four civil cases.

Project in Kapisa
Integrity Watch started the CTM project activities in Kapisa in October 2010. These included building a common understanding of the problems—notably through the baseline study by Eureka, preliminary discussions on a common knowledge database that is going to be led by CPAU, impact indicators and the outline of the final program report that will be drafted by IDLO on behalf of all partners. Additionally, the provincial coordinator was recruited and a local office was established.

The project covered the centre of Kapisa and three districts (Kuhistan, Awal Najrab, and Tagab). After community mobilisation, local monitors were selected from the local civil society, such as CDCs and provincial development assembly. CPAU assisted the project in terms of community mobilisation in Tagab district, since they had extensive field experience and understood the local context well.

The local monitors monitored 118 cases, the majority of which were criminal. The project has been implemented smoothly, and the local monitors are equipped with the skills necessary to conduct regular monitoring of the trials. However, there are a number of challenges in Tagab district in terms of security and the absence of judges.
3. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This section presents the findings of the evaluation and discusses four major areas: relevance, initial results, project management issues and sustainability of the project.

3.1 Relevancy to Afghanistan Context

Despite the fact that Afghanistan’s legal framework guarantees the right of the community to participate in court trials, very little systematic observation by citizens and civil society organizations has taken place. Media reporting about the proceedings of the courts has been virtually non-existent so far. Civil society organisations have little participation in monitoring the justice system performance. Therefore, it is important for civil society to take an active part in bringing about accountability and transparency of justice bodies through systematic observation.

The existence of accountability mechanisms alone is not sufficient to ensure integrity in the performance of judicial bodies and safeguard the right of access to a free and fair trial for Afghan citizens at the subnational level. In other words, the top-down accountability mechanisms seem to be dysfunctional. There is a need to explore bottom-up accountability mechanism opportunities in order to improve the justice system in Afghanistan. Citizen-led efforts to increase judicial accountability may partially fill this gap since participation of citizens in an anti-corruption campaign is a crucial part of the holistic anti-corruption approach.

A large number of the CSOs are facilitating ill-designed capacity building initiatives. This has relegated them to the role of “implementing partners,” rather than actively playing the crucial role of watchdogs to bring up the voices of Afghan citizens. Therefore, it is important for civil society to take an active role in demanding accountability from judicial bodies based on data collected through systematic observation of trials and judicial mechanisms in practice.

Citizen-led accountability is at the heart of Integrity Watch’s strategic mandate. Therefore, Integrity Watch tries to encourage citizens to actively take part in anti-corruption efforts through its four pillars. Corruption in the justice sector is a huge problem in Afghanistan. Intervention in this area is thus aligned with Integrity Watch’s overall strategic mandate.

The program is relevant to both rural and urban settings, especially rural areas because of the poor performance of courts at the district level. The informants interviewed strongly recommended expanding the program in rural areas. The project staff also believed that implementation of this project can greatly contribute to the improvement of judiciary institutions and providing access to justice in rural areas for the court’s clients, since the communities at district level have a very limited awareness of their rights, obligations and duties as citizens.

The recent commitment by the Afghan government to fighting corruption expressed at the Tokyo conference and Karzai’s recent decree on curbing corruption are also opportunities for the program to push policymakers to improve the justice system and to encourage Afghan citizens to participate in anti-corruption campaigns. The data that will be gathered by local monitors can improve the understanding on
what is going on in the courts at the subnational level. This can also facilitate a constructive dialogue with policymakers both at the international and national levels in order to improve the justice sector.

3.2 Initial Results

The findings show that the program has made substantial achievements. However, it should be mentioned that at the initial stage of the project, there were many challenges. The following achievements highlight the most significant outcomes of the project:

The change of Judges’ Perceptions of Participation in the trial

Almost all of the local monitors interviewed had experienced difficulties being accepted as an observer to oversee the trial and judicial performance. At the beginning of the project (in both Bamiyan and Kapisa), the judges believed they were independent and they did not need to be accountable to anyone except those above them in the judicial hierarchy. This created a misguided perception of “unconditional independency.”

It can be argued that this kind of interpretation of the “separation of powers” doctrine is inappropriate and can lead to authoritarianism. Judges have every right to maintain their independence in jurisprudence and avoid influences that may tamper their neutrality, but they do not have a right to do so behind closed doors and away from public scrutiny. CTM’s intervention and the recent authorization letter by the Supreme Court (introducing the program to provincial officials), has to some extent altered the perception of provincial court officials, who now have moved from “unconditional independency” to “conditional independency”.

“First time, I visited court in regard to monitoring a trial, the judge was not happy and he said that judiciary is an independent body and we will not report to any other entity. It took me two hours to convince the judge to allow us in monitoring the trial. Now, whenever, I visit the court he always welcomes me and even also offer me tea.”

“Monitoring is right of people. If someone from Integrity Watch come to monitor the trial and the judge says we are independent and we don’t talk to you. It is not correct. First you [Judge] should read the letter from Supreme Court … it is also a norm of free and fair trial that people should participate in the trails.”

In spite of some changes in the judges’ perceptions, court staff as well as some judges are still suspicious and reluctant about the benefits of and need for community engagement. In Kuhistan district, the judge was reluctant to be interviewed and he argued that the judiciary is an independent branch of government and the high court has advised them not to be responsible to any other institution or individual except the court. The local monitors also confirmed “the court’s staff are not fully happy with what we are doing.” In sum, there is some degree of change in judges’ perceptions. However, this needs further work and convincing.

Signing the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Supreme Court - which is under process – may help the program to achieve this objective. Integrity Watch is trying to sign a MoU with the Supreme Court to direct bilateral cooperation and collaboration between the SC and Integrity Watch. This MoU is imperative for long-term cooperation. The draft of this document is attached as annex to this report.

10 Mr. H, Interview – July, Kapisa.
11 Mr. Falahi, Interview – July, Yakawlang.
12 Ms. Fatima Interview – July, Kapisa.
Monitoring the trial and conducting public trial
The findings show that there is a gradual upturn in community participation in overseeing trials. From August to December (2011), local monitors could monitor only fourteen cases in Bamyan, but from January to June (2012) they have managed to monitor fifty cases. This shows an almost 32% increase in the number of cases. These cases were monitored in the central Bayman court because district courts were not functioning well. In Kapisa, one hundred eighteen cases were monitored until June 2012.

In addition, conducting open and public trials is a step forward and toward promoting transparency in the performance of the judiciary. In both provinces, a number of open and public trials took place. The courts also started using a notice broad to announce the open trial dates. This is crucial in restoring the community’s trust in formal justice bodies.

A public trial was held in Bamyan on July 23. It was a bribery case. This case was important because the police officer was arrested as a part of a joint initiative between the provincial governor, provincial council, and police department to fight corruption. The police officer had asked Mr. A for a bribe of 15000 AFs for a traffic accident case. A large number of Bamyan residents participated in the trials, including civil society activists and Integrity Watch’s local monitors. The officer was sentenced to two years in jail. The presence of an observer was important because there were many colorful rumors that the police officer had links to powerful top officials in the attorney’s office and the police department, which means the court might not have made a fair decision on his case.

Furthermore, one of the important achievements of the project that needs to be highlighted is the local monitors’ effort to mobilize the community. LMs are active in conducting community mobilization in order to publicize the court’s decision and CTM practices through participating in local shuras and Friday Prayers. This practice seems to be very effective in bridging the gap between the community and formal justice system. This further encourages local residents to bring their cases to the formal justice system, who previously would not have done so. As Mr. H, one of the court officials in Kapisa, stated:

“Conducting open trial and community monitoring will restore the community trust on justice and rule of law especially when open trial addresses the criminal cases. The communities who participate in the trial will talk about the case in their communities and it will be an alarm for criminal groups that they will punish upon doing any crime.”

Absence of judges and CTM’s efforts
As previously mentioned, the absence and lack of personnel in the justice body at the district level is a huge challenge. This was illustrated by the fact that Bamyan’s Yakawlang district did not have functional court or a judge for eight months. The story began after Qazi Muhammad Nabil - the district court judge - passed away, and then for almost five months the court did not have judge. During this period, another person was deployed to fill the position. However, according to community, he was reluctant to serve from the first day. On March 2012, Mr. Mohabi was assigned as judge to the district, but he was on leave for a while and he only recently started his work (June 2012). Mr. Mohabi acknowledged that “lawyers are reluctant to be

---
13 Mr. J, Interview- July, Kapisa.
deployed in Hazarajat.\textsuperscript{14} The residences of Panjab and Waras have experienced similar circumstances. The judges were often absent in this two districts. However, these positions have recently been filled. Perhaps one of the reasons for this reluctance is the fact that most of the Hazarajat areas are located in the central region, the provinces and districts relatively remote. Serving in those communities is a challenging task especially there is not any incentive mechanism in place to encourage the judges.

One of the important achievements of the program is the contribution to bringing judges to the districts. Upon realising the problem of the lack of personnel in their district, the local monitors who were supposed to monitor trials pushed the provincial authorities to pay attention to improving courts at the district level and, in particular, filling the vacant positions. The LMs in Yakawlang district mentioned that they shared this issue with Appeal Court officials in Bamyan and with the Provincial Governor. They also regularly met the newly appointed judge to make sure that the court’s functions properly and adequately address the community’s concerns and cases. As one of local monitors said:

\begin{quote}
“We also mobilized the community; however, we didn’t have enough resources to run a bigger campaign. During the absence of judge, we visited the appeal court director and shared our problem concerning to absence of judges in the court. We also visited the provincial governor.”\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

The challenge in insecure areas seems to be more complicated, and community intervention appears to be less effective in comparison to rural, under-served districts. In insecure areas, judges cannot go to their job regularly. Alternatively, the community uses traditional dispute resolution mechanism and sometimes the Taliban justice system. Due to the presence of Taliban, the community cannot work freely, and this is the reason behind the mixed results in insecure areas. The local monitor also mentioned that “the communities are suspicious of us; they think that we’re spying and getting a large amount of money for working with the CTM program.”\textsuperscript{16} The most dangerous risk is the threat to the lives of local monitors if the Talban catches them with Integrity Watch’s ID cards. Since the court is not functioning well in Tagab district, most of the cases are being processed by the provincial courts. Based on the experience in Tagab, it is difficult to recommend further expansion of the program in insecure areas.

\textsuperscript{14} Mr. Falahi Interview – July, Bamyan.
\textsuperscript{15} Focus Group Discussion – July, Bamyan.
\textsuperscript{16} Mr. H, Interview – July, Kapisa.
## Summary of the initial result in visited areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Kapisa Centre</th>
<th>Kuhsitan</th>
<th>Bamyan Centre</th>
<th>Yakawlang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The change in perception of judges in public participation in the trial</td>
<td>There has been a significant change in the perception of judges towards community participation in the trials. However, they are still reluctant to fully cooperate with the local monitors.</td>
<td>There has been a modest change in the perception of judges towards community participation in the trials. However, they are still reluctant to fully cooperate with the local monitors.</td>
<td>There has been a modest change in the perception of judges towards community participation in the trials. However, they are still reluctant to fully cooperate with the local monitors.</td>
<td>The judge is fully cooperative in conducting court trial monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the trial and conducting public trial</td>
<td>It seems it is becoming a common practice to conduct open trial for important cases and put a notice in the noticeboard about the date and venue of trials. However, the insignificant cases take place in the judge’s office.</td>
<td>The same trend was discovered in Kohistan District court.</td>
<td>The same trend was discovered in Bamyan centre court.</td>
<td>The judge has recently started his work and he is supportive of conducting open trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of judges and CTM efforts</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Since the community started local monitoring, the judges regularly attend their offices and the courts’ clients are satisfied with the court performance. It is also worth mentioning that the director of appeal court in Kapisa centre is a reformed-minded person and he regularly observes his staff performance</td>
<td>The same trend was found in Bamyan centre court.</td>
<td>Yakawlang district did not have judges for almost eight months. As a result of community efforts and the appeal court director, the district court position has been filled and it is expected that the court will be functioning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3. Project Management Arrangement

This part of the report discusses four key issues in regard to project management and methodology: coordination with key stakeholders, using data, capacity building, sustainability, and amendments and the future of the project.

**Coordination with key stakeholders**

Coordination with key stakeholders is a key factor of the successful implementation of the project, and Integrity Watch's team has also improved since the last evaluation. Receiving the letter from the Supreme Court was an important step in obtaining support from local officials. In addition, Integrity Watch is trying to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Supreme Court for further cooperation and institutionalization of this cooperation. Nevertheless, Integrity Watch needs to cooperate further with potential partners who can help the program in terms of providing technical support and advocacy, such as International Development Law Organization (IDLO), Alburoni University and Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission (AIHRC). In Kapisa, the Law and Sharia School at Alburoni University can help the program in terms of technical support. Since trial monitoring is extremely technical in nature, there is a risk that community members may not be able to catch the crucial details of the trial that are imperative for advocacy purposes in order to ensure transparency and accountability in the court practice and address the community concerns in regard to corruption taking place in the court. In Bamyan, AIHRC has human rights volunteers all over the central region. They are trained in human rights and other concepts related to Integrity Watch's mandates. In the program description, it is stated that Integrity Watch will train a group of local monitors with mixed backgrounds, individuals who will be "selected" based on their technical knowledge and others who will be "elected" based on their community representation. The rationale for the mixed composition of the monitoring team is to make the process representative and participatory, while simultaneously benefiting from the legitimacy of technically-trained members. This pairing also has another advantage in terms of capacity building of the local monitors. It seems that the number of local monitors who are elected based on their influence in the community is greater than those with technical knowledge. Having the participation of Alburoni University and AIHRC will greatly contribute to the project and address this concern. It is worth mentioning that both the Dean of Law at Alburoni University and AIHRC have promised their support to this project.

**Using the Data**

The project has also included the development of a database in order to gather the data collected by LMs. However, there has been little decided on how the gathered data should be used in order to lay the groundwork for advocacy for better performance of the court and to address community concerns related to the justice system at the national and provincial level. As it was mentioned above, it seems that coordination between the various Integrity Watch pillars is insufficient. CTM at its current capacity seems to be unable to interpret the data and push for advocacy. Thus, the Integrity Watch research department and advocacy unit should be further engaged in CTM's activities.

---

17 On 31 March 2012, Integrity Watch obtained a letter from Supreme Court to officially introduce the program to court officials in both provinces, Bamyan and Kapisa.
**Capacity building**

The local monitors and interviewees had a mixed response in terms of the capacity development. In Kapisa, most of the LMs are happy with the results of the training that they attended over the course of the project.

In order to build the capacity of local monitors, Integrity Watch provides training on monitoring techniques and basic community legal education. In Bamiyan, the legal training was conducted by Integrity Watch staff in collaboration with other experts. In Kapisa, in addition to the project introduction workshop, an extra training was conducted by IDLO to further equip them with legal education. The capacity building trainings in Kapisa have equipped the local monitors with the skills and knowledge to conduct monitoring. They were satisfied with the quality of both trainings conducted by Integrity Watch and IDLO. They did, however, still request additional trainings and materials for better preparation and education. The LMs came up with the idea of establishing a small resource centre in the Kapisa office. Having a resource centre will provide independent learning opportunities for the LMs and, most importantly, it will contribute to the sustainability of the project after Integrity Watch’s withdrawal from the community.

In Bamiyan, the training component seemed to be insufficient to prepare local monitors to deal with their assigned tasks. This was evident from the lack of technical knowledge on system and the request for additional training. The local monitors who were visited pointed out the need for further training. Perhaps the reason is that they didn’t receive the three days training conducted by IDLO that was conducted for Kapisa LMs. Therefore, the application of IDLO’s training package would also be beneficial for Bamiyan or other provinces.

As it was pointed out in the previous evaluation report, the training package trains only the local monitors, but it is equally important to train the judges, prosecutors and other stakeholders in understanding the project’s aims, objectives and implementation strategy. The program staff has, however, presented the objectives of the program to the judicial personnel.

### 3.4 Sustainability

The findings show that there is a sizable concern with regards to the sustainability of the CTM program. Will the community continue to monitor after Integrity Watch leaves the community? Even if they have are willing, are they well-equipped to do so? The first concern that needs to be addressed is striking a balance between institutionalisation and volunteerism in the project. Undoubtedly, a smooth implementation of the project requires institutionalisation of CTM’s activities. Though the efforts to institutionalize CTM - such as preparing a work plan, providing a monitoring checklist, supervision of the provincial coordinator – may minimize the energy of volunteerism of the local monitors to continue their work as community-driven initiatives. In some communities, LMs perceive themselves as an employee of Integrity Watch rather than community representatives. There were also some passionate LMs willing to carry on their role as an anti-corruption activist, not only in the justice sectors, but also in other service delivery sectors such as health and education.
The perception of local officials is also crucial to the sustainability of the project. LMs in the centre of Kapisa mentioned that, “Even if we want to continue doing ‘local monitoring,’ the officials in the court will not let us to monitor the trial. Now we have a card (LM card provided by Integrity Watch) and this is why the judge let us.”

In addition, the non-confrontational approach of the LMs in overseeing the trial is another concern that needs to be addressed. It seems that the local monitors are advised by project management team to employ a non-confrontational approach towards judges due to the fact that a confrontational approach may damage the relationship with court official. Nevertheless, this issue has probably made officials in the court think that CTM is a short-term project and it has nothing to do with citizens’ right to access to information, right to a free and fair trial and to hold the court officials accountable. The judges are also suspicious about the Integrity Watch and local monitors. Advocacy and lobbying at the national level to provide a legal mandate to community-driven accountability initiatives is therefore imperative for the sustainability of the program.

3.5 Beyond the Current Phase
The initial design of the project has been changed in terms of the project objective and methodology. In the initial program, the description of the objectives of the project was very broad and it was built on the assumption that the Supreme Court and officials at provincial level would be supportive. However, Integrity Watch has narrowed down the project objectives by modifying the program’s log-frame and amendments from the proposal submitted to the US-Embassy for Balkh and Nangarhar provinces. This shows an evolution in understanding the contextual factors influencing the project implementation and achieving expected changes. For instance, in the recent proposal submitted to the US-Embassy, the project objective is stated as: “To provide capacity-building for communities in Nangarhar and Balkh provinces for trial monitoring and corruption check, and to promote mutual recognition and cooperation between traditional dispute resolution actors and government justice workers in these provinces.” This is very close to CTM’s practice in the field. In terms of expected results, five issues have been highlighted:

1. **Capacity Building**: Local monitors have increased knowledge of basic aspects of Afghan Law;
2. **Trial Statistics**: Collect independent data on the number of the trials taking place in the province;
3. **Trial Openness**: Through consistent presence, increase acceptance of public trials;
4. **Trial Quality Data**: Collect data measuring the above basic indicators of trial fairness;
5. **Entry and Exit Surveys**: Through the program, increase community trust in local courts.

These five areas are important indicators that need to be targeted in the future expansion of the project. The capacity-building component of the project should be standardized by developing a training manual. The manual must be interactive. Whereas some local monitors are either illiterate or unable to grasp the skill and knowledge of highly technical and complicated tasks, it is imperative to visualize the training material by producing short films, and other interactive initiatives. Replicating a ‘procedures
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manual’ – such as the CBM procedures manual - may be equally fruitful to institutionalize the CTM practice and especially the capacity-building component. The CTM team has developed a basic procedures manual to provide guidelines for project, but it needs to be further developed.

As it was mentioned above, a paramount aspect of the CTM project is the research element incorporated in the program. Therefore, greater attention should be paid on gathering and interpreting the statistical and qualitative data. The statistical data will be collected through the local monitors’ trial monitoring and observations. However, the existing data collection form and tools need to be revised in order to further incorporate the standards of free and fair trials and the court’s functionality and accountability. In order to present a solid and in-depth analysis of the challenges associated with the justice system, CTM should produce a number of ad hoc reports on important cases utilizing qualitative research techniques. Merely relying on quantitative tools may lead the program to overlook the crucial details that are not included in the CTM monitoring forms. This requires additional cooperation with Integrity Watch’s Research departments.

It seems that Integrity Watch is going to imitate the community-based monitoring of infrastructure to CTM as well by developing a toolkit to build the capacity of communities and other NGOs “to reproduce or adapt the local monitoring approach”. Decentralization of CTM experience is good idea. However, there is a concern regarding the local civil society organizations’ research capacity. The CTM research component demands a decent research expertise, and most Afghan NGOs are lacking such capacity. Therefore, Integrity Watch should play a leadership role in the long-term future until corruption is significantly reduced and transparency and access are increased in the justice sector.

The current area of intervention for CTM is insufficient to address existing problems in the justice system at the subnational level. As it was discussed above, a large amount of corruption is carried out by other law enforcement stakeholders such as attorney office, police department and Huquq. This may seriously affect the court decision that is supposed to provide justice to the citizens. Therefore, Integrity Watch should also intervene in these areas. Due to the nature of these institutions, citizen-led accountability efforts through community-based monitoring seems to be unsuitable because police and prosecutors carry out their tasks in secrecy by default of the system and there is little chance of community engagement to monitor their actions. Integrity Watch should focus in this area through conducting additional qualitative research. Again, this requires coordination between research and CTM teams. As it was discussed, conducting a series of research papers on the justice system is needed to explore areas vulnerable to corruption in the attorney and police department and how these contribute to the failure of the entire justice system to deliver justice to its clients. In addition, writing case studies on the cases where the court’s decision is unjust due to the corruption in the mentioned institution will be a productive tool to promote understanding of the challenges associated with justice system and ultimately address those challenges by providing policy recommendations to the Afghanistan government and international community.
4. RECOMMENDATION

Overall, the project is a relevant and appropriate intervention to address the corruption challenge associated with justice institutions at the sub national level. Therefore, the project should be expanded in other provinces considering the following recommendations:

- Community Court Watch will make a significant contribution towards the development of formal justice institutions, especially at the district level where the court performance is weak. Therefore, it should be expanded to other provinces. Due to security and lack of results in insecure areas, expansion and implementation of the project in insecure areas is not advisable. The local monitors should be paired both in terms of their influence in the community and technical knowledge.
- A comprehensive training package is required in order to better-equip the communities who are intended to do “court watch”
- Coordination with the universities, Independent Human Rights Commission, Afghanistan Bar Association, and other civil society organizations will greatly help this project.
- The training component should also train the judges, prosecutors and other stakeholders in understanding the project’s aims, objectives and implementation strategy.
- A balance should be kept between institutionalization of the project and promoting volunteerism in the community. This can be achieved through involving the communities in some of the activities of the project and gradually increasing their role in the project to transfer project management skills to the community members.
- Civil Society organizations should work at the national level so that the national authorities provide a legal mandate to community-driven accountability initiatives. The access to information campaign is an encouraging step.

Research organisations, think tanks and NGOs, should support court watch initiatives in translating the data gathered by local communities into policy-oriented papers.
Annex 1: Methodology

This review was conducted by reviewing program documents and carrying out two weeks of fieldwork in Bamyan and Kapisa. The fact that it is early to define the impacts of the project was an important consideration while designing the methodology. Initial results, however, can be identified through the gathering of a large amount of first-hand data from the field and stakeholders’ perceptions and experiences. The following data collection techniques were therefore employed:

Desk Review: A large number of documents were reviewed by the evaluator, including the project proposal, project progress reports, and the feasibility study report. Academic literature on the justice system in Afghanistan was also reviewed to some extent.

Semi-Structured: Six semi-structured interviews were conducted with the following individuals: Project Manager Provincial coordinators (Bamyan and Kapisa), Focal Points, Lawyers and Civil Society Members. The flexible nature of semi-structured interviews allowed the evaluator to deeply explore opportunities and challenges associated with the project by asking additional questions during the interview. This tool was especially important to discover unforeseen concerns and issues in the project.

Structured Interview: This tool was mainly applied in order to interview the local monitors, government officials and project beneficiaries. A series of questions was prepared in advance based on the interviewee’s background, and the same questions were asked of other interviewees who share similar characteristics. This provided an opportunity to compare the opinions and experiences of different groups in different contexts where the project has been implemented. In addition, the technique was fruitful to identify the initial results of the project.

Focus Group Discussions: FGD was employed to gather data from Local monitors. Four focus group interviews were conducted. FGD was imperative to compare the views and concerns of local monitors. FGD was also a productive method to gain accurate data and to verify it through triangulation. Additionally, the observation of interviewees’ behaviour was another advantage of this tool.

Observation was a crucial research method that was applied during the entire process of evaluation, including checking the project documentation and filing system and gauging the reaction and behaviour of actors involved in the project. This was particularly useful while observing the trials that were monitored by local monitors.
### Summary of Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Number and Place</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing background information</td>
<td>Due to time limitation many of the selected articles have not been reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Interview</td>
<td>Two per province</td>
<td>Getting information from same specific group of individuals.</td>
<td>On some occasions, the interviewees were not keen to answer the questions quick to the point. Therefore, it was a little challenging to manage the tension caused by questions that were disinteresting for interviewees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Structured Interview</td>
<td>Three per province</td>
<td>Flexibility during the interview to investigate unforeseen topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
<td>Two per province</td>
<td>Gathering large amount of data and triangulation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Memorandum of Understanding

Memorandum of Understanding between the Supreme Court of Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and Integrity Watch Afghanistan

Parties and Assignment:
This Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) is the result of consultation between the Supreme Court (hereinafter referred to “SC”) having its main office at Chahar Rahi Sehat Aama, Kabul, Afghanistan and Integrity Watch Afghanistan (hereinafter referred to “IWA”) having its main office at Kulula Pushta road, Kabul, Afghanistan. The MoU will direct the bilateral cooperation and collaboration between the SC and Integrity Watch with regard to the implementation of the Court Trial Monitoring Program (hereinafter to “CTM Program”).

Introduction to CTM Program
Court Trial Monitoring Program strives to address the concern of Afghans about the state court as well as to ensure that courts apply procedural laws consistently and fairly, with a view to strengthening community involvement in improving the rule of law in Afghanistan. The ultimate aim is to improve citizens’ access to and trust in the formal court system and enhance the relationship between the state and society.

The program rests on people’s constitutional rights to have access to an open court. Article 128 of the 2004 Constitution of Afghanistan states that “all trials should be open to the public and each person shall have the right to attend them within the provision of the laws, with the exception of those cases which by law are allowed to be closed to the public”.

The specific objectives of the project are: 1) Speak with communities and determine their precise concerns about formal justice mechanism; 2) Provide legal education to community members regarding criminal and civil procedural laws and how these laws relate to their concerns about formal justice mechanisms; 3) Encourage community involvement in the functioning of their local primary level courts and increase their trust in local courts; 4) Support community advocacy for change in their district courts; 5) Collect independent data on the number of trials taking place in the province as well as on people’s perceptions of court fairness and application of procedural laws; 6) Through consistent presence, increase acceptance of public trials.

The program’s target groups will be the communities that live relatively close to district courts. The involvement of communities in monitoring local institutions not only reduces the cost of monitoring, but provides community members with skills that are retained. This will further improve the relation of the communities with court officials.
Both parties have agreed to the following:

**Supreme Court:**

a) The Afghanistan Supreme Court welcomes civil society programs which would encourage the rule of law by fostering a better understanding of the Afghan law among the population and building a cooperative relationship between the local populations’ trusted local monitors and the Afghan government’s justice officials.

b) The courts of appeal and the primary courts at district and provincial level will not prevent the local monitors of Integrity Watch Afghanistan from monitoring of trials except when the law specifically requires that trials must not be open to the public;

c) The court officials welcome the Integrity Watch Local Monitors at their offices on monthly basis in order to exchange their comments and cooperate with each other for the better improvement of integrity and transparency.

d) The court officials invite representative of Integrity Watch to participate at the coordination meeting held by the court of appeal regarding the activity and achievement of justice and judiciary institutions.

e) The representatives of and local monitors associated with Integrity Watch will be invited if legal trainings are conducted to build up the capacities and upgrade the knowledge of stakeholders.

f) If the court officials have any complains with the procedure and method of monitoring of open trials conducted by Integrity Watch Local Monitors, the court officials or the Supreme Court shall inform Integrity Watch Director in written.

g) The Supreme Court may use without altering it the data provided by Integrity Watch in order to improve its policies, processes, and procedures for a better delivery of justice to the citizen and increased transparency and accountability of the judiciary institutions.

h) Both parties consult with each to establish policies and procedures that create an environment favorable to civil society and grassroots monitoring of the courts.

**Integrity Watch Afghanistan:**

a) Integrity Watch Afghanistan will share its findings with court officials quarterly for the improvement and development of judiciary affairs;

b) Mobilizing of local communities and election of local monitors with consultation and collaboration of communities and various existing councils for monitoring of open trials;
c) Integrity Watch Afghanistan waves the way for the local monitors to monitor and observe the open trials;

d) The local monitors of Integrity Watch Afghanistan attend the open trials at the court with the observation of rule of law. During the trial, the local monitors will strictly avoid commenting and interfering on the verdict of the court.

e) Collection of comments from local monitors with loyalty regarding the quality and posture of conducting of open trials and share them with court officials on monthly basis.

f) Integrity Watch Afghanistan presents the findings of its research to Supreme Court that reflects the view of the local people.

g) Integrity Watch Afghanistan whenever conducts workshops and seminars for the capacity building of court officials or reinforcement of transparency at district and provincial levels, the judiciary and justice institutions are informed through issuing letters.

h) Integrity Watch Afghanistan ensures integrity for the monitoring process and prevents potential or known abuse of duty by Local Monitors.

i) Integrity Watch Afghanistan will raise the funds necessary for the implementation of the CTM, use the findings to promote broadly the results of the current collaboration and to advocate for improved access to justice in line with Afghanistan’s policies and international commitments.

General Provisions:

- This agreement will remain in effect until one of the parties, in consultation with the other, decides to end it in writing.

- Any changes to the arrangements shall be done by mutual agreement through an amendment to this memorandum of understanding.

- Any matters not specifically covered by this agreement could be dealt with under a mutual agreement between the Supreme Court and Integrity Watch Afghanistan.

- All further correspondence regarding this MoU, other than signed letters of agreement or amendments thereto, should be addressed to the Supreme Court (SC), 3rd Macrorayan, Kabul, Afghanistan and Integrity Watch Afghanistan (IWA), Kulula Pushta road, Kabul, Afghanistan.

- This agreement is signed in duplicate in Kabul on day _____ of the month of _____ 1391 in Dari and Pashtu with all versions being of equal standing.

- Both parties signed this MoU are in agreement with the provisions set forth above. This MoU is a legal document signed between the Supreme Court and Integrity Watch Afghanistan to strengthen their collaboration, and their support for higher integrity in Afghanistan.
Annex 3: Trial Questionnaire for Observation of Civil Cases

Kapisa Province

Targeted Districts:
1. Mahmud-i-Raqi  □  2. Kohistan Awal  □
3. Nejrab  □  4. Tagab  □

Date: ___________________________  Case No. ___________________________

Name of Judges: 1. __________________________  2. ___________________  3. ________________

Name of LM 1. ______________________________  2. LM 2. ______________________________

Q1: Did you have any difficulties entering the court property?
   1. Yes  □  2. No  □
   If yes, please explain.
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q2: What is the charge (s) against the accused?
   1. Family dispute  □  2. Land dispute  □  3. Trees’ dispute  □
   10. Escaping from House  □  11. Others  □

Q3: Gender of plaintiff?

Q4: Gender of defendant?
   1. Man  □  2. Woman  □

Q5: Did the plaintiff have defense attorney?
   1. Yes  □  2. No  □

Q6: Did the plaintiff present witnesses at the court?
   1. Yes  □  2. No  □

Q7: Did the defendant present witnesses at the court?
   1. Yes  □  2. No  □

Q8: Did the defendant have defense attorney?
   1. Yes  □  2. No  □

Q9: Were the witnesses capable to testify?
   1. Yes  □  2. No  □
If No, please explain.

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

10: Was the representative of Huqooq present at the court?
1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐

Q11: Where was the trial conducted?
1. At the courtroom ☐ 2. At the judge’s office ☐ 3. In other room ☐

Q12: Was the court adjourned?
1. Yes ☐ 2. No ☐

Q13: If yes, please specify the reason?
1. The witnesses were not present ☐
2. The defense attorney was not present ☐
3. The defendant was not present ☐
4. The plaintiff was not present ☐
5. The case was referred to the peace makers ☐

Q14: Which court did consider the case?
1. Primary Court ☐ 2. Court of Appeal ☐

Q15: What was the verdict of the court?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q16: Comments, suggestions, and observations of the local monitors.
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
Annex 4: Trial Questionnaire for Observation of Criminal Cases

Targeted Districts:
1. Mahmud-i-Raqi  2. Kohistan Awal
3. Nejrab         4. Tagab

Date:___________________________________ Case No. _______________________________________

Name of Judges: 1. ____________________ 2. _______________________ 3. ________________

Name of LM 1. ______________________________ 2. LM 2. ______________________________

Q1: Did you have any difficulties entering the court property?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐
   If yes, please explain.
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Q2: What is the charge (s) against the accused?

Q3: Gender of accused person(s)?

Q4: Did the plaintiff have defense attorney?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐

Q5: Did the accused have defense attorney?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐

Q6: Was the crime visible?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐

Q7: Was the scene of the crime illustrated by the police?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐

Q8: Was the comment of medical or criminal technique illustrated at the court?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐

Q9: Did the prosecutor present witnesses at the court?
   1. Yes ☐  2. No ☐
Q10: Were the witnesses capable to testify?
1. Yes        2. No       
If No, please explain.
............................................................................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................................................................

Q11: Where was the trial conducted?
1. At the courtroom   2. At the judge’s office  3. In other room       

Q12: Was the court adjourned?
1. Yes    2. No       

Q13: If yes, please specify the reason?
1. The witnesses were not present  2. The defense attorney was not present  
3. The defendant was not present  4. It was preliminary trial  
5. Lack of evidence and proofs  6. Exclusion of case was not present  

Q14: Which court did consider the case?
1. Primary Court  2. Court of Appeal  

Q15: What was the verdict of the court for the accused?
1. Short detention  2. Middle detention  3. Long detention  
7. The accused was released  

Q16: Comments, suggestions, and observations of the local monitors.
............................................................................................................................................................................
............................................................................................................................................................................


Schnabel & Albrecht, (2005), Security Sector Reform and Post-conflict Peacebuilding.

Note: In addition to the bibliography the following documents were reviewed:

- Project proposal
- Project monthly reports
- Integrity Watch Quarterly reports
- Feasibility study reports
- Training Materials
- Integrity Watch communication and advocacy strategy