

PROJECT TITLE: SUPPORTING AND SYNTHESIZING COMMUNITY-BASED JUSTICE RESEARCH (“Community-Based Justice Research”)

IDRC Grant Number: 108787-003

Grant Period: 2018 – 2022

Final Technical Report

Canadian Forum on Civil Justice (CFCJ)
2013 Ignat Kaneff Building, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Toronto,
ON, Canada M3J 1P3

Research Team:
Lisa Moore
Trevor C.W. Farrow
Ab Currie

Submitted by: Lisa Moore



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Synthesis of the Project..... 2

2.0 Research Problem.....5

3.0 Research Findings8

 3.1 Overview of Studies.....8

 3.2 Summary of Research Findings 10

4.0 Project Implementation and Management 18

 4.1 COVID-19 Impacts.....20

5.0 Project Outputs and Dissemination 21

6.0 Impact.....26

7.0 Recommendations..... 27

1.0 SYNTHESIS OF PROJECT

This is the final technical report for the Supporting and Synthesizing Community-Based Justice Research (“Community-Based Justice Research”) project.

The Community-Based Justice Research (CBJR) project launched in 2018 as a collaborative, multi-country research initiative with the Canadian Forum on Civil Justice (CFCJ) in Canada, the Centre for Community Justice and Development (CCJD) in South Africa, the Centre for Alternative Policy Research and Innovation (CAPRI) in Sierra Leone, and the Katiba Institute in Kenya. The CBJR project is funded by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC).¹ Additional support for project partners in Kenya, South Africa and Sierra Leone was provided by the Open Society Initiative for West Africa (OSIWA) and—early in the project—by Open Society Foundations (OSF). Critical research guidance was provided to all project partners throughout the project by IDRC, under the leadership of Senior Program Specialist Adrian Di Giovanni.

The CBJR project is an extension of the IDRC’s Understanding the Costs and Benefits of Community-Based Justice Services (“Community Justice”) collection of research projects. This collection includes separate studies led by CBJR project partners in Sierra Leone, Kenya and South Africa. Each study in this collection is designed and implemented by the respective in-country research team but is similarly centered on gathering country-level insights on the costs and benefits of justice services used at the local level to resolve select civil and family justice problems. Findings from the Community Justice collection of studies inform a final, pan-project, CBJR report.

The 4-year CBJR project provided an opportunity for collaborative, cross-border research ideation, peer-to-peer support, local-global research mobilization, and the rich discussion of methodologies, research challenges, best practices, and key learnings from research activities taking place concurrently across projects. At its core, the CBJR project was guided by the following objectives:

- (1) Identify and assess the monetary, temporal, and other input costs to justice seekers and providers of locally accessible justice services relative to the outcomes derived from these justice mechanisms; and,
- (2) Based on research insights, provide recommendations and/or other observations to better support and scale community-based justice programs for broader impacts.

For the three projects in Sub-Saharan Africa, additional research goals guide the scope of the research activities and project deliverables. Final Community Justice project reports are available through the IDRC digital [library](#) and respective partner websites. As part of the CBJR project, the CFCJ has also produced blogs, articles, papers, and plain language resources which explore findings and perspectives on community justice

¹ The CBJR project (and the Community Justice collection of projects) is funded by IDRC. For the duration of the CBJR project, grant funding was administered according to the terms of a tripartite agreement with the CFCJ, York University, and IDRC. Grant funding supported all CFCJ work in the CBJR project and several project activities for partners in Sub-Saharan Africa (discussed further in Section 5.0). CBJR project partners were otherwise each responsible for costs related to research execution, administration, data analysis and reporting related to their respective in-country Community Justice research project.

research in Canada, across the Community Justice collection of studies, and globally. All CFCJ CBJR project outputs are available on the CBJR project page: <https://cfcj-fcjc.org/our-projects/community-based-justice-research-cbjr/>.

A brief description of the studies in the Community Justice collection follows.

- *The Costs and Benefits of Community-based Justice in Sierra Leone* led by CAPRI: This project seeks to address the lack of empirical evidence on the scale-up costs and benefits of community-based justice services in Sierra Leone. Specifically, this project seeks to assess the direct and indirect economic and social costs and benefits of community-based justice services relative to the direct and indirect outcomes of community-based justice services (paralegal NGOs), and further, to make recommendations on strategies for scaling up access to justice in Sierra Leone. The initiatives assessed in this study include: (i) government funded Legal Aid Board; and, (ii) NGOs delivering paralegal services.
- *Alternative Approaches to Access to Justice in Kenya: A Cost-benefit Analysis* led by Katiba Institute and the University of Nairobi: The main objective of this study was to analyze costs and benefits associated with different initiatives that citizens use to resolve their disputes. The initiatives assessed in this study include: (i) court based initiatives (Court Annexed Mediation); (ii) state based initiatives; community based initiatives (traditional); (iii) civil society based initiatives; and (iv) religious and community-based initiatives.
- *Scaling Access to Justice Research Collaboration* led by CCJD: In South Africa, community advice offices (CAOs) and community-based paralegals (CBPs) constitute a complex community-based justice system. CAOs deliver a wide range of free socio-legal and at times socio-economic services to marginalised and vulnerable communities, including women and children. CBPs operate and manage the offices, which exist in urban, peri-rural and rural hinterland areas. When delivering legal services, CBPs often work in conjunction with the formal justice system and the customary justice system and through networks with various government departments, non-governmental organisations and the private sector. Access to justice and legal empowerment are interdependent. Arguably, the more individuals and groups are legally empowered, the better they will understand and seek access to justice. This study examines realities on the ground when it comes to conducting a cost-benefit analysis and assessing case management strategies with the different models of CAOs. The research aims to foster pragmatic approaches that advance mandates of the CAO pending bill and the CAO discourse as a whole. In addition to addressing these gaps, the study explores the gap in knowledge about distinctions inherent in different CAO models and what this means in terms of functionality, justice service delivery and funding. Moreover, this study is relevant to law and policy in terms of the role of African epistemologies – African ways of knowing – in drafting and reforming law and policy to meet the needs of marginalised and vulnerable groups, especially women and children.

The scope of the CBJR project and the final CBJR project report is as follows:

- *Community-Based Justice Research: Exploring the Potential of Local Solutions to a Global Access to Justice Crisis* led by CFCJ: The CBJR project involves four main components: peer-to-peer support, coordinating and catalyzing research, local-global knowledge mobilization, and impact and domestic research and reporting. The final CBJR project report seeks to situate the respective in-country research findings in the larger context of people-centered cost of justice research. It explores questions related to best practices for costs-based research, opportunities for providing community-based justice services, challenges to expanding and diversifying access points for resolving civil justice problems and the monetary costs and value of delivering accessible, community-based civil and family justice services. In

so doing, the CBJR project report also aims to be responsive to the UN Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) on access to justice (Goal 16.3) by sharing insights to understand, measure, assess and promote better community-based access to justice policies and programs.

Overall, the CBJR project achieved its core objectives and should be considered a success. This project stands to make a meaningful contribution to research and public understanding on community-based justice services. Project findings and outputs are discussed in detail in sections 3 and 5.

2.0 RESEARCH PROBLEM

Community-based justice services are a common instalment in most societies. Anecdotally, the level of engagement with these services suggests that for service providers and justice-seekers alike there is a recognized need for these services and, by extension, there are also significant benefits that derive from these services at the micro, mezzo, and macro levels. At the same time, there is little empirical evidence that confirms the extent to which community-based services address civil legal service gaps or serve as alternatives to hard-to-access, untrustworthy or ineffective dispute resolution mechanisms. There is a general lack of data globally on the benefits of community-based justice programs and services relative to their costs as well as the potential for these mechanisms to provide a solution to some of our stubborn access to justice problems.

Overall, this data gap has made it difficult to understand the contributions of community-based justice mechanisms to: (1) legal empowerment among local populations; (2) durable solutions that address civil (and family) legal problems; and (3) holistic legal problem resolution that integrates and/or reflects understandings of the local culture, traditions, and considerations around gender and family in the community. Without empirical evidence that demonstrates the value and potential of different models for community-based justice to address justice gaps, it will be difficult to make the case for policy changes to better support these services, advocate for greater financial investments in these services, or model and scale the beneficial aspects of community-based justice services for broader impacts.

When people do not have the ability to access fair justice systems, they are left without the means to resolve grievances, protect their legal rights, livelihoods, assets, or their physical security. Without access to justice, people lack the necessary protection of the law in their day-to-day lives, resulting in inequity, alienation and abuse. Further, the growing body of legal needs surveys indicates clearly, across countries and regions, that legal problems tend to be concentrated in poorer communities and populations, coupled with—and leaving them further vulnerable to—added social challenges. In recent years, researchers, legal and non-legal professionals, and other justice stakeholders around the world have increasingly engaged in activities and discourse centered on the access to civil justice problem, committing in some forums to actionable research that addresses known data gaps and has the potential to move the dial on access to justice on a global scale, at the country-level, and locally.

Recognizing that the dearth of evidence to understand and effectively improve access to justice will continue to act as a barrier to solutions that advance the safety, security and well-being of people worldwide, there has been increased momentum around research and frontline efforts aimed at advancing access to civil justice. At least some of this momentum can be attributed to UN Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16.3, which has brought significant attention to the access to justice problem, calling for “equal access to justice for all by 2030.”² Projects like the Community-Based Justice Research project are grounded in meeting this call to action.

Universal access to civil justice is a complex problem. There is no single, unassailable path to ensuring equal access across communities and nations or across the various types of legal problems, a plurality of legal systems, and varied social, cultural, political and economic contexts against which legal problems occur. While understanding and adopting effective solutions can be challenging, the general landscape of problem

² UN SDG 16.3 calls for countries to ensure equal access to justice for all their citizens by 2030. See United Nations, “Sustainable Development Goals”, online: United Nations <<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/?menu=1300>>.

experiences can often look similar across jurisdictions, with those facing the greatest challenges often belonging to similar demographic groups — poor, underserved, racialized and otherwise marginalized populations. For these groups additional considerations related to location, language, cost, and other factors are often necessary to facilitate effective legal service delivery and legal problem resolution.

In high- and low-income countries alike, community-oriented justice programs connect with and assist underserved populations with their justice needs. Community-based justice services act in official and quasi-official capacities to provide legal information, advice and services to people at the local level who experience justiciable problems.³ While the scope of community-based justice mechanisms, who they serve, how they connect with people within communities, where they work, and how they provide assistance may vary based on factors such as their location, staffing, and other resources, the value that community-oriented justice services contribute across efforts to make justice more accessible is often identified through their ability to: (i) operate against the backdrop of various historical, political, social and economic contexts; (ii) provide access to justice services in contexts where there might be a lack of faith in formal justice institutions; (iii) address gaps in legal service delivery in underserved communities; and (iv) provide services at little or no cost to people seeking redress for civil, family and criminal justice problems.⁴ Further, community-based justice services provide legal help and disseminate information in ways that are often tailored to the local areas that they serve, with service delivery provided in local languages, and in deference to the local culture, social fabric, and history of the population being served.

Community-based justice mechanisms play a role in disseminating legal and non-legal information, facilitating dispute resolution, and fostering legal empowerment within underserved areas and among vulnerable populations. The CBJR project seeks to better understand these efforts, and their costs and benefits, using the following questions for guidance:

- What do successful community-based justice initiatives look like?
- What features make for a successful initiative?
- What challenges are getting in the way of successful models? How is success measured?
- What can we learn from these models that can be scaled up or transferred to other jurisdictions?
- What are the monetary costs, opportunity costs, and other costs associated with services provided by community-based justice services?
- What are the benefits to individuals, communities, and governments of community-based justice services?

The CBJR project aims to explore these and other questions, with the goal of engendering evidence-based policy thinking to support scaling local legal services delivery, and defining community-based justice services more broadly as purveyors of “equal access to justice for all” who use their services.

It should be noted that, while the nature of the access to justice problem and the lack of available evidence to inform efforts to scale community-based justice mechanisms is shared by many nations, the Community Justice collection of studies yields in-country project insights that are based in specific social, historical and economic contexts that may not readily translate to other jurisdictions. Further, while the CBJR project seeks to respond to the research problem as it has been framed, the reliance on outcomes of the research conducted will impact the extent to which the questions (above) can be addressed. Additional insights are also possible.

³ See Lisa Moore, “Building a Business Case for Investing in Community-Based Justice”, *Slaw* (4 October 2018) online: *Slaw* <<http://www.slaw.ca/2018/10/04/building-a-business-case-for-investing-in-community-based-justice/>>.

⁴ *Ibid.*

For example, as is the case with the Community Justice research project in Kenya, researchers sought to gather data on community-based justice services as well as on other entry points to the justice system, including court-based, government systems, and other models and their benefits and shortcomings relative to community-based justice services.

3.0 RESEARCH FINDINGS

3.1 Overview of Studies

The final CBJR project report is informed in large part by findings from the three in-country Community Justice studies. An overview of the studies follows.

SIERRA LEONE

Overview

- This cost-benefit analysis study examines the direct and indirect costs and benefits of community-based justice services, denoted in this study by local, paralegal NGO services and state-funded Legal Aid Board services.
- The objectives of the study were to assess and compare indirect and direct outcomes of paralegal NGO services, and make recommendations for ways to scale up access to justice in Sierra Leone.
- The two legal problem types that are the primary focus of this study are: (i) family law problems (including child and spousal support) and, (ii) property, land and tenancy problems.

Methodology

- Mixed method (qualitative and quantitative)
 - Semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, life stories, multiple-choice survey questions
- Study participants include service users, non-service users and service providers
 - 260 service users
 - 500 questionnaires administered to non-paralegal service users (with or without legal problems)

Challenges

- Data collectors recording incorrect information
- Difficulty tracking participants; reliable recall
- COVID-19 pandemic's impacts on fieldwork

KENYA

Overview

- The justice services assessed in this study include: (i) court based initiatives (Court Annexed Mediation); (ii) state based initiatives; community based initiatives (traditional); (iii) civil society based initiatives; and (iv) religious and community-based initiatives.
- The legal problem types that are the primary focus of this study include: (i) land (30%), (ii) family – related to a spouse/partner (23%), (iii) family – related to a dispute involving a child/children (13%), (iv) other disputes (4% each), including theft, commercial problems, physical assault; (v) other disputes (2% each) sexual assault, disagreement with public bodies, police brutality, and resource conflict

Methodology

- Mixed method (qualitative and quantitative)
 - One-on-one interviews (translators present), paper-based questionnaires, shift to virtual interviews with questionnaires during the pandemic, correlational research, cross-tabulation

- The study used several methods of analysis: descriptive analysis, exploratory analysis, diagnostic analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and prescriptive analysis.
- Study participants include service users and service providers

Challenges

- Data input with paper questionnaires (as opposed to e-questionnaires) resulted in more labour and time
- The assurance of anonymity made it difficult to follow up with respondents in cases where further information/clarification was necessary
- Some challenges assess costs and benefits, particularly as relates to the operationalization of benefit.

SOUTH AFRICA

Overview

- This cost-benefit analysis study examines direct and indirect costs and benefits. The direct costs and benefits are to the service provider, the Centre, staff, and any supporting institution, as well as the costs and benefits accrued in accessing the services or resulting from the services. The indirect costs and benefits assessed are to the service recipients/clients. Costs and benefits include both tangible and intangible costs and benefits
- The study focused on 14 CAOs located in different provinces
 - The type of models include: law school clinic, stand-alone CAOs, intermediary, rent a CAO, public financing, umbrella
- The legal problem types of the CAOs involved in this study include: (i) rape and sexual offences; (ii) domestic violence; (iii) child abuse; (iv) maintenance (government support); (v) social problems (juvenile delinquency, teenage pregnancy, truancy, drug and alcohol abuse, etc.); (vi) labour problems (payouts from the Unemployment Insurance Fund, employment disputes); (vii) legal advice (advice on obtaining an ID, marriage certificates, divorce court order, disability grants, pensions, estates, paternity disputes, credit recovery, loan establishments, etc.); (viii) general crime (theft, murder, kidnapping, robbery, assault, defamation, crimen injuria); (ix) immigration (asylum, overstay, loss of passport, refugee problems; (x) problems related to HIV/Aids status
 - The most common cases brought to CAOs are: legal advice cases, followed by domestic violence and labour disputes.

Methodology

- Mixed method
 - Qualitative and quantitative
 - Community-based participatory research (site visits, focus groups, meetings with paralegals, skills development in computer literacy for paralegals and managers, recommended accredited training for paralegals by CCJD, relationship between CAOs and research team). This approach was noted as leading to a better process and more responsive compared to sites that participated through online interviews
 - Data collection included: a review of documentary evidence from CAOs from intake to outcome to closure; interviews in the field; and focus groups
 - Data analysis was done in the following ways. Documentary evidence was assessed through content analysis; primary qualitative data was assessed through a combination of content, matrix and thematic analysis; quantitative data was analysed through descriptive analysis
- The study examined CAO records from 2016 to 2018.

Challenges

- The study identified the following limitations of the cost-benefit analyses: (i) inability to cost indirect intangible costs; (ii) inability to quantify the tangible and intangible benefits of outreach activities; and (iii) underreporting of activities done by the Centres and incomplete records.
- The study compared case management across the CAOs and identified several limitations, which may have had impacts for the available 2016–2018 data. These include: the absence of reference numbers on some case files, incomplete records, poor funding which undermines outreach activities and other support operations.

3.2 Summary of Research Findings

A key objective in bringing together research teams from Canada, Sierra Leone, South Africa and Kenya for the CBJR project was to advance a comparative review of research findings from the collection of Community Justice studies, and for pan-project reporting. Each Community Justice project is distinct (outlined in Section 1.0, above). There are variations in the methodology, types and number of justice mechanisms examined, and there are also some differences in the types of files reviewed for data collection. Further, research teams faced different challenges at different times during the project. Though, notably, the COVID-19 pandemic presented universal challenges for on-the-ground research across studies (see further Section 3.1, above). There are also historical, cultural, economic and social factors that are pertinent to understanding the dispute resolution options that are available and accessible to justice seekers, the challenges these mechanisms face, and obstacles for justice seekers. In Sierra Leone, for example, a sweeping legal aid law which was enacted in 2012 ensures that at least one paralegal is available in each of the 190 chiefdoms in Sierra Leone. The study discusses the on-the-ground realities of this commitment to access to justice. In South Africa, although the Community Advice Office (CAO) sector is extensive and popular, the lack of official recognition of CAOs presents funding and other challenges. Additionally, African ways of knowing are an important consideration for the paralegal-run CAO sector, which contends with traditional and customary knowledge systems operating within Western legal frameworks. In Kenya, there have been important legislative changes in recent decades, many of which have shaped Kenya's present-day legal landscape. The most important of these identified in the research team's final project report is the 2010 Constitution of Kenya. The literature review included in the report also confirms the challenges that women and underprivileged populations face in Kenya and the importance of these issues to the access to justice conversation. The studies led by CAPRI and CCJD also consider questions on gender and gender bias and the implications for women involved in legal disputes, particularly those relating to family law matters.

Notwithstanding important distinctions among studies in the Community Justice collection and the respective historical, cultural, social, and economic contexts within which questions on access, cost, and benefits of community justice mechanisms are examined, the studies provide several areas for comparison. The final CBJR project report discusses these contrasts and the similarities among research findings in detail. Below is an overview of findings from each of the Community Justice projects in four thematic areas: Paths to Justice; Costs (to justice seekers and service providers, and where possible the return on investment); Benefits (to justice seekers and governments) and Gender Dynamics.

The CFCJ's final CBJR project report explores these findings and research themes outlined in the respective project reports as discussed in this, and earlier sections. The final report is organized into the following sections: (i) Access to Justice: A Global Crisis; (ii) Community-Based Justice; (iii) Findings and Solutions; (iv) Costs, Benefits and Funding; and (v) Scaling Community-Based Justice: Looking Ahead.

SIERRA LEONE

Type of justice mechanisms

- Community-based paralegal service
- Community advice office

Paths to justice

- Individuals using justice services accessible at the local level commonly engage in forum-shopping. Justice seekers weigh several factors when choosing a dispute resolution mechanism, including:
 - Cost, reputation (rights violations, trustworthiness/knowledge of flawed procedures), gender discrimination, objective of the dispute (including the potential or desire to repair damaged relationships)
- On average, justice seekers resolve a dispute through a community-based justice service between 2-3 weeks (less time than through other forums)
- Justice-seekers who had legal problems in the two years prior to the study and reported not seeking help at the time mainly reported that their decision was based on: (i) wanting to maintain an amicable relationship with family; and, (ii) not wanting to take time off from other obligations/activities

Costs

Justice seekers

- 78% of people report incurring monetary costs to resolve their legal problem
 - Costs range from approximately US\$4 to US\$19, with differences based largely on the service provider
 - Costs mostly relate to transportation, accommodation, and telephone
 - Justice-seekers report that money spent accessing community-based justice services might otherwise be spent on: food, petty trading, education and/or rent
 - Time spent resolving disputes through community-based justice services (though less than problem resolution through other forums) would otherwise have been spent: improving justice seekers' business, doing housework, farming, helping someone else; 33% did not consider the time spent resolving their legal problem worthwhile
- 12% report a breakdown in relationships as a result of their legal problems
- 44% report emotional stress during the dispute resolution process
- Unresolved problems tend to cluster and carry social and other costs

Service providers

- Average costs to set up a paralegal office range from \$2,500-\$3,000 (costs relate to registration costs, rent, furniture, staff)

Benefits

Return on Investment, Overall Benefits

- The government saves SLL 0.27 for every SLL 1 spent on community-based justice services

- For every SLL 1 that service users spend, they receive SLL 1.22 in benefit (SLL 2.45 in absolute terms)
 - Service users save money from the effective and timely resolution of problems
- Service users reported other benefits including: (i) restored dignity and rebuilt relationships; (ii) awareness of rights; and (iii) knowledge of relevant laws
- 65% report that the time spent resolving their legal problem through community-based justice services was worthwhile
- 87% report no relationship breakdown/negative effects to their relationship from problem experiences
- Other inferred benefits: (unquantified) savings to the justice savings in the long term; fewer cases of abuse across family law and property, land and tenant problem types
- A majority of service users reported that they found the dispute resolution process through a paralegal service to be “simple”, “straight-forward”, “fair”, and “non-threatening”

Service quality and accessibility

- 74% report community-based justice service is within 5 miles of their location
- 58% waited 30 minutes or less to receive service at a community-based justice provider (in this case, a paralegal NGO)
- 57% of service users’ problems were addressed within a month

Gender dynamics

- A majority of users of community-based justice services are women
- Community-based justice services received no significant claims of gender discrimination
- Women who indicated that they experienced at least 1 legal problem in the 2 years prior to the study but did not seek legal help overwhelmingly (76%) indicated that their reason for not taking action was fear of being reprimanded for addressing private matters publicly
- Men who did not seek legal help indicated that the main deterrent was trust in the service

KENYA

Type of justice mechanisms canvassed

- Civil-society based initiatives
- Community based, traditional initiatives
- Community-based organisations
- Court-based initiatives
- State-based initiatives, including chiefs, police and commissions that work to promote human rights and facilitate dispute resolution
- Faith-based/Religious initiatives

Paths to justice

- Justice-seekers were asked where they go first to resolve their legal problem. They responded as follows: 37.3% reported that they approached state based institutions (mostly chiefs and police); 15.2% reported community-based traditional initiatives; 12.6% reported community-based organisations; 10.1% reported faith-based community organisations; 8.6% reported civil society organisations; 6.5% reported courts, 3.5% reported other services (including community police); 1.8% reported relatives, and 1.5% reported lawyers

- People who did not seek legal help reported that the biggest deterrent was monetary costs (approximately 41%; 24% report that seeking justice is not expensive).
 - In addition to issues related to gender (outlined under Gender Dynamics, below), respondents also indicated that a lack of access to information (18.0%) acted as a barrier to accessing legal help
 - Procedural delays was noted by community members as contributing to their pessimism about justice institutions and their likelihood to shy away from them
 - Other, hidden, formal and informal costs also contribute to the costs of accessing justice. Challenges faced by justice seekers were found to be exacerbated by: (i) information asymmetry; (ii) poverty; (iii) corruption; and (iv) lack of justice institutions in remote areas
- Service providers separately report the following barriers to providing dispute resolution services: (i) a lack of adequate resources; (ii) low awareness of legal problems and available problem resolution avenues; (iii) uncooperative clients; (iv) insecure clients; (v) cultural limitations; (vi) professional malpractice; (v) lack of support from the government; (vi) lack of evidence; (vii) poor implementation plans; (viii) bureaucracy.

Costs

Justice seekers

- Costs to justice seekers, among other spending, relates to transportation (60.8%), airtime/phone (30.3%), elders' allowance (16.7%), meals (16.7%), compensation for the aggrieved party (12.1%), child care (10.6%), photocopy and printing (10.6%), legal fees (7.6%), medical expenses (6.1%), arrest warrants (3.0%) and P3 forms (3.0%). There were other types of cost, each recorded at 1.5% (search fees, process fees, meetings, etc.)
 - Average transportation cost was Kshs 316.73 (US \$4)
 - Average airtime cost was Kshs 606.60 (US \$5.50)
 - Average elders' allowance was Kshs 2,467.30 (US \$22)
 - Average meal cost was Kshs 2,881.80 (US \$26)
 - Average compensation paid to the aggrieved party (at the conclusion of the problem) was Kshs 49,500 (US \$447)
 - Average child care cost was Kshs 14,532.30 (US\$ 131)
 - Average photocopying and printing expense was Kshs 2,101.11 (US \$19)
 - Average legal fee spending was Kshs 21,666.70 (US \$196)
 - Average medical expense spending was Kshs 29,120 (US \$240.86)
 - Average arrest warrant cost was Kshs 14,500 (US \$131)
 - Average P3 form cost was Kshs 1,533.3 (US \$14)
- 42% of respondents reported experiencing a relationship breakdown
 - Relationship breakdown was identified in the following ways: not being on speaking terms (31.7%), mutual distrust (18.5%), isolation (18.1%), stigmatization (13.6%), desertion (10.3%), divorce (4.1%), kicked out of the house/premises (3.7%)
- 68% of respondents reported experiencing emotional stress
- 52% of respondents reported experiencing psychological problems
- Other impacts reported by justice seekers include: physical health problems, financial constraints, damage of property
- 60% of cases were not concluded in the time specified in the standard operating procedures

Service providers

- Costs reported by service providers include: the cost of setting up, annual operating costs, and marginal costs
 - Set-up costs: Civil society respondents reported Kshs 500,000 (~US \$4,135.65); Community-based faith respondents reported Kshs 750,000 (~US \$6,203.47). (Others did not have or did not report these costs)
 - Annual operating costs: Civil society respondents reported Kshs 200,000 (~US \$1,654.26); Community-based faith respondents reported Kshs 3,000,000 (~US \$24,813.90). (Others did not have or did not report these costs)
 - Marginal costs: Civil society respondents reported Kshs 100,000 (~US \$827.13); Community-based faith respondents reported Kshs 36,000 (~US \$297.77). (Others did not have or did not report these costs)
- Service providers offered several reasons for 60% of cases not being concluded during the expected time. Reasons for delays include: complexity of the case (41%), immobility or movement challenges (37%), insufficient financial resources for institutions and community members (32%), inadequate staff (27%)
 - For civil society based organizations, community-based organizations, and state-based organizations, complexity of the case was chief among the reasons for delay. For court-based institutions, the main reason for delays was inadequate staffing (52.6%) and CBO and religious-based organizations indicated inadequate financial resources was their biggest challenge (41.5%)

Benefits

Return on Investment, Overall benefits

- Civil society justice system: 1 Kenyan shilling saved/benefits realized for every 4 cents spent⁵
- Religious and community-based justice initiatives: 1 Kenya shilling saved/benefits realized for every 22 cents spent
- State-based justice initiatives: 1 Kenya shilling saved/benefits realized for every 58 cents
- Traditional, community-based initiatives: 1 Kenyan shilling saved/benefits realized for every 66 cents spent
- Court-based initiatives: 1 Kenyan shilling of benefit requires spending 4.2 Kenyan shillings
The costs for this service outweigh the benefits
- Service users reported other benefits including: (i) restored dignity; (ii) emotional and psychological satisfaction; (iii) restoration of relationships; (iv) resumption of peace; (v) experience resolving similar disputes; (vi) knowledge of one's rights and how to prevent similar disputes in the future.

Service quality and accessibility

- 94.6% of respondents cited a high level of access to justice for community, faith-based initiatives. This was largely attributed to their broad outreach and close proximity to people.
- 93.9% of the respondents indicated a high degree of access to justice within community-based, traditional-based initiatives. Their accessibility is attributed to their being located in the communities. Further, elders who served in the councils were members from the community, and regularly interacted with and spoke with the people about the issues they were grappling with.

⁵ 100 cents = 1 Kenyan shilling

Gender dynamics

- Generally, it was difficult to capture the extent of gender-based violence experienced by women participating in the study. Many women do not speak about the problem or deny its existence. Culturally, it is tolerated as part of normal behavior in many families. The study indicates likely underreporting of gender-based offenses in 30.4% of cases.
 - Respondents reported several other types of problems that acted as barriers to accessing justice, which were categorized as social and cultural factors. Several align with gender dynamics. These include: patriarchal (and matriarchal) attitudes and beliefs (24.6%), gender-biased attitudes (19.5%), gender economic dependence/resource inequality (18.9%), and stereotypes (15.6%).
 - Women disproportionately report experiencing psychosocial effects related to their efforts to resolve their justice problem(s), gender discrimination, challenges based in cultural factors, and women generally report challenges with the time spent pursuing a dispute.
 - These factors were also experienced in higher levels by respondents with lower education levels, vulnerable groups, marginalized groups, and rural populations.
 - Approximately 20% of respondents reported a strong belief that disputes favour men over women outright.
-

SOUTH AFRICA

Type of justice mechanisms

- Community Advice Offices (CAOs) including:
 - Stand-alone CAOs
 - University law clinic CAO models
 - Umbrella/supportive CAO models

Paths to Justice

- CAOs offer a range of services, including: counselling, support with informal maintenance agreements, legal advice, mediation, and referrals.
- Across the CAOs canvassed for this study, there is some evidence of poor case completion and management, with some instances of cases being closed on paper but not updated in the database. A majority of cases across CAOs appeared to have outcomes which were deemed to be “successful”. Cases could be deemed unsuccessful for multiple reasons, including the case being withdrawn or unresolved, the other party being acquitted, a lack of cooperation/feedback from parties, and an unsuccessful mediation.

Costs

Justice seekers

- Indirect tangible costs to service recipients who access services through CAOs relate to: transportation, meals, photocopying, lost income, payments to use facilities.
 - Service recipients were “oblivious” to many of these costs and, in many cases, could not produce receipts of their expenses. The study used reimbursements for transportation and lunch provided to focus group participants as a proxy for indirect tangible costs.

Service providers

- Direct tangible (monetized) costs in this study include: total expenditure, physical infrastructure amenities, communication infrastructure.
- Direct intangible costs include: burnout/emotional stress and the opportunity cost of working at the CAO.
- Service providers receive funding for activities. Where this funding is insufficient to cover all aspects of the projects, the service/office absorbs the expenses, losing income in the process.
 - Cost creates several challenges for service providers and can lead to staff and service providers bearing the brunt of the costs of doing business in various ways: (i) the legal advice function not being fully funded with the money received only able to cover operating costs with a stipend for some staff members; (ii) absence of stable salaries and benefits for staff; (iii) unguaranteed funding for different activities, which may ultimately lead to them being discontinued; (iv) paralegals having to take time away from their daily responsibilities to fundraise; (v) shortage of skilled staff; and (vi) corruption.

Benefits

Return on Investment

The cost-benefit ratio across the 10 CAOs assessed for 2016-2018 is as follows:

1. Port St. Johns: 0,82 (positive net value but a benefit cost ratio of less than 1 suggests the access to justice arm of their operations may not be sustainable)
2. TAWA: 1,19 (net value of R1 475 663, 36)
3. Qholaqwe: 1,68 (net value of R10 510 949,06)
4. Bergville: 10,82 (net value of R7 644 680,23)
5. Impendle: 6,03 (net value of R4 310 106,60)
6. Musina: 1,58 (net value R1 638 953,91)
7. Opret: 1,21 (net value of R1 127 396,26)
8. Bohlabela: 1,72 (net value of R1 655 519,12)
9. Leandra: 0,69 (net value of –R2 074 919,13)
10. Nkomazi: 1,74 (net value of R3 812 352,31)

Overall benefits

- CAOs provide access to legal information, legal advice and services for free. Many of the people who benefit from these services can be considered marginalized, owing to their geographical location, social circumstances, and poverty. CAOs also play an important role in educating communities about where and how to access services from non-legal services agencies, including from various government agencies and departments.

Justice seekers

- Indirect tangible benefits to service recipients include the facilitation of payments.
- Indirect intangible benefits include: (i) individual cost savings; and (ii) willingness to pay
 - As a proxy for individual cost savings, CAO services were compared to services that would be provided in the marketplace by another professional. For example, counselling was compared to services provided by a psychologist; follow-up was compared to services provided by a social worker, and so on.
 - As a proxy for a service recipient's willingness to pay, the study assessed the service recipient's satisfaction with the services received from the CAO. A subsection of service recipients was asked to indicate—through a ballot vote—an amount that they would be willing to pay if they had the

means. Across the responses and CAOs included, the maximum amount indicated was 8000 rand (approximately US \$445.64) and the lowest amount was 1,500 (approximately US \$83.56).

Service providers

- Direct tangible benefits to CAOs were assessed for this study. Those include: income to the Centre (payments to the Centre from funders, individual donors, for access to justice programs, etc.).
- Direct intangible benefits in this study to CAOs were assessed as cost savings to the government. Other intangible benefits that are identified (but were not quantified) include: a passion for the work and the ability to create change for the community.

Gender Dynamics

- A majority of community-based paralegals are women.
 - There is some evidence that women working as community-based paralegals helps to facilitate problem resolution for other women who arbitrate in the CAO sector, and plays a critical role in justice delivery in domestic violence matters. Notably, female paralegals' interactions with men are generally viewed by men as respectful.
 - This project also assessed the way in which CBP/CAO work influences social impacts on women and girls.
 - Generally, women seek help from paralegal services more than men (60% of all cases in the study are from women).
 - The most common reason for visiting CAOs by both men and women were: legal advice, domestic violence issues and labour problems.
 - More women than men sought help domestic violence problems.
 - Labour problems were almost equally common among men and women
 - Compared to men, women experienced more problems related to maintenance, child abuse and rape and other sexual offenses.
 - Men sought help for immigration problems at a higher rate than women.
-

4.0 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT

The CFCJ's role in the CBJR project for the duration of the project was fourfold – (1) peer-to-peer support, (2) coordinating and catalysing research, (3) local-global knowledge mobilization and impact, and (4) domestic research and reporting. Through these roles, the CFCJ supported the implementation and management of the CBJR project based on the following understanding of these roles.

Peer-to-peer support. *The CFCJ collaborates with and provides research support to the three in-country research projects.*

Coordinating and catalyzing research. *The CFCJ supports and coordinates pan-project reporting, research and information exchange on key learnings related to cost-benefit analysis research on community-based justice services in Sierra Leone, Kenya and South Africa.*

Local-global knowledge mobilization and impact. *The CFCJ supports and, where possible, facilitates knowledge mobilization efforts – scaling up the methodologies and results of the three individual in-country projects – as part of a growing body of national and international empirically-based, people-centered international access to justice research.*

Domestic research and reporting. *The CFCJ seeks to situate the respective in-country research findings in the larger context of people-centered cost of justice research in Canada and abroad. The final project report will also explore questions related to best practices for costs-based justice research, opportunities for providing community-based justice services, challenges to expanding and diversifying access points for resolving civil justice problems and the monetary costs and value of delivering accessible, community-based civil and family justice services.*

To guide these efforts, the CFCJ team drafted a pan-project plan shortly after the project's launch in 2018. The plan was shared with CBJR project partners for feedback before a final, revised project plan was created. The goal in creating a pan-project plan was to produce a document that could serve as a common guide for the CBJR project's implementation and management.

The project plan sought to provide a pan-project overview of project over three phases. The objectives of the first phase – June 2018 to March 2019 – were to establish the research, knowledge exchange and mobilization foundation for the CBJR project, as well as to establish research support mechanisms. The primary, pan-project objectives of Phase 2 were data collection, research coordination and analysis, and knowledge mobilization. Work in Phase 2 was anticipated between April, 2019 and February, 2020. The third and final phase (March, 2020 to December, 2020) was expected to include the exchange and delivery of final research findings and efforts to promote evidence-based policy thinking and investment in community-based justice systems.

Ultimately, the COVID-19 pandemic caused significant delays to planned activities and resulted in the project being extended to 2022. While there was an initial project meeting in Nairobi, Kenya in 2018, a second, more extensive project meeting could not be held in-person in 2020 as planned, and subsequent travel to present final research findings was canceled. Despite delays and disruptions, primarily caused by the pandemic, CBJR project teams were resourceful in identifying alternatives to in-person data collection, meetings and presentations, in many cases making a shift to remote and virtual processes.

Implementation and Management

Peer-to-Peer Support

During the CBJR project, the CFCJ offered support to project partners in the following key ways:

- Introductory phone meetings with CBJR project partners
- Organizing an Inception Project Meeting (held from September 3-5 in Nairobi, Kenya).
 - The Inception Project Meeting provided an opportunity for CBJR project partners to meet in person. The respective in-country research projects were discussed and expert-led research sessions offered a forum for further discussion of project objectives, research methodologies, best practices and other, related topics.
- Hosting virtual, pan-project video meetings.
 - One of the goals of these meetings was to discuss challenges and progress of the respective Community Justice projects with a view to providing a forum to exchanging learnings and offering suggestions on best practices.
- Reviewing and commenting on final draft reports for project partners, including, where requested/helpful, meetings to discuss key aspects of final reports.

Coordinating and Catalyzing Research

- Facilitating the exchange of research and information among project researchers via a project listserv
 - The CBJR project listserv was created by the CFCJ to facilitate intra-project communication and coordination and includes all persons affiliated with the CBJR project
- Creating a CBJR project page where outputs, updates and other materials are published (www.cfcj-fcjc.org/our-projects/community-based-justice-research-cbjr/)
- Sharing project articles and reports through the CFCJ's networks (Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, CFCJ Newsletter, and the Access to Justice Research Network) and on the CBJR project page assisting, where possible and if/when requested, with sharing project outputs on international forums
- Coordinating graphic design for final project reports

Local-Global Knowledge Mobilization and Impact

- Help organize and participate on panels and international conferences aimed at sharing findings about the CBJR project and community-based justice research findings, including: the Action Committee Annual Meeting (Canada), the Law and Society Annual Meeting (Portugal), an OECD Data and Evidence-Based Justice workshop (virtual), Network for Justice Meeting (UK), and others (see Section 5, below).
 - It is anticipated that presentations and meetings that advance findings from the Community-Based Justice Research project will continue even after final CBJR technical and final reports are submitted and approved
- Draft blogs, articles and papers discussing the Community-Based Justice Research project
- Promote outputs from project partners

Domestic Research and Reporting

- Since the beginning of the CBJR project in 2018, the CFCJ has published papers, blogs, and other outputs through Canadian platforms and networks. This includes several publications in online legal magazine, Slaw and through CFCJ-managed listservs and networks.

The following are some CFCJ and Canadian reports/papers that include references to the Community-Based Justice Research project:

- Lisa Moore, *Crossing Boundaries: Exploring Multi-Disciplinary Models for Legal Problem Resolution* (Toronto: Canadian Forum on Civil Justice, April 2022), online: <<https://cfcj-fcjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Crossing-Boundaries-Exploring-Multi-Disciplinary-Models-for-Legal-Problem-Resolution-by-Lisa-Moore.pdf>>
- Trevor C.W. Farrow, Lisa Moore and Ab Currie, *Measuring Impacts of Legal Services: Bibliography, Network and Methodology* (Toronto: Canadian Forum on Civil Justice, June 2020).
- Lisa Moore and Trevor C.W. Farrow, *Investing in Justice: A Literature Review in Support of the Case for Improved Access* (Toronto: Canadian Forum on Civil Justice, August 2019) at 62, online: CFCJ <<https://cfcj-fcjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Investing-in-Justice-A-Literature-Review-in-Support-of-the-Case-for-Improved-Access-by-Lisa-Moore-and-Trevor-C-W-Farrow.pdf>>.
- Sarah McCoubrey and Meredith Brown, *Working Toward Accessible Justice: Tracking Progress on Canada's Justice Development Goals in 2018* (Ottawa: Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters, 2019) at 21, online: <<http://www.justicedevelopmentgoals.ca/sites/default/files/2018jdgsworkingtowardsa2jreport.pdf>>.
- Government of Canada, *Canada's Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development - Voluntary National Review* (2018) at 117, online: <<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/20033CanadasVoluntaryNationalReviewENv6.pdf>>

The CFCJ has shared CBJR project findings and insights on community-based justice research at meetings and conferences in Canada (see Section 5, below).

4.1 COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic, which began while the CBJR project was underway, created challenges for on-the-ground research. Balancing the needs of project, the health and safety of researchers, and local and national in-country health mandates and guidelines ultimately led to delays for the project teams and the CBJR project as a whole. At the same time, the global health pandemic also inspired creative solutions to several research problems that could also translate to more efficient, effective practices in the future. This includes, for example, the shift to remote technologies and the use of apps for check-in with researchers onsite, where previously project coordinators/managers would accompany researchers. The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic are briefly discussed here because of its impacts for the project timeline and activities. The Community Justice collection of studies each provides details on the precise impacts of the pandemic on the methodology and project activities.

5.0 PROJECT OUTPUTS AND DISSEMINATION

Key CFCJ CBJR project outputs are listed in Table 1.

The CFCJ has used several avenues to share CBJR project findings and produced outputs in various formats, including:

- Webpages (<https://cfcj-fcjc.org/our-projects/community-based-justice-research-cbjr/>, www.ajrn.org)
- Social media (Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook)
- News releases
- Newsletters
- Listservs
- Blogs, articles (Slaw, Task Force on Justice, etc.)
- Meetings, conferences
- Papers, reports
- Infographics
- Annotated bibliography

For the duration of the CBJR project, the CFCJ also hosted project meetings and produced materials aimed at supporting the needs of the CBJR project and project partners.

Pan-project CBJR meetings were held in:

- January 2021
- March 2021
- June 2021
- May 2020
- October 2019
- April 2019
- July 2019

Internal outputs:

- CBJR Project Plan (2019)
- CBJR Project Survey (2019)

It is anticipated that the CFCJ will continue to share final CBJR research outputs and present CBJR project findings at conferences, symposia, and through online forums in the future, after all final reports have been submitted and the project officially ends.

TABLE 1: CFCJ OUTPUTS

OUTPUT TYPE	AUTHOR(S)	PUBLICATION DATE	LINK
BLOGS, ARTICLES			
Advancing People-Centered Justice: New Research on Community-Based Justice	Trevor C.W. Farrow, Ab Currie, Lisa Moore	29 July, 2022	http://www.slaw.ca/2022/07/29/advancing-people-centered-justice-new-research-on-community-based-justice/
Exploring Community-Based Solutions to Global Access to Justice Problems. Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies	Trevor C.W. Farrow, Ab Currie, Lisa Moore	31 May, 2022	https://medium.com/sdg16plus/exploring-community-based-solutions-to-global-access-to-justice-problems-53acc1f0d6e3
Community-Based Justice	Ab Currie	26 May, 2022	http://www.slaw.ca/2022/05/26/community-based-justice/
The Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Community Legal Clinics and Pro Bono Legal Services in Ontario	Philippe Thompson, Lisa Moore	20 September, 2021	https://cfcj-fcjc.org/a2jblog/the-impact-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-on-legal-clinics-and-pro-bono-legal-services-in-ontario/
The Needs of Helping Organizations in the Community	Ab Currie	February 2021	https://cfcj-fcjc.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Needs-of-Helping-Organizations-Ab-Currie.pdf
Ten Steps Forward on the Way to Justice for All	Trevor C.W. Farrow	20 October, 2020	https://medium.com/sdg16plus/ten-steps-forward-on-the-way-to-justice-for-all-c84cae998e1d
The Community Being Helped Is the Resource That is Needed	Ab Currie	August 2020	https://cfcj-fcjc.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Community-Being-Helped-Is-the-Resource-That-is-Needed-Ab-Currie.pdf
Building a Business Case for Investing	Lisa Moore	4 October, 2018	http://www.slaw.ca/2018/10/04/building-a-business-case-for-investing-in-community-

in Community-Based Justice			based-justice/
A New Call to Action to Improve Access to Justice	Lisa Moore	14 August, 2018	http://www.slaw.ca/2018/08/14/a-new-call-to-action-to-improve-access-to-justice/
REPORTS, PAPERS			
Community-Based Access to Justice: Exploring Local Solutions to a Global Crisis	Trevor C.W. Farrow, Ab Currie	2022 (forthcoming)	(forthcoming) https://cfcj-fcjc.org/our-projects/community-based-justice-research-cbjr/publications/
The Communities Being Served are the Resources that are Needed – Innovations in Community-Based Justice in Ontario, An Anthology of Canadian Research	Ab Currie	March 2022	https://cfcj-fcjc.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Communities-Being-Served-are-the-Resources-that-are-Needed-Innovations-in-Community-Based-Justice-Anthology-by-Ab-Currie.pdf
Ten Ideas for Community-Based Justice	Ab Currie	26 November, 2018	https://cfcj-fcjc.org/wp-content/uploads/Ten-Ideas-for-Community-Based-Justice-Ab-Currie.pdf
CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS, MEETINGS			
“Access to Justice” – Law and Society Roundtable (Portugal)	Ab Currie	16 July, 2022	
“The Future of Law in Africa II” – Law and Society Roundtable (Portugal)	Ab Currie	13 July, 2022	
“Legal Ethics and Deontology” Panel – Working Group on Legal Professionals Meeting (Portugal)	Ab Currie	8 July, 2022	

“Data as a Tool for Change” – Action Committee Summit	CBJR Project partners	26 May, 2022	
“Working with Communities to Deliver Justice” presentation – UK Network for Justice Meeting	Lisa Moore	November 2021	
High-Level Conference for a People-Centre e-Justice Conference organizer – Council of the European Union (virtual presentation)	Trevor Farrow	26 April, 2021	
“A People-Centered Approach to Data and Evidence-Based Policymaking” – OECD Workshop	CBJR project partners	1 April, 2021	
The Cost and Value of Access to Justice and Access to Justice 2.0 – Victoria Law Foundation (Melborne Australia, virtual presentation)	Trevor Farrow	December 2020	
“Building a delivery approach based on outreach: Lessons learned from two legal aid-community partnerships” – International Legal Aid Meeting	Ab Currie	17–19 June, 2019	

(Ottawa)			
Ten Ideas for Community-Based Justice – IDRC Presentation (Ottawa)	Ab Currie	January 2019	

6.0 IMPACT

The CBJR project has generated interest within the legal community and among members of the CFCJ's national and international networks. It is anticipated that insights from the CBJR project's methodology and data will contribute to the design of future studies on community-based justice and other, related justice research taking place at a local and national level. The CBJR project has also attracted global attention and, for policymakers, frontline community justice workers and others, it is hoped that this project will provide actionable data that will be useful for providing better funded, more better supported justice services at the community level.

It is further anticipated that the CBJR project will have the following impacts:

- Help promote a new research agenda and ways of studying community-based access to justice (indicators: growth and sustainability of the initiative, uptake of research findings in local and global policy debates and documents).
- Lead to further research and actionable evidence-based solutions on how to scale up access to justice and local research tools and methodologies (indicators: quality of findings and analysis from studies produced; number of citations and replications of studies and methodologies).
- Stronger national and international support and recognition of community-based justice initiatives (indicators: number of policy commitments and increased funds targeted at access to justice and legal aid initiatives, at both international and country-levels, particularly linked to community justice initiatives as well as initiatives that model themselves on this sort of collaborative, partner based research).
- Exemplify the kind of evidence-based, public-focused, collaborative research that has been called for by organizations like the OECD, the Canadian Bar Association ([Reaching Equal Justice](#)) and the Action Committee on Access to Justice in Civil and Family Matters ([Roadmap for Change report](#)) (indicators: successful partnership approaches, collaborative mentoring, and partner-based research initiatives).
- Provide support for an increase in the local capacity to conduct action-oriented research with stronger, more sustainable and legitimate links to national and international processes (indicators: partners subsequently conduct similar research efforts, independently as part of ongoing programming or in support of other groups).
- Help to further build the field of collaborative, evidence-based community justice research and policy reform work in the area of access to civil and family justice in Canada and abroad. Engender further cross-border and coordinated exchange of research ideas and results leading to publications that provide concrete evidence for meaningful justice system reform, as well as a model for similar future projects and initiatives (indicators: reports are successfully produced and disseminated, cited and relied upon by others, used as models for future projects, etc.).
- Encourage further research and workshops relating to the community-based justice projects that are part of the CBJR project as well as other domestic and international access to justice initiatives.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The CFCJ research team is grateful for the support of IDRC in the implementation of the CBJR project. The CFCJ is also grateful to have helped with and learned from research experts from CAPRI, CCJD and the Katiba Institute.

Along with policy, service provider, and justice delivery recommendations outlined in each of the reports produced by research teams in Kenya, South Africa and Sierra Leone, the CFCJ recommends continued engaged with CBJR project outputs where possible, through presentations, information exchange, and discussions about the CBJR project, after the CBJR project officially ends. The CFCJ further recommends one or more conference presentations involving all project partners in the future, if possible. The CFCJ invites IDRC and others beyond the CFCJ's networks and online channels to share the CFCJ CBJR reports and publications and encourages justice stakeholders working in community-based justice services and other areas to read the Community Justice collection of studies.