

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

	Source of Verification	Comments on definition, composition of indicators or on targets
OUTCOME: 1. Enhanced access to justice and security at regional and county level in preparation for UNMIL transition		
INDICATORS		
<p>1.1 % of regional hubs delivering key administrative and operational support that enable justice and security service providers to perform their duties in the most effective manner with full coverage of counties within each region, and meeting UNMIL security standards</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. It should have been 20%, assuming five planned hubs, and the Gbarnga Hub planned for 2012, that is 1 of 5. In this case, and assuming a total of 14 services, as of December 2012, 9 of 14 services were being offered from the Gbarnga Hub that is, 64% of full range of services.</p>	Gbarnga Regional Justice and Security Hub Report through January 2013	<p><u>Composition of indicator:</u> It is suggested that <i>The numerator</i> reflect the number of hubs that “deliver...” and the <i>Denominator</i> reflect total number of hubs planned. For 2012, the indicator can only be reported on as it refers to the Gbarnga Hub, because for the 5 planned hubs the indicator covers a longer period than just 2012. For purposes of 2012, the result only includes progress toward the Gbarnga Hub. No definition of “administrative and operational support” is available in project documentation. Based on discussions at the Justice and Security Board (JSB) as well as at the JS-TAG levels during 2012, going forward, the support concept has now been adjusted to be reflective of the “services” to be provided. These include 14 services: 1) Support to local police in response to public disorder; 2) Support to local police to enhance protection of life and property; 3) Response to border insecurity; 4) Patrols to increase community sense of security and trust in the police; 5) Prosecution of cases at the Magisterial and Circuit Court level (county attorneys and city solicitors); 6) Psycho-social and legal services to SGBV victims; 7) Community services by offenders; 8) Secure prisons/detention centers; 9)</p>

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

		<p>Resolution of disputes at magisterial/circuit levels; 10) Adjudication of cases at the magisterial and Circuit levels; 11) Free legal representation of indigent defendants (Public Defender); 12) Information about Hub services; 13) Referral to existing community services; 14) Referral of citizen complaints to justice and security agencies</p>
<p>1.2 % of regional hubs with joint command, control and communication structures of LNP, BIN and BCR in place to maintain effective oversight and mutual accountability mechanisms between counties and HQ in Monrovia</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. The wording of the indicator points to 100% of command, control and communication structures in place per hub. For the Gbarnga Hub the status of this indicator for 2012 is 62% based on the Composition of the indicator as explained in the respective column.</p>	<p>LNP, BIN, and BCR administrative records for SOPs; 2012 PBF Quarterly reports for the remaining factors; Scoring of Indicators document</p>	<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> Although the term “joint” in the indicator suggests that LNP, BIN and BCR will have “common” command, control and communication structures, in reality and based on the fact that they are separate agencies, and as described in the Gbarnga Hub Operational document approved in August 2012, the idea is to have shared resources as it relates to command and control for LNP and BIN, and for all three agencies to share a communication structure being set-up in the Gbarnga region [through inputs coming under Project No. 9].</p> <p><u>Composition of the indicator:</u> Having clarified the above, this indicator is composed of 5 factors: 1) the infrastructure to house the LNP and BIN regional commanders and their staff; 2) the pilot automated records management system; 3) the Operational Guide for institutions with presence at the Hub; 4) the SOPs of each agency; 5) and the communications network. Each factor has a weight of 20 points of a total of 100. The breakdown of each aspect and the score obtained</p>

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

		by each factor as of December 31, 2012 is contained in the narrative of the report.
<p>1.3 % of official border entry posts with evidence of improved effectiveness of border control that result in reduced illegal trafficking and transnational crimes</p> <p>TARGET: Please see comment column.</p>		<p><u>Definition of indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not include what is meant by “improved effectiveness”, nor does it specify which illegal trafficking and transnational crimes it seeks to track. Also, the indicator does not take into account that there is limited direct correlation between the existence of a border entry post and its effect on illegal trafficking and transnational crimes. In order for the effect to take place on these crimes, the sole presence of a border entry post is not sufficient. The reduction of these crimes is a combined effort of BIN, DEA, LNP, prosecution, and the Judiciary, depending on the type of crime. It is not possible to report on this indicator as formulated. It is suggested that this indicator be modified during the revision process.</p>
<p>1.4 change in # of incidents reported to LNP annually in Bong, Lofa and Nimba counties</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. The baseline in 2011 was 0 because previous to the deployment of the PSU to the Gbarnga Hub in 2011 the PSU were deployed from Monrovia when security incidents occurred. In 2012 the result of the indicator is 11. In order to report on the “change”, 2013 will have to end so that the Program can report on the variance.</p>	<p>Gbarnga Regional Justice and Security Hub Report through January 2013. In 2013, administrative records of LNP at Gbarnga Hub.</p>	<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not include what is meant by “incidents”. Based on discussions held at the JS Board, it is suggested that this indicator be worded as follows: “Change in the number of crime events or security incidents to which the PSU responded to in support of local police” (disaggregated by county).</p>
<p>1.5 change in # of civilian complaints lodged in Lofa, Nimba and Bong counties</p>	<p>Gbarnga Regional Justice and</p>	<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> In order to be more specific as to what is being measured, it is</p>

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. In 2012, two complaints were lodged at the Gbarnga Hub. It is only until 2013 that public outreach offices will be opened in Nimba and Lofa. The variance from 2012 to 2013 can only happen when the year 2013 is over.</p>	<p>Security Hub Report through January 2013, Gbarnga Hub PSO records</p>	<p>suggested that the indicator read “Change in # of civilian complaints lodged in the public outreach offices in Lofa, Bong, and Nimba counties”.</p>
<p>1.6 Change of target population’s confidence and trust in law enforcement and the judiciary at county level</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012.</p>	<p>Peacebuilding Office records for the survey process.</p>	<p><u>Composition of the indicator:</u> The survey to measure this indicator was developed in 2012 which is when the baseline became available. Since the different questions in the survey do not add up to an index, specific questions from the survey will need to be identified in order to track the variances from year to year.</p>
<p>OUTPUTS</p>		
<p>1.1. Infrastructure, equipment, and systems critical for command, control and operational response put in place for all regional hubs</p>		
<p>1.1.1 # of logistic support facilities built (disaggregated in construction of # of circuit courts, magistrate courts, police barracks, training facilities, joint LNP-BIN administrative buildings, border crossings, Gbarnga prison upgraded with separate facilities for women and juveniles)</p> <p>TARGET: With regards to the Monrovia Central Prison Project, the target for 2012 was that 1 cell block and the administrative building would be constructed. By end 2012, the land clearing was 100% complete, the cell block had not initiated construction (0%), and the Administrative building was 30% complete. The</p>	<p>Bi-annual report to PBF</p>	

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>average for these three activities by end 2012 was 43%. The target for the upgrading of the Gbarnga Prison was accomplished (100%). The Gbarnga Hub was 80% complete by end 2012.</p>		
<p>1.1.2 # of regional hubs constructed and operational</p> <p>TARGET: The target for 2012 in terms of construction was 85%. The achieved target as of December 31, 2012 was 80%. See report narrative for explanation of delays.</p>	<p>Bi-annual reports to PBF</p>	
<p>1.1.3 # of functional LNP, BIN and BCR regional command and control structures in place</p> <p>TARGET: See results under Indicator 1.2.</p>		<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> The wording of the indicator is not specific in terms of whether the command and control structures are limited to those being set up at each Hub. Because of the focus of PBF funds, it is assumed from hereon, that this will be the case. It is therefore suggested that the phrase “at each hub” be added after the current wording. Also, it is important to note that LNP, BIN and BCR command and control structures are already in place in each region, independent of the existence of the Hub. It is also suggested that this indicator be combined with indicator 1.2.</p> <p><u>Composition of the indicator:</u> From hereon, the term “functional” is composed of 5 factors as referenced under Indicator 1.2.</p>
<p>2.1 Justice and security service providers at the regional hubs level able to provide fair and accountable professional services</p>		
<p>2.1.1 # SGBV cases taken to trial</p> <p>TARGET:</p>	<p>SGBV Crimes Unit records and reports</p>	<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> The wording of the indicator is not specific in terms of the geographic coverage. Because of the focus of</p>

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. The baseline in 2011 was 0 because the SGBV Crimes Unit only had presence in Monrovia. In 2012 the # of cases prosecuted was 2. One in Bong in the February term, and one in Lofa in the November term.</p>		<p>PBF funds, it is suggested that the indicator be changed to refer to cases being brought to courts in the Gbarnga Region by the Sexual Gender Based Violence Crimes Unit which has offices at the Hub. The new wording of the indicator would therefore read “Number of cases prosecuted by the Gbarnga Hub SGBV Unit” (disaggregated by county and by court term)</p>
<p>2.1.2 % reduction in the number of procedural releases</p> <p>TARGET:</p>		<p>It is suggested that this indicator be revised as the definition of what a “procedural release” needs to be arrived at by consensus.</p>
<p>2.1.3 # of prosecutors and public defenders deployed to the regional hubs out of total expected (%)</p> <p>TARGET:</p> <p>The target for 2012 was 5 public defenders and 5 county attorneys. In 2012 three public defenders were deployed to the Gbarnga Region, one per county in addition to the existing Public Defenders in each county. As the Judiciary had deployed 1 public defender per county with GOL funding but had no resources for mobility, it considered it was necessary to reduce the number of public defenders in order to make the work of the office in each county more effective. Two prosecutors were deployed to the Region, 1 to Bong and 1 to Lofa, in addition to the existing County Attorneys in each county. The remaining three were assigned to Montserrado courts to implement a hands-on training before they are deployed to the Gbarnga Hub Region.</p>	<p>Judiciary’s administrative records and reports to UNDP; Solicitor General’s administrative records</p>	
<p>2.1.4 # of joint trainings undertaken and # of personnel trained to achieve full coverage of target counties (disaggregated by institution and sex)</p>	<p>Gbarnga Regional Justice and Security Hub</p>	

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. In 2012 two joint trainings were held. A total of 59 people were trained, 7 of which were female. 23 participants were from Bong, 18 from Nimba and 18 from Lofa. A total of 18 officials were from the Judiciary, 12 from LNP, 12 from BIN, 6 from BCR, 9 from Prosecution, and 2 from Probation.</p>	<p>Report through January 2013, Gbarnga Hub Joint Training records</p>	
<p>2.1.6: # of in-service trainings delivered to LNP, BIN and BCR annually (including disaggregated by institution/sex).</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. One course was held in 2012 addressed to BCR officers.</p>		<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> In-service training are refresher courses.</p>
<p>2.1.6 % of cases that are tried and disposed of within the legal limit</p> <p>TARGET:</p>		<p><u>Composition of the indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not identify what types of cases are of most concern, which in turn would determine what the legal limit is. This indicator and its composition will be discussed with the Inter-Agency Steering Committee who is chaired by the Circuit Court Judge.</p>
<p>2.1.7 Medical directorate developed to increase access to health care for corrections staff and prisoners and incarcerated populations</p> <p>TARGET: The MOJ/Bureau for Corrections for Rehabilitation has identified a focal point in the Ministry of Health through which inmates are referred to for medical services.</p>		

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>2.1.8 % reduction in prisoner recidivism</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. In 2012, 85% of offenders under Gbarnga Hub probation officers' supervision did not reoffend within reporting period.</p>	<p>Probation Program administrative records, Presentation to the Justice and Security Board at the March 12, 2013 meeting.</p>	<p><u>Definition and composition of the indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not define what the composition of the indicator is, meaning, there is no information about what the numerator and denominator should be. In discussions at the JS Board level, the indicator that was reported on by the Probation Program is "Percentage of offenders receiving services from the Program who are not reoffenders during reporting period in the Gbarnga Region." It is suggested that the numerator read "# of offenders under Gbarnga Hub probation officers' supervision that reoffended during the reporting period" and the denominator be "total # of offenders under Gbarnga Hub probation officers' supervision during the reporting period".</p>
<p>2.1.9 # of operational PSU deployments stationed in the region that can respond to security incidents in their geographical area of regional coverage</p> <p>TARGET: The initial target was 70 which is the number of PSU officers that were deployed in November 2010. However, the LNP subsequently considered that 50 was the most appropriate number of PSU that they needed which is the number of deployed PSU officers at the Hub as of December 31, 2012.</p>	<p>Gbarnga Regional Justice and Security Hub Report through January 2013</p>	
<p>2.1.10 # of trained BIN staff deployed at official border crossings</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to</p>	<p>BIN administrative records</p>	<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not specify what the target official border crossings are, and therefore the universe is too broad. Also, the indicator focuses on the official border crossings and not the</p>

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>a specific target for 2012. Forty-five BIN/BPU officers were deployed to the Gbarnga Hub. They undertake surveillance patrols to Nimba, Lofa and Bong.</p>		<p>presence of the hub. Based on lessons learned, it is suggested that the indicator be changed to “# of times in the year the BIN/BPU officers deployed in the Gbarnga Hub are rotated to the counties covered by the Hub.” The target for 2013 would have to be 4 times. It is important to track this, because the use of the Hub facilities is only meaningful if it serves to ensure that the 45 officers are rotated out of the Hub into the counties being served every three months. It will show GOL commitment in providing fuel for these officers to be deployed into border crossings in the counties being served by the Hub.</p>
<p>2.1.11 % increase in the number of cases being handled through the court system</p> <p>TARGET:</p>		<p><u>Composition of the indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not identify what types of cases are of most concern. This indicator and its composition will be discussed with the Inter-Agency Steering Committee who is chaired by the Circuit Court Judge. It is not solely the result of the judges’ dynamism, but rather the result of effective case management within each of the criminal justice actors.</p>
<p>2.1.12 # of corrections officers recruited and trained</p> <p>TARGET: The target for 2012 was 20 new BCR officers through PBF funding. In 2012 20 new BCR officers were recruited and trained. Their training ends in March 2013 and they will be deployed into the Gbarnga Region as of April 2013.</p>		
<p>3. 1. Security and justice service providers are responsive to community concerns</p>		

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>3.1.1 % of increase in public awareness of rights and responsibilities at county level related to PSO outreach campaigns</p> <p>TARGET:</p>	<p>UNDP Cso grantees report</p>	<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> The indicator does not correspond to the reality of the Gbarnga Hub PSO outreach efforts nor the efforts undertaken by the three civil society organizations that received grants from UNDP in 2012. The outreach efforts carried out in 2012 included providing target communities information about how the Gbarnga Hub works. A more relevant indicator for 2012 would be “number of people reached by Gbarnga PSO Outreach Office and CSO grantees” disaggregated by community. For 2013, this indicator continues to be relevant as UNDP will provide new grants to CSOs in the Gbarnga Hub region, precisely to enhance the knowledge that target communities have of their rights and how to access the justice system.</p>
<p>3.1.2 # of networks of CSOs established linked to regional hubs</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. In 2012, the Gbarnga PSO Office established a partnership with 6 networks in the Gbarnga Hub Region.</p>	<p>Gbarnga Hub PSO records</p>	
<p>3.1.3 # of County Justice and Security Councils operational</p> <p>TARGET: This initiative is not supported with PBF funds. County security councils are functioning in Nimba and Lofa Counties, supported through a United States’ government funded project entitled ‘Tetra Tech DPK – Mitigating Land Disputes in Liberia’. The councils in Grand Gedeh and River</p>		

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

<p>Gee have been activated and are functioning but face extreme challenges regarding funding and management experience. Councils have not yet been activated in Bong, Maryland, Sinoe and Grand Kru, but are expected to be functioning by June 2013. Functioning security councils are especially crucial in Nimba, Lofa, Grand Gedeh, and Maryland counties, in light of the volatile border situation. It is expected that these councils will act as an important early warning mechanism.</p>		
<p>3.1.4 # of human rights monitors deployed</p> <p>TARGET: The target was 3 and in 2012 3 human rights monitors were deployed to the Gbarnga Region one to each county.</p>		
<p>3.1.5 # of people assisted by civil society organizations to seek redress for violations of human rights (disaggregated by type of case, age and sex)</p> <p>TARGET:</p>		
<p>3.1.6 # of cases resolved by ADR at the community level</p> <p>TARGET: The program results framework does not include a reference to a specific target for 2012. With World Bank funding, the Ministry of Justice in collaboration with the Judiciary will begin an ADR program in 2013.</p>		<p><u>Definition of the indicator:</u> The available project documentation does not establish if the assumption was that the Hub would be resolving cases through ADR or if the idea was that the cases referred by the Hub to existing community services may be resolved through ADR. The Gbarnga Operational Guide, approved in 2012, attributes three functions to the Public Services and Outreach office: referral of complaints against justice and security officials to relevant instances; referral of requests to existing community services, one of which could be to community-based organizations that resolve cases</p>

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

		through ADR; and finally, the information provided about the Hub services. Based on this, it is suggested that the indicator read “Number of requests for community services referred to existing community-based organizations” (disaggregated by type of organization the request was referred to, which could include organizations providing ADR services)
4.1 Legal and policy frameworks in place that enable national authorities to better perform their duties in the justice and security sector		
4.1.1 Legislation relating to jury law and the jurisdiction of magistrates developed and implemented TARGET: The draft Jury Law was presented to the legislature. It will expand magistrates’ jurisdiction and improve the jury systems. This law will help reduce the caseload currently being experienced in the circuit courts by trying more serious cases and thereby speeding up trials that would otherwise remain pending for a long time in the higher courts. The new Jury Law will also improve the appointment of jurors and is expected to reduce any corruption related with the current system.		
4.1.2 Bail and alternative sentencing provisions being implemented in line with legislation TARGET: This item was included in the agenda to be discussed at the Criminal Justice Conference which was scheduled to take place in November 2012, but was postponed to March 2013. The Conference will gather legal scholars from around Liberia to discuss key issues to make the criminal justice system more		

Annex 1: Detailed Indicator Based Performance Table

effective.		
4.1.3 Regional framework for access to justice developed TARGET:		Definition of the indicator: The available project documentation does not define what is meant by “regional framework”. It is suggested that this indicator be dropped during the revision process.
4.1.4 Legislation relating to jury law, prison law, the jurisdiction of magistrates gun control law and National Security reform developed and passed TARGET: The National Security Reform and Intelligence Act was passed by the Legislature. The Prison Act was drafted and is awaiting passage by the Legislature. Since the Act establishing the Small Arms Commission was passed, the draft legislation on firearms control is expected to be prioritized. The Commission has an important role to play in facilitating the necessary political will to ensure passage of the legislation. In the meantime, responding to the gap in legislated fire arms control, the President has signed Executive Order Number 34, which extends the total ban on firearms and ammunitions for civilian use (except for hunting purposes) due to lapse on 25 October 2012.		
4.1.5 Regional framework for access to justice developed TARGET:		This indicator is repetitive of indicator 4.1.3. Same comment as above.