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A. Basic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country:</th>
<th>Mongolia</th>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Legal and Judicial Reform Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project ID:</td>
<td>P074001</td>
<td>L/C/TF Number(s):</td>
<td>IDA-35950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Date:</td>
<td>07/05/2009</td>
<td>ICR Type:</td>
<td>Core ICR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lending Instrument:</td>
<td>LIL</td>
<td>Borrower:</td>
<td>MONGOLIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Total Commitment:</td>
<td>XDR 0.0M</td>
<td>Disbursed Amount:</td>
<td>XDR 4.0M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Category: C

Implementing Agencies:
Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs

Cofinanciers and Other External Partners:

B. Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Original Date</th>
<th>Revised / Actual Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept Review:</td>
<td>05/31/2001</td>
<td>Effectiveness:</td>
<td>07/30/2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal:</td>
<td>10/01/2001</td>
<td>Restructuring(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval:</td>
<td>12/21/2001</td>
<td>Mid-term Review:</td>
<td>09/30/2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>05/14/2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>04/30/2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Ratings Summary

C.1 Performance Rating by ICR

Outcomes: Satisfactory
Risk to Development Outcome: Moderate
Bank Performance: Satisfactory
Borrower Performance: Satisfactory

C.2 Detailed Ratings of Bank and Borrower Performance (by ICR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bank</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Borrower</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality at Entry:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
<td>Government:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Supervision:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Implementing Agency/Agencies:</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Bank Performance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Overall Borrower Performance:</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.3 Quality at Entry and Implementation Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Performance</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>QAG Assessments (if any)</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Problem Project at any time (Yes/No):</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Quality at Entry (QEA):</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Problem Project at any time (Yes/No): Yes
Quality of Supervision (QSA): Moderately Satisfactory
DO rating before Closing/Inactive status: Satisfactory

D. Sector and Theme Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sector Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law and justice</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme Code</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to law and justice</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial and other dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law reform</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Bank Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>At ICR</th>
<th>At Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>James W. Adams</td>
<td>Jemal-ud-din Kassum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>David R. Dollar</td>
<td>Ian C. Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector Manager</td>
<td>Anthony G. Toft</td>
<td>Carlos Ricardo Escudero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Leader</td>
<td>Robert Buergenthal</td>
<td>Carlos Ricardo Escudero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Team Leader</td>
<td>Robert Buergenthal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICR Primary Author</td>
<td>Halsey L. Beemer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Results Framework Analysis

**Project Development Objectives** (from Project Appraisal Document)
To assist the Borrower to enhance public trust and confidence in the legal system as a whole and the judiciary in particular through the design and testing of new tools and systems that promote better access to legal information, the establishment and operation of a specialized court system, and improved legal education and profession.

**Revised Project Development Objectives** (as approved by original approving authority)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Original Target Values (from approval documents)</th>
<th>Formally Revised Target Values</th>
<th>Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1:</td>
<td>Administrative courts were created in 2004, so no baseline data is available.</td>
<td>By the end of the Project increase the number of cases received and solved.</td>
<td>no revision</td>
<td>21 Aimag and Capital city Administrative Courts (ACs) refurbished, 79 judges and administrative staff trained, 74 percent growth from 2004 through 2007 (145 to 550 + cases) in cases resolved by ACs, in Ulaanbaatar, similar growth at aimag level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>10/01/2004</td>
<td>04/30/2006</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Ulaanbaatar administrative courts were by far the most active and accounted for almost fifty percent the cases handled by all the 21 administrative courts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 2:</td>
<td>In 2002 the Unified Information Network (UIN) did not exist</td>
<td>Creation of the Unified Information Network (UIN) by the close of the project.</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>UIN created with two databases, (<a href="http://www.Legalinfo.mn">www.Legalinfo.mn</a> and <a href="http://www.Judgeinfo.mn">www.Judgeinfo.mn</a>) and connecting 30 government organizations and agencies by a fiber optic link, and available to the public through computers in the National Legal Center (NLC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
<td>05/05/2003</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>100 percent achieved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 3:</td>
<td>Degree to which Administrative Courts are developed and become operative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 4:</td>
<td>The adequacy of communication strategy manifested by an increase of Public trust and respect for the judiciary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value (quantitative or Qualitative)</td>
<td>In 2002 there were no Administrative Courts (ACs) and by the close of the project, it had supported the construction of 11 ACs and had trained the judges and administrative staff in all the country's 21 ACs. One AC in Ulaanbaatar (UB) and one in a pilot Aimag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
<td>12/14/2005</td>
<td>04/30/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Centrally important achievement of the LJRP is the substantial increase in the number of ACs established, judges trained and case and trial handbooks produced with project support.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Indicator 5: | National Legal Center (NLC) built and operational and dissemination and public awareness tools design and tested |
| Value (quantitative or Qualitative) | National Legal Center (NLC) did not exist at time of project design. NLC operational with dissemination and public awareness tools designed and tested. Added a Print Shop to the NLC for production of training, reference and dissemination publications. |
| Date achieved | 01/22/2002 | 12/01/2007 | 12/01/2007 | 12/01/2007 |
| Comments (incl. % achievement) | No specific data provided | No changes | Impact Evaluation Study (IES) found that 73.6 percent of those surveyed were either well or somewhat well informed of the ACs and their individual or corporate legal rights in these courts. |

Eleven ACs in UB and Aimag received project support for building or refurbishing ACs and provision of court related equipment.
**Indicator 6:** Degree to which developed monitoring methodology shows effectiveness of legal education within renewed curricula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value quantitative or Qualitative</th>
<th>At time of Legal Needs Assessment, there was little or no monitoring of the effectiveness of the then current legal education curricula.</th>
<th>Creation of a method to monitor the effectiveness of the legal curricula.</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>New law teaching curriculum, judged to be close to international standards, introduced and piloted in two accredited law schools.</td>
<td>By the close of the project 93.3 percent of surveyed law professors taking part in the reforms at the 2 accredited law schools felt that their views were reflected in the new syllabi.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator 7:** Adequacy of designed training materials for legal profession's exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value quantitative or Qualitative</th>
<th>None existed at time of project preparation</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date achieved</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
<td>12/01/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments (incl. % achievement)</td>
<td>Survey data is not robust and this question will have to be followed up with reviews of how the students fare in the new legal exams and bar exams when they are introduced.</td>
<td>At project close, the IES surveyed law students, 83.9 percent of whom were satisfied with the contents of the new syllabuses as were 93.3 percent of the professors who taught the courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Intermediate Outcome Indicator(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline Value</th>
<th>Original Target Values (from approval documents)</th>
<th>Formally Revised Target Values</th>
<th>Actual Value Achieved at Completion or Target Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator 1:</strong></td>
<td>Since this is a LIL there were no intermediate indicators included in the PAD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value (quantitative or Qualitative)</th>
<th>Date achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>01/22/2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

04/30/2006
### G. Ratings of Project Performance in ISRs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date ISR Archived</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Actual Disbursements (USD millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>06/30/2003</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>07/22/2003</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>06/29/2004</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/23/2004</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12/29/2004</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>06/22/2005</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>05/19/2006</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>06/29/2007</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H. Restructuring (if any)

Not Applicable

### I. Disbursement Profile

![Disbursement Profile Graph](image-url)
1. Project Context, Development Objectives and Design
(this section is descriptive, taken from other documents, e.g., PAD/ISR, not evaluative)

1.1 Context at Appraisal
(brief summary of country and sector background, rationale for Bank assistance)

Country Background. Following the disintegration of the socialist bloc led by the Soviet Union, Mongolia embarked on a comprehensive reform path encompassing all spheres of the nation’s political, economic and social life. Between 1990 and 2000, Mongolia underwent a transition toward modernization of its legal system, establishing political democracy, and creating a market economy. The Rule of Law was judged by Mongolian political leaders to be important for broader objectives: the development of a market economy and a democratic state. Strong, autonomous, and respected courts were understood to be necessary parts of an effective legal order. A sound legal and judicial system and rule based regulatory system were seen to play a pivotal role in the effective operation of private sector development.

In pursuing this reform, the following objectives were laid out by the Mongolian Government:

- To initiate the transition from a planned economy dependent on investment from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries into a market-based economy to ensure political and economic independence and sustainable development;
- To build a civil and democratic society with full adherence to the principle of respect for human rights and the rule of law; and
- To become a full fledged member of the international community.

In order to achieve the above stated goals there was an urgent need to establish a basic legal framework within which society would evolve politically and economically while maintaining its culture and identity.

Sector Background. The first stage of reform culminated in 1992 with the adoption of a new constitution. Since then efforts have been make to establish the legislative framework necessary for a new political and economic system. In 1998 the Ih Hural (Parliament) of Mongolia adopted the Legal Reform Program which sets the new basic directions structured upon the appraisal of new demands for further reforms. It outlined the basic direction of activities to be undertaken to ensure the effective implementation of the constitution and legal reform in the country for the purposes of building “the humane civil society” and “creation of the legal basis and favorable environment for economic development”. The program reflected the need for the next stage of legal reform and encompassed the conceptual policy of the Mongolian Government and society as a whole.

The General Provisions for the Legal Reform Program stated the basic directions of implementation of the Program. They included:

- Development of the legal basis for ensuring the sovereignty of Mongolia.
- Perfection of the legal basis of economic relations.
- Ensuring of human rights, freedoms and its legal guarantees.
- Perfection for the legal basis of the state structure.
- Creation of the environment for legal reform.
- Perfection of the training of legal professionals.
- Broadening of participation of Mongolia in international legal relations.

On May 4, 2000, the Ih Hural adopted the Strategic Plan for the Justice System of Mongolia. This plan is a strategic document which clarifies the direction of development of bodies of the judiciary within the framework of overall legal reform and, more significantly, sets strategic goals to define the Mongolian judiciary with comprehensive and coordinated
activities for its implementation. The plan raises the need for the judiciary to protect its political, economic, organizational and decision-making independence as the first fundamental value. Among strategic goals to do so, the plan states that the provision of an oversight mechanism on wrongful decisions made by the executive branch was to be the creation of a court specializing in adjudication of administrative cases.

Other major fundamental values highlighted in the plan were fairness and accessibility. The plan stresses the necessity to treat citizens with respect and to consistently apply only the law. This would be guaranteed by ensuring correct application and strict observance of the laws by the justice system. In this regard, dissemination of new legislation, Supreme Court interpretations and court decisions would be developed. To ensure accessibility of the justice system the plan focuses on the need to improve relations with the public and to provide it with legal information. Legal education and enhancing the quality of the legal profession were also identified as strategic principles to ensure the effectiveness of the justice system.

In the late 1990s, public confidence in the judicial system was extremely low. This lack of trust was mainly due to the perception of the lack of transparency and accountability, absence of information regarding court decisions, significant administrative cases, extensive case backlogs, limited independence of the judiciary, etc. Public attitudes toward the judiciary were largely based on the experience of the earlier Soviet style legal system where courts were not presumed to be protectors of citizens’ rights but more the long arm of the government’s often repressive actions. Surveys and consultations conducted in Mongolia as background for the Legal Needs Assessment (LNA – see below) carried out by the Government of Mongolia (GOM) with the support of the World Bank in preparation for the new project revealed that the public was less confident in the legal and judiciary system compared to other governmental bodies. The central challenge of the judiciary at that point in time was to enhance public trust by being more transparent, more accessible and more efficient.

The extensive drafting of laws in the 1990s frequently assisted by advisors from legal traditions of different countries, resulted in many laws that were inconsistent and in contradiction to each other. In some instances, the laws were prepared without taking into account local traditions, cultural and linguistic background and existing legislation. Moreover, many laws had been drafted with a narrow sectoral view and interest, thereby causing adoption of laws that was detached from the overall objectives of national socioeconomic development and that overlooked economic priorities and the scarcity of resources. Many laws emerged in an autonomous way without ties to any social or economic necessity.

Legal education was provided by 31 law schools, only two of which were accredited. With the transition to a market economy, Mongolia altered the basis of social and economic relationships, and thus, the essence and justification of the legal system. To meet this challenge, legal education had to be restructured in terms of having a unified curricular standard applicable to all accredited law schools, the choice of courses, these content and presentation. Moreover, a rigorous system of entry to the practice of the legal profession had to be adopted based on equal treatment, fairness, competition and qualifications.

In June 1999, the World Bank funded, and the MOJHA managed, the Legal Needs Assessment (LNA) for Mongolia. The assessment process was based on the premise that justice sector reform must be designed by the country itself. The problems and needs were identified by the Mongolian authorities and major actors involved in the legal sphere through open debates and consultation.

---

1 Between 1992 and 200, 337 laws were adopted and 491 laws were amended and changed. The massive amount of existing laws needed a comprehensive review to avoid contradictions if any, and to undertake follow-up work on reconciliation of legislation. No less important was the fact that the laws had yet to be disseminated to the public.
The LNA report analyzed the activities to be carried out under the Legal and Judicial Reform Program and served two purposes. The first was to assess major problems affecting the efficiency of the newly shaped legal reform system and identify the program needed to help the government to design further legal reform activities. The second was to provide information to the external donor community for designing the forthcoming legal reform projects and to coordinate activities that had been or were being carried out as part of the legal reform process. There was coordinated effort of the Government, Parliament, Judiciary, scholars and civil society to assess their needs for Justice Sector Reform in their country.

To further achieve the objectives of the Legal Reform Program; the following areas for assistance were identified in the LNA:

- Legislative drafting: development and coordination;
- Judicial and criminal justice reform;
- Legal profession: improvement of legal education and bar development;
- Legal Scholarship: development of materials and research databases;
- Public awareness: dissemination of legal information; and
- Coordination and harmonization of International treaties.

From the ongoing evolution of legal reform activities at the national level and the work of the Legal Needs Assessment, the Bank and the Mongolian government identified and prepared the Justice Sector Reform Project (LJRP) as well as other donor supported Justice Sector Reform projects.2

Rationale for Bank Assistance. The Bank’s Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) of June 2, 1998, supported the government’s primary goal of poverty alleviation. This program was based on a four pronged approach: a) supporting macro-economic stabilization; b) facilitating private sector development; c) investing in infrastructure; and d) promoting greater equity in development. In addition, the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper prepared by Mongolia (I-PRSP, IDA-SecM2001-0557) of September 27, 2001, set forth an active legal reform agenda as a necessary factor for the creation of a stable macroeconomic framework conducive to growth and increase in private investment to support Mongolia’s poverty reduction strategy. The LJRP project was designed to contribute to the Bank’s country assistance strategy and support the Government’s poverty reduction strategy, since facilitating the private sector development as well as promoting greater equity in development relies heavily on the existence of a transparent, equitable and effective justice system. The project, designed as a Learning Investment Loan (LIL), proposed to back a core set of reforms on a pilot basis, focusing on those which enhance the user’s perception of the legal system in general and the judiciary in particular in order to foster private sector development, help reduce poverty and inequality and promote better access to justice.

1.2 Original Project Development Objectives (PDO) and Key Indicators (as approved)

The objective of the Legal and Judicial Reform Project (LJRP) project was to assist the Borrower to enhance public trust and confidence in the legal system as a whole and the judiciary in particular through the design and testing of new tools and systems to promote better access to legal information, the establishment and operation of a specialized court system, and improved legal education and profession.

---

2 Other donor supported projects included the USAID supported “Mongolia Judicial Reform Program”, “Economic Law Reform” and “Legal Training and Retraining” project supported by the German Society of Technical Cooperation (GTZ); the Legal Reform Assistance Project of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and activities supported by the Hanns-Seidel Foundation, and the Mongolian Open Society (Soros) Foundation
Key Performance Indicators were:

- More transparent, equitable, and effective justice system;
- Better access to justice;
- Improved level of public trust and confidence in the legal system as a whole and the judiciary in particular;
- Level to which legal and judicial information is accessible and shared with different categories of civil society;
- Degree to which Administrative Court System courts are developed and become operative;
- Pilot administrative courts fully operational and efficient, and administrative judges trained;
- Adequacy of communication strategy manifested by an increase of public trust and respect for the judiciary;
- National Legal Center (NLC) built and operational, and dissemination and public awareness tools designed and tested;
- Degree to which the monitoring methodology shows the effectiveness of legal education within renewal of curricula; and
- Adequacy of designed training materials for legal profession’s’ exams.

1.3 Revised PDO (as approved by original approving authority) and key indicators, and reasons/justification.

The objective was not revised.

1.4 Main Beneficiaries:
(original and revised, briefly describe the “primary target group” identified in the PAD and as captured in the PDO, as well as any the other individuals and organizations expected to benefit form the project.)

The main beneficiaries for the project were:

- Mongolian citizens seeking judicial conflict resolutions, especially by settling cases related to the infringement of the citizen’s rights by government agencies or officials, were expected to benefit substantially from the introduction of the institutional reforms;
- The private sector and foreign investors were expected to respond positively to improved legal and judicial framework that would reduce their risk of doing business in Mongolia;
- Judges were expected to benefit from overall improvements in their capacity and efficiency in handling and resolving cases; and
- Legal professionals are expected to benefit from the reformed legal education curricula and law school accreditation and the introduction of a law bar examination.

Other indirect beneficiaries/key actors were:

- Administrative Court System: established and institutionalized and played the major role the public awareness campaigns on citizens rights;
- The National Legal Center (NLC): played key role in reforming legal education for judges and lawyers, enhancing legal research and the administration of the Unified Information Network (UIN);
- Accredited law schools in two universities and other non-accredited law schools: developed and implemented newly reformed bachelor degree legal educational curricula and syllabus, and
- The Project Steering Committee: designed to perform high-level management strategic functions and to be responsible for making key project decisions.
1.5 Original Components *(as approved)*

**Component A - Administrative Court System (ACS):** US$ 0.95 million

Establishment and operation nationwide of a specialized administrative court system to foster the rule of law by settling cases related to the infringement of citizen’s rights by any agency or government official empowered to handle proceedings and issue mandatory decisions on administrative acts, including: (i) the provision of training and training materials for administrative judges and court personnel; (ii) development of manuals for court management and case administration, (iii) publication and dissemination of decisions of the administrative courts; (iv) development of a communications strategy for public awareness to promote public participation and access to administrative courts; (v) development of a program of gathering and publication of data on administrative courts performance and public opinion surveys; (vi) development of a program to facilitate access by the poor and women to the administrative courts including providing *pro bono* legal assistance; (vii) provision of building facilities for one administrative court at each at the Supreme Court level, a selected Capital City Court and a selected *Aimag* Court, including office space for judges and court personnel, court rooms, office equipment and computers; and (viii) technical assister therefore.

**Component B – Knowledge Sharing and Capacity Building to Foster Access to Justice.** US$ 3.07 million

Establishment and operation of the Center on Legal and Judicial Research, Training, Information and Publicity (the National Legal Center – NLC) including the construction of the required physical facilities in Ulaanbaatar, development of legal and judicial database, establishment of a legal library, provision of training facilities to implement training programs for judges, lawyers and prosecutors and other civil servants, and establishment of a legal research unit, through the provision of staff training, office equipment, computer software and hardware, printing equipment, television studio equipment, training equipment and technical assistance therefore.

**Component C– Enhancement of the Legal Education System and the Legal Profession** – US$ 0.65 million

Development of a nationwide enhanced curriculum, including contents and teaching methods, to be applied on a pilot basis by selected accredited Schools of Law established and operating in Ulaanbaatar, including provision of training to law professors on the subject matters of the enhanced curriculum and methodology of teaching. Development of a nationwide examination for law graduates.

**Component D – Project Implementation** – US$ 0.33 million.

Strengthening the capacity of the PIU to implement legal and judicial projects though the provision of technical assistance and training.

1.6 Revised Components

The components were not revised.

1.7 Other significant changes *(In design, scope and scale, implementation arrangements and schedule, and funding allocations)*

- Given the unanticipated delay in the enactment of the Administrative Court Law, the Borrower requested and was granted changes in the deadline for the carrying out of the works listed in Part 3, 5, and 7, Schedule 4 of the Development Credit Agreement (DCA). The extensions in deadlines varied from seven to nine months;
- In 2003, during the early stages of project implementation, and at the request of the Borrower, the DCA was amended to include Bank support for the development of fiber optic links between the already agreed legal and
judicial database (the Unified Information Network – UIN) and other databases and end-users in Ulaanbaatar to expand their connectivity with the UIN;

- In May 2006, in light of accumulated project cost savings because of the XDR: US Dollar exchange rate, the Government of Mongolia decided to expand project activities. This decision increased support to the Administrative Courts System in 10 selected Aimags1, including supply of court facilities and repair of court buildings. To accomplish this additional work, a new Closing Date of June 30, 2007 was agreed to by the Bank;
- In June 2005, at the request of the Borrower and with the agreement of the Bank, the Closing Date of the project was extended to June 30, 2006 in order that the Unified Information Network (UIN) could be financed and completed;
- In April 2007 the Borrower requested and the Bank agreed to an extension of the Closing Date until December 31, 2007 in order to accommodate civil works containing in certain Aimags and procurement of the originally agreed Print Shop of the National Legal Center (NLC); and,
- In December 2007, due to project delays resulting from a government reorganization, the Bank approved a final extension request to April 30, 2008 in order to finalize delayed project closeout activities.

2. Key Factors Affecting Implementation and Outcomes

2.1 Project Preparation, Design and Quality at Entry

(Including whether lessons of earlier operations were taken into account, risks and their mitigations identified, and adequacy of participatory processes, as applicable.)

*Background analysis.* Important to the design of the project were the findings and recommendations of the Mongolia: Legal Needs Assessment Report (see Section 1.1 for details.) In addition to the LNA, the Bank had drawn experience in the justice by its support of the legal component of the previously financed BELTAC Project (Bank, Enterprise and Legal Assistance Credit), a banking sector project that included technical assistance for legal activities.

*Participatory process.* The LJRP was prepared using a participatory approach. As part of the process, the LNA (see above) roundtables composed of the Mongolian government officials and representatives of civil society were organized to discuss issues and share opinions on the justice sector in open fora. Another roundtable gathered the donor community to discuss information and comments regarding the findings of the previous roundtables. Other information and observations were gathered through interviews with officials of the Mongolian government agencies, non-governmental organizations, legal professionals, practitioners, business people and representatives of civil society. The output of these extensive consultations was the LNA based upon which components of the project were identified and agreed upon.

The participatory process was built into plans for project implementation with projected consultations with the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA) Coordinating Committee for Legal Reform Projects, NGOs, academia and the donor community. It was expected during preparation that this participatory process would be able to track the results of the pilot tools supported by the project and fine tune them in accordance with the user’s needs and reactions the reform process.

*Government commitment.* The Government’s commitment to the project was confirmed by its inclusion in the June 2, 1998 CAS, as well as the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper prepared by Mongolia (I-PRSP, IDA-SecM2001-0557) which was reviewed by the Bank on September 27, 2001. In May 2000, the Ih Hural adopted the Strategic Plan for the Justice System of Mongolia which clarified the developmental direction of the judiciary within the framework of

---

1 Darkhan-Uul Aimag was the original Aimag at the time of project preparation. In May 2006 the following 10 Aimags were added to the project: Bayan-Ulgii, Uvs, Khovd, Zavkhan, Arkhangai, Orkhon (Erdenet), Selenge, Khentii, Khuvsgal, Tuv (Central).
overall legal reform in accordance with the findings of the LNA. Central to the Strategic Plan was the effort to enhance accessibility to the Justice System by focusing on improving public communication and legal information. Legal education and strengthening the legal profession were also identified as strategic principles to ensure effectiveness of the justice system. The Government, through the MOJHA, was fully involved in not only the LNA upon which informed project design but also in the detailed content of the three project components and the project management structure.

**Project Design.** Project design drew directly from the LNA. Given the existing condition of Mongolia’s justice sector, a Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL) was selected as the lending instrument in order to pilot locally based models prior to large scale implementation and given the need to build local project management capacity in the justice sector. Component scope and implementation arrangements were clearly defined. The project’s design allowed for a fair amount of flexibility during implementation and therefore a good choice of instruments to use for project design. Project components - the administrative courts system, knowledge sharing and capacity building and legal education reform - came directly from the LNA report and reflected the Government’s Strategic Plan. The decisions on which component would be included in the Project were also informed by the coordinated approach that the donor community took to supporting the various parts of the Government’s own strategic plan. These other donors active in the legal and judicial sectors were the Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), The Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Hans Seidel Foundation, the Soros Open Society Foundation and The US Agency for International Development (USAID), among others.

**Risks and risk mitigation.** The design considered the following risk factors and appropriate measures were adopted to mitigate them.

- **Enacting the legislation on resolving administrative cases (Administrative Court system) delayed.** Mitigation Measure: Commitment from the government was sought and received to accelerate the review and approval process within the parliament and to lobby actively to ensure passage of the legislation. The law was to be passed as a condition of effectiveness.

- **Space for pilot Administrative Court is not made available.** Mitigation Measure: During the project preparation process, the Government identified spaces for the Administrative Courts.

- **Land for construction of the National Center for Legal and Judicial information, research and training is not made available.** Mitigation Measure: Land had been identified and allocated to the MOJHA for use by the Center.

- **Problems in dissemination of laws and judicial decisions and public awareness, policy matters and staff will not be receptive.** Mitigation Measures: The project was judged to have strong government and civil society support. Constant coordination with the policy makers and staff to raise consciousness about the importance of dissemination and public awareness was planned.

- **Procurement difficulties delay project implementation.** Mitigation Measures: Constant follow-up, training and supervision were planned within implementation.

- **The Project Implementation Unit’s (PIU’s) ability to implement the project proves inadequate.** Mitigation Measures: The PIU would be composed of technical and specialized staff and trained accordingly. The staff was composed of long-term Mongolian consultants.

**2.2 Implementation**

(Including any project changes/restructuring, mid-term review, Project at Risk status, and actions taken, if applicable)

There were no changes made in the design of the project. The project was never at risk, but implementation was often challenging, and the project was expanded twice:

- In 2003, during the early stages of project implementation, and at the request of the Borrower, the DCA was amended to include Bank support for the development of links between the already agreed legal and judicial database and other databases in Ulaanbaatar to provide accessibility to (the Unified Information Network – UIN).
• In May 2006, in light of lessons learned and accumulated savings of somewhat more than US$ 0.9 million because of the XDR:US Dollar exchange rate, the Government of Mongolia decided to expand Component A project activities. This decision increased the support of the Administrative Courts System in selected 10 Aimag.

The Mid Term Review (MTR) was carried out in October 2004. The MTR followed a Quality of Supervision Assessment (QSA6) carried out by the Quality Assurance Group (QAG) in September 2004. Both activities were instrumental in improving the implementation and evaluation of the outcomes of the project.

The QSA6 review found that no intermediate project output indicators were designed at entry, as this was a three year LIL, and that supervision had not yet addressed this area in any depth. The panel was “…of the view that it should have been accompanied by a greater focus on sharpening the results framework and thinking through measurement of intermediate indicators of outcome.” The QAG panel also found that “…while some skills were clearly strong in the supervision teams (e.g. procurement), these could have been complemented with specialist advice for each of the three components, and that there could have been more learning from experience in other parts of the Bank with respect to Justice Sector Reform projects during supervision.” Further, the QAG panel found that the project’s Development Objectives as defined were very general and therefore were not helpful in monitoring the project of the purposes of supervision from the point of view of outcomes. Additionally the panel found that “Given that the results framework at entry left undefined key indicators which would provide some link with expected outcomes/impact, it would have been appropriate during supervision to think through these areas for building consensus with the Borrower and other stakeholders.”

The MTR took the QAG findings and recommendations into consideration as both the Borrower and the task team evaluated the progress attained under each component and activity by assessing: (i) outcomes and impacts; (ii) the status of procurement and disbursements under the project; (iii) difficulties encountered and possible solutions; and (iv) fulfillment of the provisions stipulated in the DCA. At the MTR the following issues were identified and actions taken:

• **Strengthening impact assessment.** The task team worked with the USAID-supported Judicial Reform Project team to develop specific portions of the “Comparative Study of the Public Perception of Judicial Administration – Nationwide Survey”. This survey, conducted bi-annually and funded by USAID, measured public attitudes toward the Mongolian legal and judicial system, and was initially geared toward the USAID supported Judicial Reform Project. The Bank task team agreed to partially fund the 2005 survey and added items which particularly focused on changing attitudes toward the development of local court systems where the Administrative Courts (Component A) were found. The inclusion of these new items in the survey allowed for a more accurate way of measuring success in achieving the development goal of the project.

• **The Financial Viability of the National Legal Center (NLC) once the Credit closed was discussed and the task team reviewed the draft business plan of the NLC for the period 2004-2006. Efforts by the NLC management to seek the funds necessary were reviewed. Although the NLC had been able to secure a contract with USAID for the rental of space in the center, the task team identified the issue of ongoing financial sustainability of the Center to be of concern to the Bank and asked for additional focus to be placed on this issue during the latter part of the project. Toward that end, during the last year of project implementation, the NLC operating costs were funded out of the MOJHA budget rather than from the proceeds of the Credit.**

---

4 World Bank, “Quality of Supervision Assessment (QSA6) 08/16/2004, Pg 3
5 Ibid., pg 3
6 Ibid., pg 3
Other issues identified during implementation were:

- **Public Awareness Programs were not given consistent emphasis.** Key to developing public trust and confidence in the legal system were public awareness campaigns both by the courts and the NLC. Systematic public awareness campaigns on the Administrative Court System and UIN were implemented through radio and TV programs and town hall meetings. However, during the implementation of the project the physical aspects of the project (e.g., building and furnishing the administrative courts and the NLC, training and research activities, and reforming law school syllabus, etc.) consumed most of the project management’s time and energy and the public awareness campaigns received less attention. Toward the end of the project the public awareness campaigns were strengthened through the Courts and the results could be seen in final 2007 Public Perception survey that awareness of and involvement in the Administrative Court System has increased, especially in the country side.

- **Weakness in the Policy Guidance Mechanism.** The LJRP lacked an effective, ongoing and high-level policy guidance group. The project Steering Committee (SC) envisioned in the PAD and mandated in the DCA, was inefficient and failed to perform its policy guidance role as outlined in the DCA. The MOJHA did not make the Steering Committee accountable to the government, nor were Terms of Reference (ToRs) agreed between the Bank and the Government on the role and function of the SC. The lack of a functioning Steering Committee placed additional burdens on the task team during supervisions in coordinating the policy dialogue necessary for a reform project of this scope.

### 2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), Design, Implementation and Utilization

(a) **M&E Design.** The project provided five initial output and impact indicators to assess progress towards meeting targets and objectives. During the Project Concept Document (PCD) review, the meeting recommended that the performance indicators should be more limited, modest, focused and measurable. The meeting noted that this would facilitate effective implementation. At appraisal, five new key performance indicators were to be added. However, none were quantitative even though the largest portion of project funds was designated for construction and rehabilitation of courts, training of judges, awareness campaigns, preparing legal books and guides, and introducing a new pilot law education curriculum. No statistical baseline was developed at the start of the project. No method to assess public perceptions of the legal and judicial system was agreed upon and included in the Project Implementation Plan (PIP). The DCA lists performance indicators which are largely modified project objectives without a systematic method of gathering either ongoing or final output of outcome results.

(b) **M&E Implementation.** During the project’s initial stages, the timely completion of activities listed in the PIP and DCA covenants were the primary focus of task team supervision missions. Delays in project implementation were caused by delayed passage of critical laws regarding the Administrative Court System, and there was limited mention in early aide memoires of project indicators to mark progress toward achieving project objectives. This changed after the QAG Quality of Supervision Review when under the category 4.4 **Effective use of Key Performance Indicators, actual vs. target, in PSR,** QAG gave the project a 4, its lowest mark.

(c) **M&E Utilization.** After the QAG review and the MTR the task team, in cooperation with the USAID Judicial Reform team, developed a set of indicators to be added to the bi-annual Public Perception Surveys scheduled to be carried out in 2005 and 2007. This action marked a substantial expansion in the task team’s supervision focus beyond monitoring progress on non-controversial outputs by adding a focus on systematic gathering of data on public perceptions of justice. It was only through this foci on public perception surveys that it was possible to test whether an increase of public trust and respect for the judiciary through better legal information, the creation of specialized courts and improved legal education as well as a legal profession would enhance better access to justice, all of which constituted the fundamental Project Development Objective the project.

It should be noted that in 2001, during the design and preparation of this project, the Bank did not have a set of agreed upon justice sector M&E outcome and output indicators to apply in justice sector projects. As a result, the implementation of and reporting on the LJRP project suffered, despite being among the second group of Bank-
supported legal reform LILs where such Bank-agreed indicators were lacking. (The first group of LILs included justice sector projects supported by the Bank in Venezuela in 1997, Argentina in 1998, Yemen in 1999, Colombia in 2001, and Croatia in 2001). Moreover, despite the Bank’s increasing work in the justice sector, task teams worked without the benefit of Bank-wide monitoring and evaluation techniques and indicators, or sufficient supervision budgets to undertake the required research and monitoring at the project level. This was and remains an especially important issue with justice sector LILs where learning from experiments is the most critical reason for the development of this financing product.

The task team was asked to strengthen their draft indicators, a direction at the PCN and PAD review stages and echoed in the QAG review two years into the project implementation. As a result, the task team, at the time of the MTR and after the QAG review of project supervision, implemented a process to gather useful impact data, which was subsequently used to review the project outcomes. Moreover, the task team initiated a final review of the project through an Impact Evaluation Study (IES), the final report of which is appended to this ICR.

It may be useful to note that another Bank-supported justice sector LIL, designed and implemented during roughly the same period, “Colombia: Judicial Conflict Resolution Improvement Project (JTC Project), Loan Number 70810”, received sufficient funding to design its own opinion poll to gauge the level of user satisfaction (i.e., lawyers, plaintiffs and defendants) with the services provided by the JTC project in the country’s five main cities. Sharing experiences and best practices among Bank staff is critical, especially when working with new loan instruments such as LILs, and with new strategic objectives such as justice sector reform.

2.4 Safeguard and Fiduciary Compliance
(Focusing on issues and their resolution, as applicable)

The project did not have any major safeguard and fiduciary issues during implementation.

2.5 Post-completion Operations/Next Phase
(Including transition arrangement to post-completion operation of investments financed by present operation, Operations and Maintenance arrangements, sustaining reforms and institutional capacity, and next phase/follow-up operations, if applicable)

(a) Transition arrangements for the project’s future operation. The Administrative Court System (ACS) became fully operational in June 2004 and is a formal part of the Mongolian judicial system with ongoing financial support from the national budget. The National Legal Center (NLC) has submitted a proposal to the Government to transform its status to that of a Legal Academy with a renewed charter with the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA). The Government budget is projected to cover 50-60 percent of the NLC’s budget with the remaining coming from training fees, income form publications, etc. as has the UIN.

(b) Operation and Maintenance arrangements. As noted above, both the operational (salaries, etc.) and training costs of the ACS will come from the national budget. Likewise, arrangements are being made to develop a robust business plan for the NLC in order to allow for salaries, research and training costs, although at the time of the ICR exactly what those plans were not clear. There is a budget for the continued work of the NLC and UIN.

(c) Follow-on project. The sustainability of the reforms and institutional capacity achieved through the implementation of this project is likely to be reinforced by the proposed follow-on Enhanced Justice Sector Services Project which has been approved and is anticipated to be effective in December 2008. The new project is expected to include activities aimed at
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7 The Mongolia LJR project was the sixth LJR LIL but the 20th legal or judicial project since the first one in 1992. Preparation of the Mongolia project was, therefore, twenty years after the preparation of the initial “Venezuela Judicial Infrastructure Project”.
8 The survey’s objectives were to: (i) design a model to measure court satisfaction; (ii) establish a baseline of user satisfaction; (iii) analyze outcomes, emphasizing the strengths and weaknesses in terms of justice services; (iv) recommend further actions; (v) validate quantitative results; and (vi) disseminate results achieved.
modernizing the national legal education system, refurbish selected Court Decision Enforcement Agencies at the *Aimag* level, and develop the justice sector IT infrastructure. The new project was designed taking into consideration lessons learned from the LJRP.

**d) Sustaining reforms and institutional capacity.** Access to judicial and legal information, increased transparency in the publicizing judicial decisions through the UIN, the training of judges and administrative staff in the ACS, the research and training capacity of the NLC and the newly reformed law curricula are all solid reforms and increased institutional capacity.

### 3. Assessment of Objectives

#### 3.1 Relevance of Objectives, Design and Implementation

*(to current country and global priorities, and Bank assistance strategies)*

The objective of the LJRP was relevant and appropriate to the country’s social and economic development at the design stage and throughout implementation. It was also timely, appropriate and fully consistent with the Mongolia CAS (see Section 6.1). Judged by the development priorities and circumstances prevailing at the closing of the project, it is equally evident that the project development objective remains relevant and appropriate.

The project constituted the learning phase of a long-term initiative undertaken by the Government of Mongolia (GOM), aimed at improving the country’s legal and judicial system. It allowed the testing of a participatory strategy to bring about change in court operations by the establishment of an oversight mechanism on decisions made by the executive through the creation of a court specializing in the adjudication of administrative cases.

The operation fit squarely with the features of the LIL instrument. It was modest in size. The focus of the project was on testing whether an increase of public trust and respect for the judiciary through better legal information, the creation of specialized courts and improved legal education as well a legal profession would enhance better access to justice. Each project component was seen as a part of the overall strategy distinctly designed to address elements of the prevailing court structure and operations and to determine whether such models and strategies could be scaled-up.

There was, and continues to be, a high overall relevance of the project objectives to both the Government’ and the Bank’s development goals, both at the time of loan approval and at closing of the project is clear and substantial.

At the time of loan approval the project was situated squarely within the Mongolian Government’s “Justice System Strategic Plan” adopted by the Mongolian Parliament on May 4, 2000 (Resolution 2000/39). As the closing date of the project approached, the implementation of this Strategic Plan was reviewed by MOJHA in September 2006 to determine those tasks that were completed and those that were not. The Ministry concluded the some of the tasks successfully completed include the creation of the administrative court system, enhancing the capacity of the General Council of Courts (GCC) and establishing the National Legal Center (NLC). Lastly, the project objective and activities which derived from the objective support the implementation of the *Ikh Hural’s* 2007 “Millennium Development Goals-Based National Development Strategy” in which the concepts of law, justice and human rights figure prominently.

The Bank’s Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) of June 2, 1998, supported the government’s primary goal of poverty alleviation which included reforming the legal and judicial system. In addition, the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper prepared by Mongolia (I-PRSP, IDA-SecM2001-0557) of September 27, 2001, set forth an active legal reform agenda as a necessary factor for the creation of a stable macroeconomic framework conducive to growth and increase in private investment to support Mongolia’s poverty reduction strategy.

At the end of the implementation period, the project objective remains fully consistent with the government strategy for the justice sector and with the World Bank’s Mongolia 2004 *Country Assistance Strategy* (CAS) and the forthcoming
Country Partnership Strategy (2009). The proposed project will assist in this shared objective by supporting the Strategy’s goals of strengthening government institutions and improving the legal environment to ensure transparency and accessibility of public services.

3.2 Achievement of Project Development Objectives
(Including brief discussions of causal linkages between outputs and outcomes, with details on outputs in Annex 2)

Satisfactory. The LJRP achieved its objective of assisting the Borrower to enhance public trust and confidence in the legal system as a whole, and the judiciary in particular, through the design and testing of new tools and systems to promote better access to legal information, the establishment and operation of a specialized court system and improved legal education and profession. A brief review of the outcomes of the activities in the three components of the project follows.

Component A: Administrative Court System:
- The specialized Administrative Court System is established and institutionalized and has been assessed as satisfying the legal needs of key stakeholders and the public.9
- There is a new generation of educated legal professionals and judges with the ability to communicate with clients on values of independence, accountability, responsiveness, fairness and effectiveness.10

Component B: Knowledge Sharing and Capacity Building for Foster Access to Justice:
- The National Legal Center (NLC) is playing a key role with respect to legal education of judges and lawyers, facilitating enhanced legal research and administering the Unified Information Network (UIN).11
- Public perceptions of the judicial system administration have generally climbed positively during the implementation period of the project, especially at the local court level where the Administrative Court System predominates.12

Component C: Enhancement of the Legal Education and Legal Profession:
- The law schools of one public (National University) and two accredited private universities (Otgontenger and Shikhihutug) have introduced a newly developed bachelor degree level law education curricula reflects many international legal standards in terms of both content and quality and will be used in other accredited and non-accredited law schools.13

The MOJHA, in their own final assessment of the project, reviewed all the operations planned for each component, and concluded that 98.32% of the operations were completed with a score of “very good”.14 Almost all of the learning and innovation activities financed under the project were completed according to the revised implementation timetable.

The link of causation between the project outputs and outcomes was tested through in-depth user surveys in 2001, 2003, 2005 and 2007 as well as the Bank-funded Report on the Impact Evaluation Study (IES) of the LJRP. According to these surveys, the project produced the originally envisaged results, namely:

(a) access to legal and judicial information was increased and distributed efficiently among government ministries and agencies by the establishment by the project of the electronic Unified Information Network (UIN) (as evidenced by the increased use of the internet to find out information on legislation and the court system);
(b) positive changes in public attitude toward the judicial system and confidence in the judges had occurred during the period 2001-2005. (This was especially true for those in the rural areas where court facilities were more sparsely distributed, poorly built and judges less well qualified);

10 Ibid, pg 14
11 Ibid, pg 25
13 Ibid. pg 40
14 “An Assessment Report on ‘Justice Sector Reform” Project, World Bank; Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA), 2007, pg 12
(c) increased public trust and respect for the Administrative Court System (ACS) has been largely dependent upon the increased qualifications and processional skills of judges and their assistants. (The Administrative Courts recruited 65 new judges and the project provided more that 1050 person times of training to judges, assistants, Aimag officials and mass media workers); 
d) increased public awareness about the Administrative Court System, the protections it afforded and how citizens could thereby access justice (especially among private citizens who increasingly used the system to deal with civil law issues); and 
e) pilot legal education reforms were carried out in two universities (as evidenced by the development, testing and modification by the project of 33 new law courses which are now being taught, all approaching international levels).

Access gains to fairer justice. The project contributed toward improving access to specialized courts dedicated to the adjudication of cases related to the infringement of citizen’s rights by a government agency or officials who have power to issue enforceable administrative acts. In 2002, administrative courts were established in all 21 Aimagas and in the capital city and at the Supreme Court level. The project was responsible for the provision of refurbished building facilities for the Administrative courts at the Supreme Court level, the Capital City Administrative Court and 10 Aimag courts, thus improving legal access for administrative cases to the capital and more than half of the country’s Aimagas. The project provided training for legal staff for all the Aimag administrative court staff, the development of manuals for court management and case administration, and developed a communication strategy for public awareness to promote public participation and access to the administrative courts.

Improved competencies and capabilities. The project supported training for all administrative judges and administrative court staff which at the national capital level and in the 21 Aimagas which increased their competencies and capabilities. During the development of the new legal syllabi, a team of 62 professors and researchers, assisted by 20 legal expert reviewers, studied a wide range of legal education issues, taking into consideration the best international experience in this process. The development of the 33 new reformed courses, using national and international input, demonstrates the project’s successful efforts at improving Mongolian legal competencies and capabilities.

Building a unified system of legal and judicial information. The installation and operation of the Unified Information Network (UIN) in the NLC: (i) provided legal and judicial information to some 30 government organizations, agencies and ministries; and (ii) facilitate public access to this information via two websites containing the laws of Mongolia, court decisions, decrees of ministries and government agencies, and court commentaries, etc. The success on these websites is illustrated by 2007 survey results which show that whereas in 2001, 2003, and 2007 it was reported that 0.00 percent of the public received information about the courts system by internet, in 2007 the number jumped to 18.00 percent, a year after the websites were fully activated.

3.3 Efficiency

(Net Present Value/Economic Rate of Return, cost effectiveness, e.g., unit rate norms, least cost and comparisons; and Financial Rate of Return)

Net Present Value/Economic Rate of Return, Financial Rate of Return, and Cost Effectiveness Analysis are not applicable to LILs. Nevertheless, after the MTR, the modified project design allowed for monitoring of the connection between outputs-outcomes via the use of performance indicators and monitoring procedures selected at appraisal and augmented during implementation. The project tested and assessed an organizational model (e.g. access to justice was enhanced by increasing trust in the judiciary through better legal information, a new specialized court system and improved legal education), and used tools to monitor and evaluate change management, in order to replicate successful experiences elsewhere.

15 Ibid, pg 29-39
16 Comparative Study of the Public Perception of Judicial System Administration - Survey, 2007, Sant Marel, pg 26
This overall evaluation process was hampered by the lack of baseline data, and non-quantitative monitoring indicators at the start of the project. However, this problem was partially overcome by the task team after the QAG review of project supervision in 2004 and the MTR when the project started contributing items to and using the USAID-directed bi-annual Surveys of Public Perception toward the Juridical System Administration (SPP). In addition, and as a preparation for the closing of the project, the task team decided to complement the survey results with an independent evaluation which produced the “Report on the Impact Evaluation Study of Justice Sector Reform Project” (IES).

Based on the information provided by the IES, the project used the increased number of administrative cases resolved and increased professionalism of administrative judges and court staff as proxies for the efficiency of the administrative courts during the 2004-2007 periods. Two conclusions emerge: (i) With the introduction of the administrative court system, the assignment and additional training of judges and administrative staff, there was an increase of approximately 74 percent of administrative cases resolved between 2004 and 2007. And (ii), the high level of professionalism and management has remained key points in doing well in courts during the period 2001-2007. (See Annex 2 for additional details)

It must be noted that the project’s closing date was extended four times, from the initial date in the DCA of October 31, 2005 to the final date of April 30, 2008. This added some two and a half years on to what was originally seen as a four year project. The reasons for the extensions ranged from the belated approval by the Parliament of the Administrative Court System Law and assignment of judges to these courts, delays in the bidding and construction of the NLC and the additional time needed to complete the additional court construction and refurbishing. Project preparation had envisioned project effectiveness after the Law on the Administrative Courts was passed and it was only at negotiations that this was changed to a condition of disbursement for Part A – Administrative Courts – of the project. More careful analysis of the political environment in Mongolia at the time of project preparation and effectiveness may well have produced a more reasonable project implementation timetable and thus lessened the inefficiency inherent in the one year wait until the project really started to implement effectively.

3.4 Justification of Overall Outcome Rating
(combining relevance, achievement of PDOs and efficiency)

Based on the discussion of Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, the overall outcome is rated satisfactory.

3.5 Overarching Themes, other Outcomes and Impacts
(if any, where not previously covered or to amplify discussions above)

(a) Poverty Impacts, Gender Aspects and Social Development

Not Applicable

(b) Institutional Change/Strengthening
(particularly with reference to impacts on long-term capacity and institutional development)

The project supported the development of the Administrative Court System, a new institution designed to protect citizens from the capricious actions of government officials and to fundamentally strengthen Mongolia’s progress towards democracy and the rule of law. The project supported training of judges and court personnel to increase their levels of professionalism and the delivery of court services to the public, training which will have a long-term impact on the judicial structure of the country. The project’s support on infrastructural upgrading and rehabilitation has provided Mongolia, especially the rural parts of the country, with a vastly improved stock of court rooms and offices. Ensuring the

optimal public access to and utilization of such new court systems, especially by the poor, women and the less well educated, is highly dependent on proactive and robust public information campaigns by the court systems.

The project’s support of the NLC with its training, research and public information functions (e.g., the UIN) allowed for the creation of a new legal institution in Mongolia which is now capable of providing the MOJHA, the Judiciary and the legal profession with a much needed research and training capacity. The development of the UIN with its legal and judicial databases, connected electronically to some 30 government ministries and units, and access to the public at large through an on situ free computer usage and library demonstrates the increased efficiency and transparency which can be achieved in providing access to the full corpus of Mongolian law and court decisions to end users.

The long-term institutional contribution of new legal education syllabi cannot be overlooked as Mongolia works to achieve its objectives under its 1998 Legal Reform Program which seeks to both perfect the training of legal professionals and broaden the participation of Mongolia in international legal regulations. Development and implementation on a pilot basis of a bachelor level legal education curriculum that is close to international legal standards in terms of contents and quality in a limited number of universities is possible if the Borrower is willing to provide focus and leadership.

(c) Other Unintended Outcomes and Impacts (positive or negative)

There were no unexpected positive or negative impacts of the project.

3.6 Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops  
(Optional for Core ICR, required for IIL, details in annexes)

Background. An Impact Evaluation Study (IES) was conducted in October and November 2007 to identify outcomes and assess public attitudes towards activities supported by the project and degrees of user (plaintiffs and defendants) satisfaction with the services provided by the ACS, the NLC and the legal professions reactions to the newly reformed legal education system. (See annex 5 for additional detail and the full IES report in project files)

Objectives. The IES was carried out to assist the Borrower and project team in evaluation of the progress achieved in the implementing of the three main project components, to assist in the lessons learned and to identify potential recommendations for future assistance. To achieve this objective, the consultant team designed, conducted and analyzed specific surveys and statistical data with regard to each project component.

Methodology. The IES team and sub-teams utilized face-to-face meeting with stakeholders and key informants, statistical data analysis provided by the government officials, legal staff and lawyers and an extensive impact assessment survey conducted among project direct and indirect beneficiaries such as administrative case participants (applicants and defendants) and judges and lawyers using participatory methods. (Selection criteria and the final list of key stakeholders can be found in the full IES which is outlined in Annex 5)

Key Findings.

Overall Outcome. The Mongolian Legal and Judicial Project reinforces many general lessons learned with respect to the Bank’s justice reform portfolio. Projects must offer flexibility while not being overly-ambitious. Careful attention must be given to what is relevant and attainable within the overall context of a country’s legal reform efforts. Full achievement of project outcomes can only be accurately measured well after the closing of an individual intervention, raising potential problems with using the Learn Investment Loan (LIL) as the best investment vehicle for LJR projects. Projects offering grants can provide assistance in supporting priority research topics, increasing access to legal databases and reforming legal training curricula. Justice Sector Reform projects with limited and tightly targeted objectives, which are firmly embedded in the Borrower’s reform priorities and offer both judicial training and infrastructure enhancement, can provide both the physical and human capacity foundations necessary for substantially new court systems.
**Strengths.** The IES team found that most citizens surveyed are well or somewhat informed about the existence of ACS. The total number of administrative cases resolved by the Administrative Courts rose between 2004 through 2007 indicating a substantial increase in the use of this new institution. There was widespread agreement among case applicants and defendants that the ACS can protect their legal rights. The NLC is playing a key role with respect to legal education of judges and lawyers, carrying our better research and the administration of the UIN. The accredited law schools of two universities have a newly developed and taught legal bachelor degree education curriculum that is close to international standards in terms of content and quality.

**Weaknesses.** There is explicit scope for further public education especially through the mobilization of legal professionals as only 8 percent of the survey public representatives indicated that they received information on the ACS from legal professionals. There is a need to undertake a much more proactive systematic, timely and public education in partnerships with NGOs, by means of TV, radio and online debate, site tours for interested groups to administrative court facilities and public meetings with court staff.

The IES also found that the NLC has been less successful in conducting a comprehensive public awareness campaign, dissemination of legal and judicial information and legal counseling services particularly for poor persons and those who do not have access to the internet of financial resources to purchase promotional materials. Of considerable concern to the IES team was the poor business planning and the consequent unresolved self-financing of the NLC.

The project was slow to implement the legal education reform component and the Mongolian implementation team had to be prompted by the task team to move the process forward in an efficient fashion. After being prompted by the task team leaders, progress went well and outcomes were good.

**Conclusions and recommendations.** Based on the above results, the IES survey reached the following conclusions and recommendations.

**Administrative Court System:** The specialized Administrative Court System (ACS) has been established and institutionalized and generally satisfies the requirements of the key stakeholders and the public. Public awareness of the part of the public on how to protect their rights from infringement by government agencies and officials is improved. The installation of computers in all the Aimag administrative courts gave judges hitherto before unavailable access to the latest laws which is likely to have an impact of the quality of court decisions and understanding of the laws by the private Bar and general public. Case tracking software and public access to the information it provides at public access terminals in the courts and now the UIN ensures that parties are informed about court events and the tracking information also allows the courts to better manage its workflow. Public posting of court decisions has a significant impact on court transparency and also reduces opportunities to manipulate court decisions. It is also a major element in ensuring that court decisions become more predictable and in furthering debate and development of the law.

- **However, there is a strong need to review the NLC’s current training program for judges and administrative court staff to develop and implement a long term and systematic training program for judges and administrative court staff based on a training needs assessment done in conjunction with the NLC, legal academic and education institutions. The training plan should propose a strategy that is pro-active, catalytic, and collaborative and provide a systematic approach for identifying needs of judges and the court staff which would allow those needs to determine priorities for training, and,**

- **Additionally, administrative courts in conjunction with the NLC, should design a public awareness program for public interest groups particularly for the poor as the majority of case applications are relatively well educational and informed persons and they have relatively higher living standards.**

**National Legal Center (NLC).** The NLC is playing a key role with respect to legal education of judges and lawyers, carrying our better research and the administration of the UIN. (See Annex 2 – Output by Component, for details). As
the IES points out, “It can be concluded that the LJRP has significantly contributed (to) the development of a legal and judicial database and (the) establishment of fiber optic links with 30 agencies within Ulaanbaatar to form the country’s first Unified Information Network (UIN).”

- However, the MOJHA must make a decision on the further direction of the NLC and if necessary reorganize the structure with the separation of research components from the NLC and fully finance these academic works directly from the Government budget. This will allow the NLC to concentrate totally on training of legal professionals and implementation of public communication strategies. Alternatively the MOJHA could well consider a more robust income generating strategy for the NLC and thus retain its research capacity;
- Additionally, the NLC urgently needs to develop a business and marketing plan to become a self-financing entity in the near future. The proposed business plan should identify the core business areas, reorganization and staffing plans and marketing strategies. One key precondition for ensuring the sustainability of NLC operations is to introduce market-oriented instruments;
- Likewise, the NLC has been less successful in the area of conducting a comprehensive public awareness campaign, dissemination of legal and judicial information and legal counseling services particularly for poor people and those who do not have access to the internet or financial resources to purchase books and promotional materials;
- The NLC is open to visitors and the public only during business hours (closed for lunch) and the timetable for the library and computer laboratory is not flexible enough to serve visitors during lunch and after hours. This should be rectified to be more responsive to the public; and
- The data updating process to keep the legal and judicial information system current and useful is not yet clear and member agencies do not formally recognize their obligations for contributing to the entire UIN. The Government needs to establish procedures on roles and responsibilities of the UIN member agencies in upgrading and maintaining data. The Bank-assisted IDF Standardization of Administrative Regulations is providing assistance to that effect.

Legal Education. The accredited law schools of one public university (National) and two private universities (Otgontenger and Shikhikhutag) have a newly developed and taught legal bachelor degree education curriculum that reflects international standards in terms of content and quality. (See Annex 2: Outputs by Component for details.)

The IES did make recommendations on legal education:
- Although the content of the new curricula meets the requirements of students and the entire society, other relevant aspects of legal education require further attention (e.g., in equipment, qualification of teaching staff, learning environment, continuous education, retraining, skills upgrading);
- Considering the dependency of success of the new curricula on qualification and skills of the professors, there is a need to train and retrain professors in methodology courses based on modern information technologies. This should be supported by a new system of performance evaluation and a bonus system for professors; and
- The quality of the 33 newly developed courses needs to be assessed as to their practical application to identify their effectiveness and obtain accreditation form the relevant educational authorities. Also the remaining 19 training manuals still need to be developed in addition to the 14 manuals currently available.

4. Assessment of Risk to Development Outcome
Rating: Negligible to Low

The proposed follow-on operation is expected to minimize the risk of not sustaining the achievements of the project.

---

18 IES, pg 24
19 IES, pg 40, 41
5. Assessment of Bank and Borrower Performance
(relating to design, implementation and outcome issues)

5.1 Bank Performance
(a) Bank Performance in Ensuring Quality at Entry
(i.e., performance through lending phase)
Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The Banks’ performance in the identification, preparation and appraisal of the project was moderately satisfactory. The identification process, which was carried out satisfactorily, focused on critical gaps and the need for systems in Mongolia’s judicial system. Important to this identification process was the Bank-supported and –administered LNA based on a highly participatory process carried out June 1999-May 2000. The LNA and the task teams worked closely with the Government of Mongolia (GOM) thus ensuring that the project design was consistent with the GOM’s development priorities and the Bank’s CAS. During preparation and appraisal, the Bank took into account the adequacy of project design and major technical and institutional aspects, including procurement and financial management. In addition, during appraisal the Bank identified and assessed the project’s risks, mitigation measure and the benefits to be derived from successful project implementation. The Bank consistently maintained a good working relationship with the Borrower during preparation and appraisal and ensured that the GOM was in full charge of all aspects of identification and preparation. This was an important and highly satisfactory aspect of project preparation and in line with the Banks’ current emphasis on placing the Borrower in charge of the project.

However, it is evident that both the task team and the Bank’s management review process during project preparation did not pay adequate attention to the development of good, focused project development, output and impact indicators. At both the PCN and PCD review stages, Bank management recommended that the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system for the project be reviewed and better focused but allowed the project to go forward with what was recognized by the management review teams as a weak M&E system. There was no QAG review on entry for the project as is the case with most LILs. It was not until the QAG Supervision Review two years into project implementation that the M&E system was seriously reviewed and the problem rectified. The lack of a detailed baseline and a good M&E system from the start of the project hampered efforts at the end of the project to adequately and accurately report on the project’s impact. Thus, bearing in mind the critical importance of a robust M&E system for project-supported Bank activities, especially in light of the choice of a Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL) supported project, Bank performance at entry is rated as moderately satisfactory.

b) Quality of Supervision
(including of fiduciary and safeguard policies)
Rating: Satisfactory

Bank performance during project implementation was satisfactory. The task team focused on the project’s development impact and after the QAG report on the quality of project supervision seriously increased the focus on the results framework and monitoring outcomes. The task team regularly prepared Aide-Memoires, alerted the GOM and Project Implementation Unit (PIU) of issues which arose during project execution and facilitated prompt corrective actions. The large majority of the Implementation Status Reports (ISRs) rated project performance as satisfactory both in terms of achievement of development objectives and project implementation, although at times during the supervision process the ISRs were filed more sporadically than was useful and with scarcity of detail and repeated observations from one to the next.

Bank procurement and financial management specialists in Beijing worked with the PIU staff to explain the rules and procedures to be applied during project implementation in such areas as good and works, selection of consultants, accounts and audits, per applicable Bank guidelines and on the basis of respective Loan and Project Agreements. The overall quality of procurement documentation and processes remained satisfactory, and compliance with agree procurement schedules remained good following the first half of project implementation. Some shortcomings associated
with the financial management of the project arose (reports on expenditures, underpaid contracts) but these were resolved in 2007 and the project was given a satisfactory rating for Financial Management, a rating that it retained up through its closing. Likewise, problems identified in a 2003 procurement review (i.e., lack of current procurement plan, split contracts) were rectified in 2003 and 2004 and the rest of the procurement went smoothly.

The task team carried out a MTR in October 2004. Based on the MTR discussions, and the availability of savings due to the XDR:US$ exchange rate changes, project activities were rescheduled, project scope was enlarged and the closing date was extended initially by six months and then, after further review of the project implementation scheduled, for an additional twenty-two months.

As the closing of the project approached, and preparation of the follow-on project moved forward, it was imperative that a systematic review of the project outcomes be carried out. In order to do this, the task team drew up the terms of reference (ToRs) for an IES. This study was carried out in October-November 2007 and the results are detailed in Annex 5 of this ICR and reflected above in Section 3.6 Summary of Findings of Beneficiary Survey and/or Stakeholder Workshops.

The QAG report on Quality of Supervision made the observation and recommendation that staffing of Bank supervision missions should include those with specialized skills such as the administrative law, curriculum and legal examination design, M&E for outcomes, and guidance on research areas. Additional specialized (e.g., legal reform) skills, beyond those currently found among the Bank staff would strengthen such supervision. Although Bank supervision budgets were adequate to carry out the missions necessary for routine review of project implementation, especially when task teams were able to supervise a number of projects on trips to Mongolia, or supervise the project from Beijing where the Task Team Leader was for a time stationed, supervision budgets may have to be augmented in order to add appropriate consultants to critical supervision missions.

One issue compounded the task team’s supervision mission responsibilities was the failure of the Steering Committee to perform its DCA designated tasks (see section 5.2 (b) (i) for details.). This meant that Bank task teams, on supervisions missions, routinely met with policy level staff – generally the Minister of Vice Minister and State Secretary – of the MOJHA, the Secretary of the Council of Courts, the President of the Supreme Court, the State Secretary of the Ministry of Finance and the Director of the NLC, as well as with the presidents of the selected pilot Law Schools, and thereby were able to keep maintain a constant and high quality dialogue on issues which arose during implementation. The fact that a Steering Committee did not meet presented task teams with additional burdens of supervision in that they had to meet individually with all stakeholders in the project and often was responsible to reporting their findings back to the MOJHA at the end of missions. This provided the task teams with first hand knowledge of the political and legal environment within which the project was being implemented and thus enabled them to make sound recommendations on changes in implementation schedules, enlarging the scope of the project, etc., but it was not the most efficient use of Bank staff time and supervision budget. The supervision missions also maintained close coordination with other donors active in the sector, in particular with GTZ and USAID.

An additional issue which must be taken into account when reviewing Bank supervision performance is the fact that there were four task team leaders (TTLs) during the life of the project due to staff reassignments and retirements. A certain lack of continuity in supervision reporting (e.g., failure to update ISRs on time) can be attributed to the high turnover of TTLs and the necessity of learning the myriad details of a new country’s legal and judicial system, the project and its implementation history. The fact that new TTLs were able to quickly assess and resolve monitoring and evaluation issues at MTR and later to efficiently expand the project in light of the realized exchange rate surpluses attests to the high quality of individuals’ work on the project. However, high turnover of staff always comes at an efficiency cost and should be avoided where possible.
(c) Justification of Rating for Overall Bank Performance
Rating: **Satisfactory**
As discussed in 5.1, overall Bank performance is rated as **satisfactory** based on its performance throughout the preparation, lending, supervision and closing stages.

5.2 Borrower Performance
(a) Government Performance
Rating: **Satisfactory**

As mentioned in Section 2.1, the GOM was fully committed to the project. The Government, through the MOJHA, was fully involved in not only the needs assessment which informed project design but also in the detailed content of the three project components and the project management structure. The government ensured that the needs assessment process was adequately participatory so as to allow a wide range of stakeholder’s voice in the process on project preparation.

The MOJHA, the General Council of Courts (GCC), the Supreme Court of Mongolia, the NLC, the Mongolian Bar Association, the presidents of two accredited law schools, and staff from the Ministry of Finance worked closely with Bank’s project team on a regular basis, and cooperated fully with such teams. Appropriate levels of review and approval were in place; financial accountability was observed, expenditures were duly authorized before they were incurred; and documentation was properly maintained for periodic review. Loan Covenants, with the exception of a functioning Steering Committee, were complied with (including financial covenants related to audits), albeit with some delays and after audits revealed the necessity of additional training and increased care in carrying out procurement and disbursement procedures. Audit reports were satisfactory and financial statements submitted with slight delays.

(b) Implementation Agency or Agencies Performance
Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

(i) **The Steering Committee.** The performance of the Steering Committee (SC), as a management and supervisory body, was **unsatisfactory**. The SC was chaired by the Deputy Minister of Justice and Home Affairs, and with representatives of the Supreme Court, the General Prosecutor Office, the Secretary of the *Ih Hural*, General Council of Courts, Ministry of Finance and Economy, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, and the Mongolian Bank of Advocates. The purpose of the SC was to provide policy guidance and ensuring coordination and supervision in the implementation of the Project, and was to meet at least once every quarter. Its establishment was covenanted as a condition of effectiveness. There is no record that the Steering Committee (or “Coordination Committee” as it is referred to in the Borrower’s Assessment Report) met during the implementation of the project. The Borrower’s own Assessment Report confirms this finding and comments “…however the “Coordinating Committee” organized to provide …strategy and monitor the functions of the Project failed to exercise the duty imposed.”

However, the project was not without continuous and high level policy input from the MOJHA and General Council of Courts. Bank task teams, on supervisions missions, routinely met with policy level staff – generally the Minister or State Secretary – of the MOJHA, the Secretary of the Council of Courts and the President of the Supreme Court and thereby were able to keep maintain a constant and high quality dialogue on issues which arose during implementation (see above for details). The project was also greatly assisted by both the General Council of Courts and the Supreme Court throughout implementation.

**Project Implementation Unit (PIU).** The performance of the PIU was **satisfactory.** As outlined in the project DCA, the PIU was to be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the project. The PIU reported to the Minister of Justice and Home Affairs though the State Secretary. The PIU: (i) ensured compliance with the Bank’s requirement in the areas

---

of procurement, disbursement and financial management; (ii) reported to the Bank on a monthly basis on the progress of implementation of each of the three project components, (iii) and conducted many additional tasks such as; coordinated many of the public awareness campaigns, met regularly with the law curriculum working group, provided liaison services to other donor organizations and their legal reform projects, participated in national conferences on Justice Sector Reform, and monitored the public perception surveys which were instrumental in evaluating public attitudes toward Justice Sector Reform.

Financial Management Review The financial management system was reviewed in detail twice, once in 2005 and then again in 2007, the latter as part of the review between the project closing date was approved. In both reviews minor issues were identified and resolved. The minor points found in the 2007 review were judged not significant enough to disallow the request to extend the closing date. The Financial Management team found that quarterly FMRs were not regularly submitted and within the time period specified in the legal agreements, an issue which was recurrent throughout project implementation, and was a constant target of project supervision scrutiny and some FM training provided by Bank staff.

Procurement Arrangements. Procurement of all works, goods and technical services under the project followed the Bank Procurement Guidelines. In 2005 a procurement post review was held and several weaknesses in the PIU’s handling of procurement were found primarily due to the lack of experience in Bank management procedures. On the recommendation of the Procurement Post Review team, further post reviews were to be carried out and at that point the procurement process improved further and there were no further problems reports. The delays of the first two years of project implementation were resolved with assistance of the Bank procurement specialist who provided training to the PIU and all projects were completed before the closing date, which was extended from December 31, 2005 to April 30, 2008.

Reporting Arrangements. The Development Credit Agreement called for quarterly implementation reports but once the project got underway it was apparent to the task team that monthly reports would serve better in that many details, especially at the early stages of implementation, were new to the PIU. These monthly reports detailed activities for each component as well as providing financial data useful to the task team.

(c) Justification of Rating of Overall Borrower Performance
Rating: Satisfactory
As discussed in Section 5.2 (a) and (b), overall Borrower performance was satisfactory in light of the Government and PIU’s performance.

6. Lessons Learned
(both project specific and of wide general application)

- Justice Sector Reform projects with limited and targeted objectives, which are firmly embedded in the Borrower’s reform priorities and offer both judicial training and infrastructure enhancement can, provide both the physical and human capacity foundations necessary for substantially new court systems;
- Justice Sector Reform projects must offer flexibility while not being overly-ambitious. Careful attention must be given to what is relevant and attainable in the context of a country’s legal reform efforts. Full achievement of project outcomes often can only be accurately measured well after the closing of an individual intervention, raising potential problems with using the Learn Investment Loan (LIL) as the best investment vehicle for such projects. Projects offering grants can provide assistance in supporting priority research topics, increasing access to legal databases and reforming legal training curricula;
- Ensuring the optimal public access to and utilization of such new court systems is highly dependent on proactive and robust public information campaigns by the court systems. Equal emphasis and appropriate financing resources must be given the public information campaigns as is provided for the training and infrastructure components of the project;
• The project team might have injected more of a sense of urgency in the early stages of the implementation of the legal curriculum reform activities which were late in getting underway. The Bank, using its well recognized comparative advantage as an effective convener, especially in leading donor coordination, and having access to global knowledge, might have accelerated the start of the curriculum reform activities by organizing an international conference on the subject;

• The development of the Unified Information Network (UIN) with its legal and judicial database, connected electronically to some 30 government ministries and units, and access to the public at large, demonstrates the increased efficiency and transparency which can be achieved in providing access to the full corpus of Mongolian law and court decisions to end users. However, there must be an increased, substantial and sustained effort to publicize the existence and utility of this database in order that there is an increase in the number of public users of these internet sites, in particular in regard to the judicial information website;

• The lack of a robust monitoring and evaluation system and its dependent baseline data deprive otherwise good projects of the possibility of being systematically reviewed and its performance judged;

• Bank review of LILs at both the PCD and PAD stage, should carefully evaluate the feasibility of stated project goals and development objectives and their relationship to project outputs and outcomes. These reviews should ensure that adequate and accurate baseline data for the project has been generated and a robust monitoring and evaluation regime is in place before the projects are approved for appraisal;

• Bank supervision of projects cannot be limited to outputs but must be accompanied by a greater focus on sharpening the results framework and monitoring outcomes. This is particularly important in a LIL in order to draw lessons for replication/scaling up and to decide in/how to alter design in the future, expanded phase;

• The Project Steering Committee (SC) failed to perform its policy guidance role as outlined in the Development Credit Agreement (DCA) and as anticipated. The Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA) did not make the Steering Committee accountable to the government, nor were Terms of Reference (ToRs) agreed between the Bank and the Government on the role and function of the SC. Overall management of projects with important policy reform objectives must have both high level policy guidance input and strong implementation management throughout the implementation period. The Steering Committee could have been strengthened by the establishment of working groups such as:
  o A Legal Advisory Group with a broad range of institutional representation for: providing policy guidance for the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) and a substantive interlocutor to assist the Bank in supervision; monitoring and evaluating project outcomes; targeting use of grant resources based on a country’s legislative agenda, and reviewing, approving and monitoring grant funds used to support research and study activities;
  o A Training Advisory Group to share useful experiences; develop reformed law curricula and teaching methodologies; manage the sharing of expensive international consultants; draw on international expertise and monitor and evaluate curricula reform outcomes.

• PIUs with substantial financial and procurement responsibilities require intensive and repeated training in the Bank’s procurement and FMS procedures especially for projects that are extended; and

• Staffing of Bank supervision missions should include those with specialized skills. Additional technical skills, beyond those currently found among the Bank staff would strengthen such supervision and could provide valuable benefits to the Borrower’s own Legal and Training Advisory Groups. Bank supervision budgets may have to be augmented in order to add appropriate consultants to critical supervision missions.
7. Comments on Issues Raised by Borrower/Implementing Agencies/Partners
(a) Borrower/implementing agencies

The Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs completed its “Assessment Report on “Justice Sector Reform” Project – World Bank, in October 2007 (see Annex 7 for Summary of Borrower’s ICR). Using its own framework of analysis for assessing the implementation of the outcomes of the project, the MOJHA found that:

- In Component 1 (Administrative Court System), a mark of 89.95 was awarded to the civil works portion of the component in that the new buildings in Uvs and Bayan-Ulgii were not fully completed at the time of the assessment. This mark meant that this component received a “Good” instead of a “Very Good”.
- In Component 2 (Knowledge Sharing and Capacity Building to Foster Access to Justice), 5 of the planned 6 activities were competed fully and the Print Shop was the only remaining semi-complete operation. The assessment of this component was rated at 96.6 percent and given a “Very Good”
- In Component C, (Enhancement of the Legal Education System and the Legal Profession) all planned activities were completed and therefore the assessment awarded a 100 percent achievement and a “Very Good” to the component.

The Assessment working group concluded that the project overall outcome was “Very Good” having 98.32 percent of the activities successfully completed. The Assessment recommends that:

- The NLC continues to be funded in the follow-on project with an expansion of the UIN, the TV Studio, computer center and the print shop;
- More resources be used to compile court procedures and provide more equipment to the courts;
- Public awareness campaigns need to continue and be expanded;
- The new National Standard Bachelors Law Degree and the curriculum to support the new degree, needs to be spread through other law schools;
- Independent assessment of any future Justice Sector Reform project must be made each year; and
- Continued collaboration with the Bank on Justice Sector Reform projects is important.

All of the assessments outline in the MOJHA’s report mirror findings of the ICR (Annex 7) The Assessment’s recommendations have been taken into account in the preparation of the new follow-on project and many of the items are included in the various activities under the new proposed project.

Subsequent to the Assessment Report, the MOJHA reported in direct correspondence with the Bank that they had reviewed the final draft of the ICR, made no comments or corrections and voiced their acceptance of the document. (see Annex 7 for wording of letter) 21

(b) Co financers

Not applicable

(c) Other partners and stakeholders
(e.g.) NGOs/private sector/civil society)

Not applicable

---

21 Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs correspondence June 13, 2008, see Annex 7 and IRIS
## Annex 1. Project Costs and Financing

### (a) Project Cost by Component (in USD Million equivalent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)</th>
<th>Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)</th>
<th>Percentage of Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE COURT SYSTEM</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>213.7 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNOWLEDGE SHARING AND CAPACITY BUILDING FOR FOSTER ACCESS TO JUSTICE</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>110.1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENHANCEMENT OF THE LEGAL EDUCATION AND LEGAL PROFESSION</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.28 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRENGTHENING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION UNIT</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.1 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Baseline Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.19 percent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Contingencies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Contingencies</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.19 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.95</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-end fee PPF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-end fee IBRD</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financing Required</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.19 percent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (b) Financing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Type of Co financing</th>
<th>Appraisal Estimate (USD millions)</th>
<th>Actual/Latest Estimate (USD millions)</th>
<th>Percentage of Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borrower</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Development Association (IDA)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Outputs by Component
($ as approved, $ actual)

Component A - Development of an Administrative Court System (ACS): (US$0.95 US$2.03)
Objective – to assist in the promotion of transparency and governance in the Mongolian judicial system and thereby ensure the rule of law with emphasis on equity and fairness.

Results achieved:
- Construction and refurbishment of 2 Court facilities in Ulaanbaatar and Administrative Courts in 10 Aimags (12 in total);
- Training programs organized for Chief Judges, administrative Judges, Secretaries and Assistants;
- 22 informational TV programs developed and broadcast in Ulaanbaatar and selected Aimags;
- 10 radio programs developed and broadcast nationwide;
- Donors (WB, USAID, GTZ, PACT) collaborated in the development and broadcast of over 100 televised episodes of the “Legal Hour” to promote public awareness of the Administrative Law
- Training of legal professionals in all 21 Aimags;
- Public awareness campaigns conducted in 84 remote soums in 7 Aimags;
- “The Law on Settlement of Administrative Cases” was translated into the Kazakh ethnic minority language; and
- Administrative courts’ decisions, handouts, books and poster on Administrative Court were prepared, published and distributed nationwide.

i) Establishment of Administrative Court System - The first phase of the project refurbished three pilot courts in Ulaanbaatar (Supreme Court and Capital City Court) and one at a selected Aimag (Darkhan). After the Mid Term Review (MTR) and with savings derived from a favorable XDR: U.S. dollar exchange rate, administrative courts were established in 9 additional Aimags. This included provision of office space for judges and court personnel and chambers, including courts, designing manuals for court management and case administration, publication and dissemination of decisions of the administrative courts, development of a program of data and the results of surveys, and provision of office equipment and computers and consultants’ services. Altogether 13 buildings for the administrative courts were renovated. The administrative courts were provided with computers, printers scanners, photocopies, large screen TV and VCD/DVD players to provide technical support to the decision making process at the selected administrative courts. Air conditioning and heating equipment was provided to the Ulaanbaatar administrative court. Additionally, office furniture was provided to selected administrative courts.

Impact of the establishment of the Administrative Court System: The project contributed toward improving the access to specialized courts dedicated to the adjudication of cases related to the infringement of citizen’s rights by an agency or officials who have power to issue enforceable administrative acts. In 2002, administrative courts were established in all 21 Aimags and in the capital city and at the Supreme Court level and the project was responsible for the provision of refurbished building facilities for the Administrative courts at the Supreme Court level, the Capital City Administrative Court and 10 Aimag courts, thus improving legal access for administrative cases to the capital and more than half of the country’s Aimags.

The total number of administrative cases resolved by the administrative courts between 2004 and 2006 increased by 66 percent and the preliminary figures for 2007 would indicate that the overall increase in through that year is likely to be about 74 percent. In one sample Aimag, 55 percent of the decision were in favor of the applicant with 45 percent of the cases were dismissed. In a survey conducted in the national capital of case applicants, public representatives, legal
iii) **Public awareness.** The project supported the development of a communication strategy for public awareness to promote public knowledge of, participation in and access to the administrative courts. It aimed to promote full participation and access to administrative courts including *pro bono* legal assistance for the poor, access to justice for young people and women, and timeliness of publication of administrative decisions.

Under this component, the project supported the development and broadcasting of some 22 TV programs on legal and judicial topics for distribution in Ulaanbaatar and selected Aimag, some 10 radio programs were developed and broadcast nationwide and with the support of other donors (USAID, GTZ, PACT) the project developed and broadcast over 100 episodes of the “Legal Hour” to promote public awareness of Administrative Law. Public awareness campaigns were conducted in 84 remote soums of 7 Aimag. The manual “The Law on Settlement of Administrative Cases” was translated into Kazakh.

**Impact of public awareness campaign:** The Impact Evaluation Study (IES) team conducted public surveys in the fall of 2007 on the level of public awareness of the ACS and found that 33.9 percent of the respondents were well informed and 39.7 percent were somewhat informed about the court system. Considering this was a new system at the start of the project, these public awareness figures – a total of 73.6 - are good. Likewise, the Department of Sociology of the Mongolian National University conducted a survey on the effectiveness of the “Legal House” TV serial among all audiences and found that 23.1 percent of the respondents confirmed their interest in obtaining more information on the

---
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ACS, an indication that a significant portion of the population is aware of the existence of the ACS and is keen to know more about the system.  

**Efficiency of the Administrative Court System:** Based on the information provided by the IES, the project used the increased number of administrative cases resolved and increased professionalism of administrative judges and court staff as proxies for the efficiency of the administrative courts during the 2004-2007 periods. Two conclusions emerge:

(i) With the introduction of the administrative court system, the assignment and additional training of judges and administrative staff, there was an increase of approximately 74 percent of administrative cases resolved between 2004 and 2007.  

(ii) Likewise, the administrative cases as a percentage of all cases for both defendants and plaintiffs went from 0.0 percent in 2001 and 2003 to 11.95 percent and 12.75 percent in 2005 and 2007 respectively. This increase in case resolution and participation rates across all *Aimag* and the capital city was matched by high rates of satisfaction among case applicants. When asked as to whether they believed the Administrative Courts protected their legal rights, 83.3 percent of the case applicants answered positively. Likewise there was a small but measurable increase in the overall satisfaction in the way that courts handled civil cases over the period 2001-2007. There is a somewhat greater increase in rural areas where the bulk of the project’s work on the administrative court system has been focused.

And (ii), the high level of professionalism, good personnel and good management have remained as key points in doing well in courts during the period 2001-2007. Low levels of professionalism as a reason for doing poorly in court have dropped from 25.2 percent in 2003 to 16.2 percent in 2007 at the same time that poor management and organization of courts has also dropped from 22.4 percent in 2003 to 13.2 percent in 2007.

**Component B – Knowledge sharing and capacity building to foster access to justice.** (US$ 3.07 million US$ 3.38 million)

**Objective:** facilitate the dissemination of legal information, support legal research and establish a unified and web-base information data base and network.

**Results achieved:**

- Construction of the required physical facilities in Ulaanbaatar;
- Development of a legal and judicial database and establishment of fiber optic links with 30 agencies within Ulaanbaatar to form the country’s first Unified Information Network (UIN);
- Formation of an Information Technology consultation center permitting public access to the UIN and internet;
- Establishment of a publicly accessible legal library with over 5,800 volumes;
- Training facilities to implement training for judges, lawyers, prosecutors and other civil servants
- Establishment of a legal research unit through the provision of staff training, office equipment computer software and hardware, printing equipment, television studio equipment training equipment and technical assistance.

**i) National Legal Center (NLC).** The project supported the establishment and operation of the National Center for Legal and Judicial Information, Research and Training (“National Legal Center” or NLC). The project provided support in building the required physical infrastructure as well as the acquisition of adequate equipment for the NLC. Land and related landscaping were provided by the government.

---
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The NLC:

1. Developed new tools for the dissemination of legal and judicial information and supported public awareness activities.
   - Taking 2006 as an example, in that year the NLC produced
     - 24 issues of the “Legal Information” newspaper, producing 12,800 copies
     - 24 issues of the “Legal Information” magazine, producing 20,300 copies
     - 4 issues of the quarterly magazine “The Respectfulness to Legislations”, 2,337 copies
     - 28 omnibus collections of laws – 30,000 copies
     - 19 technical manuals, 19,400 copies

2. Provided training for judges, lawyers, prosecutors and other civil servants, some funded by other donors
   - The NLC provided extensive training and in one year, 2006, conducted 132 training courses and trained 2,507 judges, prosecutors and lawyers.

3. Carried out research specializing in analyzing draft laws, their impact on different economic sectors and level of society, and legal statistics regarding courts, notaries and any other relevant data;
   - The project supported the writing of some 239 publications\(^{31}\) for sale and free distribution and 70 research and study topics for a range of government agencies and domestic and international clients.\(^{32}\)
   - In 2006 alone the NLC held five conferences and 59 workshops on the key research findings.

4. Established a *pro bono* legal clinic;

5. Established a comprehensive legal library for public use;

6. Opened a bookstore selling NLC produced books and publications;

7. Established a TV production facility and print shop to disseminate legal materials and promote legal education.

Impact of the establishment of the National Legal Center

The study team which led the Impact Evaluation Study concluded that the NLC is playing a key role with respect to legal education of judges, facilitating enhanced legal research and administering the UIN. However, the NLC has been less successful in the area of conducting public awareness campaigns, dissemination of legal and judicial information and legal counseling services particularly for poor people and those who do not have access to internet or financial resources to purchase books and promotional materials.\(^{33}\)

ii) Unified Information Network (UIN). The UIN is made up of two databases and a fiber optic interconnectivity facility which is linked to some 30 government agencies and to which the public had internet access. The two databases are the LEGALINFO situated in and managed by the NLC and JUDGENET situated in and managed by the Supreme Court.

1. The UIN provides the ability to:
   - gather various legal documents;
   - perform content sensitive searches;
   - carry out detailed classification of legal documents, and,
   - gather information on courts, including case information

2. The LEGALINFO database contains the following:
   - Laws of Mongolia
   - Resolutions of the *Ikh Khural"

---

\(^{31}\) See “Book List of National Legal Center”, project files

\(^{32}\) See “Research and Study Activities Supported by the NLC – 2003-2007”, project files. Client included the NLC, the MOJHA, National Commission on Human Rights of Mongolia, National Police Department, Financial Regulatory Commission, and the Mongolian Mining Bank, and NGOs and Bilateral and International Assistance Organizations such as the Haines Zaidel Foundation, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the World Bank and UNDP.

\(^{33}\) Impact Evaluation Study, pg 25
• International Treaties
• Decrees of the President
• Decisions of the Constitutional and Supreme Courts
• Resolutions of the Government
• Decrees of the Ministers and Government and Ikh Khural, and
• Resolutions of Aimag and local governments and governors.

3. The JUDGEINFO database contains information on:

• Supreme Court Commentaries;
• The Judicial System;
• The General Council of Court;
• Agenda of Court Hearings;
• Court Statistics;
• Case Registration;
• Judicial Research Center
• Court Case Management;
• Introduction to the Courts
• Resolutions of the Supreme Court;
• Decrees of the Chief Justice
• Advisory Recommendations of the Supreme Court Chambers and
• Resolutions of the General Council of Courts.

Impact of the establishment of the Unified Information Network: As part of the Impact Evaluation Study (IES), the study team conducted three questionnaire surveys of staff, clients and representatives of user organizations. The survey results indicated that 75.7 percent of the NLC clients and 80 percent of the UIN users responded that they need legal information often. However, less than 5 percent of them answered that they got the legal information from the NLC. The quality of service offered by the NLC/UIN was assessed as excellent or good by 67.1 percent of the clients and 67.2 percent of the UIN users. It is evident that the more work has to be done by the NLC to advertise the services offered by the UIN as well as the NLC. The IES study team sums up the achievements of the project in regard to the UIN subcomponent by saying that the project “…has significantly contributed to the development of a legal and judicial data base and establishment of a fiber optic link with 30 agencies within Ulaanbaatar to form the country’s first Unified Information Network.34

Component C – Enhancement of legal education and the legal profession to provide market based solutions for better delivery of services. – (US$ 0.65 million, US$ 0.18 million)

Results achieved:
• 33 course curricula designed and distributed to 20 Law Schools;
• 11 curricula tested in two pilot law Schools
• 14 student handouts prepared
• Course curriculum and national standards design roundtables attended by over 100 law professors and law advisors, and,
• Additional law schools have applied these new syllabi.

34 Ibid., pg 23
The private and public law schools of National, Otgontenger and Shikhikhutag Universities developed and tested the 33 types of new legal study courses in close cooperation with legal professionals and academicians for the NLC, the Economics and Social Sciences Schools of the Mongolian State University, and the Police Academy Law Faculty. The new syllabi were developed by a team of 62 professors and legal staff and reviewed by 20 legal experts. Subsequently, 25 professors and 9 reviewers contributed to the development of training manuals and materials. These new syllabi were tested and adopted into legal training the accredited schools starting from the 2004-2005 academic year.

Impact of the legal education component: The IES process found that the accredited law schools of the two universities have newly developed and implemented legal bachelor’s degree education curricula that better reflects international education standards in terms of their contents and quality. This is judged to be an important step in quality improvement of legal higher education and in the move from a government-centered legal education system toward a student-centered system.

The IES surveyed both students and professors on attitudes toward the new legal syllabi and found that 66.9 percent of the students felt that their ideas and recommendations were reflected in the new syllabi, that 81.2 percent of the students agreed that the new courses meet their own as well as Mongolian society’s requirements, and 83.9 percent were satisfied with the content of basic and the specialized disciplines. In response to a question “How would you evaluate the new syllabi?” 20 percent of the survey professors responded as “excellent” and 73.3 percent answered “good”. The majority of professors assessed the impact of training under the LJRP as “very effective” and “effective”. All the survey professors had received training under the LJRP.

The IES also surveyed the two non-accredited universities to assess the impact of the new syllabi on school administrators, professors and students as compared to the old courses. Some 84 percent of the students knew about the new legal syllabi indicating that the new syllabi were well spread into other than the accredited universities. Among the professors, when asked how they evaluated the new course offerings, 7.6 percent found that they were “very good” and 84.6 percent four that they were “good”.

The three substantive components of the project were to interlink in a way that the legal profession would have access to the existing legislation and court decisions group the NLC. The public would become increasingly knowledgeable of the legal system via public awareness activities, and be able to use efficiently the legislation and judicial database for the protection of their rights. The creation of the administrative court system would enable the public to defend itself from wrongful decisions of government agencies or private entities. The participation in improving legal education and the legal profession would allow the public to have access to qualified legal professionals. By the end of the project it was evident that these linkages had been achieved although they are still fragile. Of particular concern is the need to continue the public awareness campaigns, both to inform citizens of the role and function of the Administrative Courts, and clients and government agencies of the assets of the National Legal Center and the Unified Information Network.

Component 4 – Strengthening the Project Implementation Unit. – (US$ 0.33 million. US$ 0.36 million)

In order to implement the legal and judicial activities of the project, the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) will be established through provision of consultants’ services and training.

Project Implementation Unit (PIU). The PIU was to be responsible for the day-to-day implementation of the project. The PIU reported to the Minister of Justice and Home Affairs though the State Secretary. The PIU: (i) ensured compliance with the Bank’s requirement in the areas of procurement, disbursement and financial management; (ii) reported to the Bank on a monthly basis on the progress of implementation of each of the three project components, (iii) and conducted many additional tasks such as; coordinated many of the public
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awareness campaigns, met regularly with the law curriculum working group, provided liaison services to other donor organizations and their legal reform projects, participated in national conferences on Justice Sector Reform, and monitored the public perception surveys which were instrumental in evaluating public attitudes toward Justice Sector Reform.

Financial Management Review  The financial management system was reviewed in detail twice, once in 2005 and then again in 2007, the latter as part of the review between the project closing date was approved. In both reviews minor issues were identified and resolved. The minor points found in the 2007 review were judged not significant enough to disallow the request to extend the closing date. The Financial Management team found that quarterly FMRs were not regularly submitted and within the time period specified in the legal agreements, an issue which was recurrent throughout project implementation, and was a constant target of project supervision scrutiny and some FM training provided by Bank staff.
Annex 3. Economic and Financial Analysis
*(including assumptions in the analysis)*

Not Applicable

**Annex 4. Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes**

**Annex 4 – Bank Lending and Implementation Support/Supervision Processes**

(a) Task Team members (names taken from PAD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Responsibilities/Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lending</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos R. Escudero</td>
<td>Chief Counsel</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Task Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karien Abdelnoor</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>LJR Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarangua Davaadorj</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>LNA Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Langbroek</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Administrative Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa E. Muleta</td>
<td>Sr. Disbursement Officer</td>
<td>LOAG3</td>
<td>Disbursement Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chau-ching Chen</td>
<td>Sr. Financial Management Specialist</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Financial Management Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi Dong</td>
<td>Disbursement Officer</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Disbursement Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.I.Gopalkrishnan</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>EAPCO</td>
<td>Procurement Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat-Orgil Turbold</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>MOJHA-PIU</td>
<td>Project Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oyunchimeg Dash</td>
<td>Deputy Project Coordinator</td>
<td>MOJHA-PIU</td>
<td>Project Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malini Rangarajan</td>
<td>Program Assistance</td>
<td>PEGOP</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazhar Farid</td>
<td>Program Assistance</td>
<td>PEGOP</td>
<td>Team Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Dakolias</td>
<td>Lead Counsel</td>
<td>LEGOP</td>
<td>Peer Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waleed H. Malik</td>
<td>Sr. Public Sector Management Specialist</td>
<td>LCSP</td>
<td>Peer Reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision/ICR</strong></td>
<td><em>(Names from Aide-Memoires and ISRs)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Shen</td>
<td>Lead FMS Specialist</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Toft</td>
<td>Chief Counsel</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Task Team Leader, Team Member, Sector Mgr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4/02-6/03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianna Montiel</td>
<td>Senior Counsel</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Task Team Leader (10/11/05-1/09/06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocio Mariela Malpica Valera</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Team Member, Task Team Leader (4/01-11/01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1/10/06-5/16-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos R. Escudero</td>
<td>Chief Counsel</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Team Member, Task Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5/17/07-Present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gita Gopal</td>
<td>Lead Evaluation Officer</td>
<td>IEGCR</td>
<td>ICR Training (OECDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Buergenthal</td>
<td>Senior Counsel</td>
<td>LEGJR</td>
<td>Team Member, Task Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5/17/07-Present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoping Li</td>
<td>Sr. Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tserendagva Gerelgua</td>
<td>Procurement Analyst</td>
<td>EAMMF</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertrand Ah-Sue</td>
<td>Lead Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowena Gorospe</td>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>LEGIA</td>
<td>Operations Analysis (LEGJR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Serrano</td>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>LEGEA</td>
<td>Country Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramesh Sivapathasundram</td>
<td>Lead Information Officer</td>
<td>ISGEG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Haixia</td>
<td>Sr. Financial Manager</td>
<td>EAPCO</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ochir Lkhavasuren (Masha)</td>
<td>Financial Manager</td>
<td>EAPCO</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David I</td>
<td>Senior Financial Management</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Financial Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi Jinan</td>
<td>Sr. Procurement Specialist</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu Junxue</td>
<td>Sr. Finance Officer</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yu Zhou</td>
<td>Finance Analyst</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Finance Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang Fang</td>
<td>Finance Analyst</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Finance Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luo Guangqin</td>
<td>Finance Assistant</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Finance Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Chunyan</td>
<td>Finance Assistant</td>
<td>EACCF</td>
<td>Finance Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. I. Gopalkrishnan</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>EASTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiaoping Li</td>
<td>Sr. Procurement Spec.</td>
<td>AFTPC</td>
<td>Procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsey L. Beemer</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>EAGEA</td>
<td>ICR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Staff Time and Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Project Cycle</th>
<th>Staff Time and Cost (Bank Budget Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of staff weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lending</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision/ICR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5 Beneficiary Survey Results

During the final months of the project, an Impact Evaluation Study (IES) was carried out in order to survey the public opinion toward the full range of project activities. The IES utilized face-to-face meetings with stakeholders and key informants, statistical data analysis provided by the government officials, legal staff and lawyers and an extensive impact assessment survey conducted among direct and indirect project beneficiaries such as administrative case participants (applicants and defendants) and judges and lawyers using participatory methods (see IES report for details of each survey group).

Administrative Court System (ACS). Important to the success of the project was both the degree of public awareness of this new court system and the opinions of both the applicants and defendants of their experiences with the courts. The IES report found that most citizens (73.6 percent) had some degree of familiarity with the ACS. Among the sources of the awareness of the ACS, radio and TV ranked highest at 31.9 percent, a good indication that the project supported public media campaigns had a substantial impact on the awareness of the new court system.

The IES survey teams asked about the importance of the establishment of the Administrative Courts and found that 97.6 percent of the case applicants, 78.4 percent of the case defendants and 100 percent of the legal professionals found the importance of the new system to be significant. In response to a question “Do you believe that the Administrative Courts can protect your legal rights?”, 83.3 percent of the case applicants, and 54.8 percent of the case defendants/public representatives answered positively. As one of the objectives of the project was to support the development of a court system which helped defend the legal rights of individual citizens against the unfair decisions of administrators and government agencies, these are positive findings for the impact of the project.

National Legal Center (NLC) and the Unified Information Network (UIN). The IES study teams conducted three questionnaires/surveys to gather opinion on the NLC and UIN. The preponderance of people surveyed were clients of the NLC and users of the UIN. The survey teams found that 75.7 percent of the NLC clients and 89.0 percent of the UIN clients indicated that they needed access to legal information often but less than 5.0 percent answered that they currently received this information from the NLC. However, of those who did use the services of both the NLC and UIN, 67.1 percent of the NLC clients assessed the services as excellent as did 67.2 percent of the UIN users.

As the IES study notes, the NLC is playing a key role with respect to the legal education of judges and lawyers, facilitating the enhanced legal research and administering the UIN. However, the NLC has been less successful in the area of conducting a comprehensive public awareness campaign, dissemination of legal and judicial information and legal counseling services, particularly for poor people and those who do not have access to the internet or financial resources to purchase books and promotional materials.

Enhancement of Legal Education and the Legal Profession. The IES study teams surveyed both law school teachers and students to gather information on the impact of the changes in the law curriculum and the teaching methods. Overall, the IES study for that in the accredited law schools of the two universities where the reformed curricula were developed and piloted and in the two private law schools where the reformed curricula was also taught, the newly developed and implemented legal bachelor degree curricula were close to international legal education standards in there of content and quality. In both the accredited and private, non-accredited law schools, student satisfaction with the new curricula content and teaching methods ranged between 80 and 84 percent. When asked to evaluate the new syllabi, 20 percent of the

38 Ibid, pg 2
39 Ibid., pg 23
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41 Ibid., pg 40
Interviewed professors at the accredited lay schools found it “excellent” and 73.3 percent found it “good”. A majority of the professors assessed the impact of training activities under the project as “very effective” and “effective”42.

The assessment process pointed to ways in which legal education should continue to improve. There was a strong consensus that further upgrading of the qualifications of the professors writing textbooks and instructors delivering classes was highly necessary. Likewise, more effort had to be made in providing training manual and textbooks for all the newly reformed courses. And there is a list of law courses which need to be reformed if they currently exist of written if they do not.

Annex 6. Stakeholder Workshop Report and Results

Not Applicable

Annex 7: Summary of Borrower’s ICR and/or Comments on Draft ICR

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS (MOJHA)

AN ASSESSMENT REPORT ON
JUSTICE SECTOR REFORM PROJECT
WORLD BANK

Approved by: State Secretary, Mr. Bayasgalan. G

Guidelines on Assessing the World Bank Justice Sector Reform Project

ONE: Objectives of Monitoring and Assessment. This assessment analyzes the impact of the Justice Sector Reform Project on building trust among the people of Mongolia in the legal and judicial systems, improving the management of justice and court proceedings, and the outcome of legal training and dissemination of information to enhance public awareness of the justice system. As a consequence of the analysis, the assessment report makes recommendations and conclusions for further study by the relevant authorities.

TWO: Staffing, Duration and Scope of the Assessment. According to the Annual Plan of 2007 of the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs (MOJHA), a working group has been set up comprising officers from the MOJHA’s Information, Monitoring and Assessment Department – Mrs. Altanzul. B, Senior Officer, Mrs. Nugarmaa. Ts, Officer, and Mrs. Maramandah. T, Officer. The assessment work was to be done from 1-13 October, 2007.

The following activities were to be covered by the assessment:

- Project Part A: Activities related to Administrative Court System
- Project Part B: Training, public awareness and informative activities
- Project Part C: Law School Curriculum Reform

---

42 Ibid., pg 37
THREE: Scope of the Monitoring and Assessment Activity

1. Professional training of judges and administrative staff of the Administrative Court System (ACS), provision of text books and handbooks on courts case management;
2. Arrangements on publicizing court decisions and verdicts of Administrative Court and access to the judiciary by the community and poor and vulnerable people;
3. Administrative Courts’ working environment including decent work conditions, equipment installation, etc.;
4. Activities related to the establishment and activation of the National Legal Center (NLC) for information dissemination, research, awareness campaigns, training of legal professionals and the creation of a research unit and Network for Information database;
5. Evaluation of the experimental legal curriculum development and enhancement, within the project in legal law schools;
6. Evaluation and analyze the fiscal activity and funding expenditures of the Project.

FOUR: Criteria and Approach used in Conducting the Analysis and Assessment. For the evaluation and assessment the following papers would be used as an assessment guiding criteria:

- Law of Foreign Loans and Grants
- Government Decrees 51, 160, and 2006
- Guidelines on financial statements of the projects funded with concessionary loans from International Financial Organization of Donor Countries through cooperation of the Mongolian Government (as approved by the Finance Minister Order 114 in 2002)
- Guidelines on coordination of projects funded by concessionary loans provided by International Financial Organizations or Donor countries (guidelines approved by the Minister of Finance October 361, 2005)
- Guidelines on the analysis and assessment of projects funded by foreign concessionary loans or grants (as approved by the Minister of Finance Order 370, in 2005)

The Assessment team will carefully study the implementation of the Project, interview related personnel to ensure an accurate understanding of the situation, and scrutinize relevant project materials. The Assessment team will follow the standards, norms and ways developed on evaluation and analysis and applied in the State organizations.

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND HOME AFFAIRS

Project name: “Justice Sector Reform” Project
Project Number: 3595-0-MOG
Project Approval Date: 22 December, 2002
Project Duration: 6 years
International Donor Organization: International Development Association, WB
Financing Type: Special Drawing Rights (XDRs)
Project Implementer: Project Implementation Unit
Project Manager: Project coordinator – Oyunchimeg. D

Forward: The World Bank loan project “Justice Sector Reform” was launched in 2002 and has as its objective the support of the Administrative Court System by civil works and technical assistance, establishment of a National Legal Center including a training center, a legal and judicial information database, research and public awareness, and provision of free access to legal advice, improvement of training approaches of legal professionals and to enhance the creditability of legal and judiciary management and service compatible to public expectation.
According to the guidelines approved by the State Secretary of Justice, the working group from Department of Information, Monitoring and Assessment, MOJHA, was appointed to conduct the assessment of the Project from 1-13 December, 2007.

**General:** As stated in Agreement of Development Credit Agreement between Finance Ministry and the International Development Association, MOJHA established a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) as well as a Coordination Committee in charge of providing of strategic policy guidance and directional coordination for the project. The Committee would be led by the Deputy Director of the MOJHA, with members from the Supreme Court, State General Prosecution Office, Parliament Secretariat, General Court Council, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Education, Art, Science and Mongolian Association of Advocates.

The Project launched in January 2002 and will end in December 2007 and the objective is defined as stated below:

- **Establishment of Administrative Court System**
  - Training for judges and others related to the ACS and providing them with training materials;
  - Compiling books and manuals related to the judiciary, management and proceedings in the Court Hearings;
  - Public awareness of Court Hearings decisions and verdicts to be strengthened;
  - Supreme Court, City and Aimag Courts assignment of a Courtroom for Administrative Court and rooms for staffs separately, provide them with technical assistance and the necessary equipments and computers in the Courtroom;
  - Educate the public on the law of Administrative Court and render legal aid to vulnerable citizens that live under minimum subsistence and women.

- **Education and access to legal and judicial service**
  - Establishing National Center of Research, training, education and public awareness with necessary equipment and software programs, conduct trainings for professionals and create a Printing Shop and TV studio for the purpose of education;
  - Creation of Unified Information Network (UIN) for legal and judicial Information Database;

- **Legal Education and enhancement of professional qualifications**
  - Development of a reformed legal curriculum and pedagogical technique and conduct an experiment in UB in accredited Law Schools and pass through the result to Aimag.
  - Based on the above mentioned Program, re-train the trainers

As stated in Development Credit Agreement /3595-0-MOG, the World Bank agreed to release US$4.0 million/4,000,000/ to Special Drawing Rights (XDRs) to the Mongolian Government (Borrower) in different currency according to Government discretion. Therefore the financing would be allocated as stated below:

1. **Activity implementation and service and maintenance (Works)**
   - For Part “A” - 240,000
   - For Part “B” - 800,000

2. **Commodity (Goods)**
   - For “A” Part - 80,000,
   - For “B” Part -720,000

3. **Consulting and Training (Technical Assistance)**
   - Project implementation unit - 160,000
   - Center - 160,000
   - “A” Part - 360,000
   - Others - 940,000

4. **Contingency expenditure:**
- Project implementation unit - 70,000
- Center - 40,000
- Audit expense - 20,000

5. **Non-Allocated (Unallocated)**
- The balance of Special Drawing Right - 410,000

Total US$ 4,000,000 Special Right of Loan

**Project Component A:**
**Administrative Court System**

1. **Activity concerning the training of legal professionals related to Administrative Courts, procurement of training materials, Management and procedures in the Administrative Court System:**

The creation of a specific court to resolve complaints that persons or businesses may have with government officials fulfilling their statutory requirements, and ensuring to develop public administrative regulations is the core value of the **rule of law**. Therefore the Mongolian Parliament has approved a Law on Administrative Court on 26 December, 2002. In connection with the law enforcement, the Project has launched activities focusing on creation of the institutions of “Administrative Court System”.

   - Development of training curriculum to be used for training of trainers in order to teach legal professionals was needed and therefore, the Project has announced an Invitation for Expressions of Interest, to select an organization with interest to work on preparing training curriculum and text books, in the International Development Business newspaper and internet as well;
   - Invitation of bid, with two phases, was announced among local and international companies, inviting bidders to conduct the training courses for judges of Administrative Court. 4 organizations out of 8 responses remained in the second phase of selection;
   - 17 trainers were trained to teach Judges and Attorney Generals from Administrative Courts and under those trainers guidance, there were 2 independent training courses for Attorney Generals and judges from 21 Aimag and UB’s Administrative Court;
   - After agreement by the General Court Council, a training course was held including assistance judges and secretaries of the Administrative Courts and the course was coordinated with the training organized by Hannez Seidel Fund in UB; and,
   - The Staff from Administrative Court Department in the Supreme Court and City Court had attended in 2-level English Language Courses.

2. **Compiling Administrative Court Verdicts and Providing legal assistance to Poor People**

   - “Information and Reference Department” was established in the Capital City’s Administrative Court Office and the Clinical Training Center was created in the National Legal Center. As a result free consulting service was launched in these offices for poor people;
   - Manuals on “Administrative Court Case Documents”, “Administrative Cases and Principles of Procedures”, and “Administrative Court Management” were compiled for reference to judges, researchers and law students, by the staff from the National Legal Center; and,
   - The volume on “Collection of Court Verdicts” has been published twice already to provide access to the public and provide openness of court’s activities.

3. **Appropriate Space Assigned to Administrative Courts And Procurement of Necessary Equipment**
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- Administrative Court Halls and staff rooms were assigned, reconstructed and equipped with furniture and necessary equipment in Supreme Court, City’s and Darhkan-Ul Aimag Courts; and,
- Sufficient savings collected from the difference in the XDR:USD exchange rate and the Bank and the Finance Ministry agreed to expand the Project for reconstruction and expansion of Administrative Court Offices in 10 Aimags. New office construction in a Aimag including procurement of furniture and equipment.
Project Component B
Training and Access to Legal and Judicial Services

- National Legal Center for legal and judiciary research and training was constructed and Center was provided with equipment and furniture and a microbus for training courses in rural areas;
- Tele-studio in the NLC was built and together with other donor organizations a TV program named “Legal Hour” was broadcast through FM radio and TV channel. Additionally, the Computer Service Laboratory with 50 seats is in the same building;
- Hard working young researchers who work in National Legal Center were sent to universities abroad for 1-2 months of training. Research workers also attended the classes on “Civil Procedure Law Implementation”, “Adoption of Administrative Case Procedure in Court” (edited by Mr. Chimid, Senior Advisor and Deputy to the Center) as well as “International Agreements of Mongolia and Comparative Case Procedure” (led by Mrs. Zumberelam, Department Head of Criminology). In order to learn how to work as a team member or as an independent researcher; 3 months English training language course also has been held under the Project framework;
- As a result of continuous work to improve the activity of a library in the NLC, it strengthened its foreign collections with help from the Asian Fund (Asia Foundation), the World Bank, University of Maryland, USA by receiving more that 200 legal and judicial collections besides the procurement of software program and surveillance equipment;
- An agreement was reached with the “Working Group Assigned to Systematize the Legislations” to cooperate on building of Unified Information Network (UIN) and Database on legislation. As a result more than 30 legal and judiciary related organizations were connected though fiber optic cable and the Integrated Legal Information Network was established and thee organizations were provided with computer and servers necessary for function of the integrated system; and,
- The UIN developed a search capability of its content as well as providing introductions to court determinations.

Project Component C
Enhanced Law Curriculum Curricula Development

Over 100 teachers from different Law Schools contributed their knowledge and experiences to create a benchmark model of legal training curriculum course at the Bachelor degree and 11 of 33 renovated curricula were piloted in 2 selected Law Schools

- With attendance of teachers from 2 selected Law Schools “Otgontenger” and “Shikhihutug” as well as Law School of Mongolia National University within the methodology of developing a law curriculum including modernized methods of interactions. In total 172 teachers participated in the new courses;
- National Standard Bachelor in Legal Sector” were amended and was approved by the Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs and the Ministry of Education, Arts and Science which worked together under the project;
- According to the newly developed curriculum 14 textbooks for students were compiled and 3 teachers have attended 3 months English language course in the National Legal Center;
- 60 Teachers from the selected law schools attended a course at the National Legal Center of teaching software program “PowerPoint” and some them been studied foreign experiences at the University of Montreal, Canada; and,
- textbooks for students, teachers, training books with audio CD, on Legal English language was developed with the assistance of the NLC, the Law School of Mongolian National University) and ESPF. In addition there was procurement including printing equipment, a projector, a player for DVD and VHS for the Law School
Conclusions

The following conclusions and assessments as well as recommendations have been made based on the analysis and evaluation of the outcomes of the Project having studied the responses of both those directly involved and who benefited from the Project.

1. According to the DCA, the Project Unit has implemented its duty in line with the detailed plan and schedule. However, the Steering Committee organized to provide strategic policy advice and guidance, and to coordinate and monitor the functions of the project has failed to exercise the duty imposed.

2. The following have contributed a considerable impact in increasing the positive attitude by the community toward the legal and judiciary system:
   a. enhanced free access to judiciary and legal assistance;
   b. establishment of a specific Court of Administrative cases;
   c. improvement in the working conditions for judges to work in the ACS; and
   d. Procurement of necessary materials, reference books, etc. that helped create a more effective service.

3. Real contribution has been made by the Project in fixing and construction of existing Court Offices building in UB and Aimag to suit the Administrative Court functions. In this way it was very helpful to fill a shortage of budgeting, not only for civil works but also procurement of furniture and equipment.

4. Establishing the Unified Information Network (UIN) linking the Legal and Judicial databases provided the opportunity to track of how civil, criminal, administrative cases were resolved within the existing legislation acts providing explicit access to the public. This enhances human right protection, emphasizing equal right to face justice and upgrading accountability both citizen and entity.

5. TV studio, Internet Laboratory and Printing Shop that have been established in the National Legal Center need to be managed according to market economy principle so that in return make the Center financial sustainable and help attract and keep more capable staff with skills and knowledge.

6. Development and approval of National Standard of Bachelor in Legal Sector is praiseworthy and the implementation of the Standard in the Law Schools have already took place to renew the curriculum, and that it gives them good opportunity to improve the pedagogical approach which causes hood quality of teaching. It is recommended that the development a sound and efficient curriculum with the new themes and subjects be continued with the involvement of consultants from other countries and locals and experiment with the results immediately.

Assessments

1. The implementation outcomes within the framework of the Project have been evaluated according to the guidelines “Assessment and Analyze the operation of Ministries, and Governors of Cities and Aimag” enacted by Government Decree 51, 2006 and “Introduction of Statement of Assessment and Analyze of operations implemented under projects with assistance of foreign loan and grant” approved by Finance Ministry’s Order date 27 December 2005.

2. In Component A, 8 operations were planned and 7 of it accomplished fully (100%), and the progress of the Project there was an agreement to construct one building for Administrative Court and for 10 other reconstruct or expand the existing Court buildings in Aimag. In assessing the results, the new building constriction in Uvs has completed around 80 percent and the reconstruction in Bayan-Ulgii is around 95 percent of completion which gives the result of approximately 89.95 percent that resulted to mark as “good” which is one level from the mark of “very good”.
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3. In Component B, there were planned 6 operations and 5 of which were considered fully (100%) accomplished and the only one operation, to build the Printing Shop is 80 percent complete causing the average to 96.6 percent, and an assessment mark as “very good”.

4. In Component C, the planned activities such as to develop Legal curriculum for education, the new methodology of pedagogy in law schools and to improve new National Standard of Bachelor in that sector fulfilled completed 100% which gives then mark of “very good”.

5. For the Project finance statements have got 2 authorization signatures, Mr. Ganzorig. Ch, the Finance Minister and Mrs. Oyunchimeg. D, the Project Coordinator. Within the terms of the International Development Association, quarterly statements of income and expenditure are introduced which 45 days from the end of the quarter to the World Bank. An enclosure of statements on procurements including purchases of commodity, service and operations has attached to this report.

6. The Working Group unanimously concluded that the Project outcome overall is suited to the mark “very good” have 98.32% of completion in total.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended to dedicate the forthcoming new project finance:
   a. construction a “Justice Center” that is helpful to provide and independent judiciary in Mongolia;
   b. to expand the Unified Information Network through local courts, which will establish interconnection between and within Supreme Court and General Court Council;
   c. to provide movable court vehicles with necessary equipment to travel between rural district locations, considering the exclusives of the nomadic population and geographical and governance specifics and density of rural areas;

2. There are needs for additional assistance in developing the Administrative Court Case verdicts into a Judge’s Handbooks, and procurement of surveillance cameras for courtrooms, and recording tools for interrogation and interviews;

3. Continuing education of public awareness, expanding the UIN to increase service to local communities, upgrading the equipment used for connections to local communities and the TV studio, Computer Center and Printing Shop. The all need to operate according to market economy principles what would provide profitability for the NLC;

4. the National Legal Center was built in a modern style and design; however, in terms of engineering it is necessary to enhance the quality of the ventilation system;

5. Since the National Standard of Bachelor Degree is set up, in order that it can be complied this generally, it is necessary to assess and analyze all Law Schools to identify and set up the new curriculum, to train teachers to be compatible and produce more suited training materials including further development of Masters and PhD Degrees standard;

6. Even though the public access to legal and judicial information has been increased, there is need to focus more into given detail specifics a of certain cases including indictment and the causes of implementation of different verdicts according to the Law;

7. One of the imperatives is that make mediatory the independent assessment, conducted once a year, for every project;
8. It is recommended to continue the collaboration based on mutual agreement and maintain the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in place.

Monitored and Assed by: Information, Monitoring and Assessment Department
Senior Officer Altanzul. B
Officer Naramandah. T
Officer Hugarmaa. T

Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs

October 22, 2007

List of Enclosed Materials

Official letter form “Legal and Judiciary Reform” Project
Official letter with Introduction Paper from the General Court Council of Mongolia
Official Letter from City’s Administrative Court
Official Letter form National Legal Center, Re. to deliver data
Introductory Paper and report from “Otontenger” Law School
MINISTRY OF JUSTICE AND
HOME AFFAIRS OF MONGOLIA
15160 Government Building V, Trade Street 6/1
Chingelti District, Ulaanbaatar, MONGOLIA
Tel./Fa (976-11) 32-52-25, E-Mail: FOREL@mojha.gov.mn
http://www.mojha.gov.mn

Date: June 13, 2008-06-18
Ref. 03/1929

Mr. Robert Buergenthal
Task Team Leader
Legal Judicial Reform Project
World Bank

Dear Mr. Robert Buergenthal:

Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs of Mongolia presents its compliments to World Bank and Task team of Legal Judicial Reform Project and I would like to take this opportunity to express my warms gratitude to you.

We have received the final draft of the Legal Judicial Reform Project Implementation Review Report earlier and reviewed for a while. Thus we do not have any comments and present our acceptation.

Ministry of Justice and Home Affairs of Mongolia avails of this opportunity to renew to the World Bank the assurance of its highest consideration.

Best regards,

(Signed)

G. Bayasgalan
State Secretary
Annex 8. Comments of Co financiers and Other Partners/Stakeholders

Not Applicable
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