HUMANITARIAN INNOVATION FUND
Final Report

Organisation Name	Microjustice4All

Project Title	Innovation in Humanitarian Relief through a post – emergency Legal Rehabilitation Methodology and Toolkit
Problem Addressed / Thematic Focus	Legal rehabilitation in post-emergency humanitarian crises
Location	Pilots in a) earthquake affected area in Peru (Pisco, Ica) b) flood-affected area in the Amazon region in Peru (Iquitos, Loreto) Feasibility study in Kenya in MJ4All legal service provision for the refugees in Kenya; with focus on the Somali refugees in Eastleigh/Nairobi
Start Date	1 December 2014
Duration	22 ½ months (1 Dec 14 – 15 October 2016)
Total Funding Requested	£149,980

Partner(s)	• MJ4All Country Organizations in Peru and Kenya: Microjusticia Perú (MJP) and Haki Mashinani (HM) • Law Firm Allan & Overy • Humanitarian Relief Organizations in Peru: Peruvian Red Cross • Relevant government agencies in Peru: the Ombudsman Office; the National Registry of Identification and Civil Status (RENIEC); the Ministry of Housing; Municipal Governments of Pisco and Maynas.
Total Funding	£149,980 HIF funding £33,384 Budgeted cofunding (in kind and financial) Total £183,364 But confunding (financial and in kind) has been: £74,421

	(and not 33.384)

Innovation Stage	Development
Type of Innovation	Process - Innovations that focuses on processes through which products are created and/or delivered.
Project Impact Summary	A methodology and toolkit for addressing legal issues of the victims of humanitarian crisis developed and tested in humanitarian crisis areas. With this method and toolkit, legal empowerment and rehabilitation activities can be integrated in the core activities of humanitarian agencies, and the method replicated worldwide. The Legal Inclusion Index that has been developed in the expansion phase at the end of the project will be a tool to make legal empowerment programs mainstream and funded by the donors.

Reporting Period	1 December 2014 – 15 October 2016
Total Spent	On HIF budget has been spent £154,074 This is more than the HIF funds of £149,980 This is due to exchange losses, that made the budget planning too high. MJ4All funds the overspending

PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

What have been the key achievements of the project?

What were the major activities and outputs of the project (this may include a description of the activities conducted and how they related to the work plan)?

What adjustments and adaptations were made through the course of the project? Why were these needed and how were these made?

Please explain any budget various greater than 15% of the original budget headlines

The major activities and outputs / achievements have been (which will be sent separately):

1) Pilot projects successfully implemented in two areas: flooding in Amazon in Peru and post-earthquake in Pisco. Products developed in both areas. See report on the project implementation of these two pilots (Annex 1)
2) Research undertaken in Peru in Iquitos and Pisco, and in Kenya with the following outputs:
   - General Desk study report – See report (Annex 2)
   - Baseline assessment in Pisco and Iquitos – See tow reports (Annex 3 and 4)
   - Impact evalation in Pisco and Iquitos – See 2 reports (Annex 5 and 6)
   - Feasibility study in Kenya – See report (Annex 7)
3) MJ4All Handbook and toolkits developed to help set up the pilots and further developed on the basis of our experience during the pilots. See MJ4All Methodology Handbook (Annex 8) and toolkits (Google Drive link)
4) MJ4Al Handbook which focuses on how to set up MJ4All activities in the humanitarian context. (Annex 9)
5) Promotional material developed for Humanitarian agencies, explaining the importance of integrating MJ4All activities in humanitarian interventions (Annex 10)
6) Proposal for a Legal Inclusion Index (Annex 11)

Modifications

Kenya; it was hardly possible to do the proposed pilot for flooding regions as there were no significant floods. Even if there had been flooding, Microjustice4All services would not have been appropriate for two reasons:

1) **The informality of the system**: people do not have to show their ID in order to obtain humanitarian aid; rather the chief will decide who should receive aid.

2) **The restricted economic development in Kenya**: this means that there are not so many government welfare schemes and therefore, in this context, there are fewer benefits from having paperwork in order.

That is why MJ4All proposed a change in the Programme and to do the pilot of MJ4All legal service provision in flooding area in the Amazon in Peru (Iquitos) instead. In addition a feasibility study in the context of the refugees in Kenya has been undertaken. See agreements and correspondence as of February 2015 on this topic

Duration: the duration was extended from 31 May 2016 to 15 October 2016 (4 ½ month) due to the here-above mentioned modification of the project, and the time (about the same period as the extension) that it took for HIF to agree on the proposed modification.

Budget: The modification in project location had also its reflection on the budget. The budget modifications were agreed due course.

INNOVATION OUTCOMES

What were the outcomes of the project (positive or negative) and how did these follow from activities and outputs described above?

Peru: the two pilots in the target regions were positively received, showing the importance of MJ4All interventions within the humanitarian context. This is shown by the various reports (Annex 1 Report on the pilots; Annex 3 & 4 Baseline assessment reports in both pilot areas; Annex 5 & 6 Impact Evaluation Reports).

Kenya: as mentioned above, only a feasibility study could be done, which was largely positive, with the conclusion that MJ4All legal service provision is relevant for the refugees, but that to implement a program in such a complex context on such a sensitive issue in Kenya, it takes time to build up the trust and to find the ways to deal with the government constraints. In this context, MJ4All legal capacity has to be developed within the large humanitarian agencies. See feasibility study report Kenya in Annex 7.

Has the project demonstrated the success of the innovation?

Yes

See all the reports, handbooks, toolkits and other material mentioned above in Annex 1 - 11

If yes, what evidence is there for the performance of the innovation?

See Annexes: 1 report on the pilots, and 5 & 6 impact reports in pilot areas in Peru,
See Annex 7 Feasibility Study in Kenya

If no, what are the key lessons about the innovation or area of practice?

In Kenya, it is not NO but the challenges have shown that MJ4All programs are easier and increasingly relevant in a more formal and developed context.

Do the outcomes support the initial rationale for the innovation?

Yes see all the outputs/reports in annex 1-11

How has your understanding of the innovation changed through the project period?

Our experience of working together with the Red Cross in Peru has been very positive. Consequently, we will seek to work with other large humanitarian organizations and integrate Microjustice4All Programs within their work in the future.

During this project, we have gained a greater understanding of how the Microjustice4All Methodology can be applied in the context of humanitarian crises. We already had a lot experience in the Former Yugoslavia with the legal rehabilitation of the IDPs and refugees, but we gained also experience with the relevance of MJ4All interventions in the response phase of a humanitarian crisis. MJ4All as a legal organisation is well positioned to deal with transparency issues on the ground in the aftermath of a humanitarian disaster. During the project we came across this need and we have developed the Transparency and Accountability Tool including CRS (Complaint Registration System) on the basis of this experience. Specially for earth quakes (both prevention, response and rehabilitation) we have developed the fit-purpose community-based property surveying Tool.

Did the innovation lead to any unexpected outcomes or results? How were these identified and managed?

The Kenyan context for implementing MJ4All activities with refugees has been harder than expected.

It has been difficult to work with refugees in Kenya for three reasons:
1) The refugees are first and foremost focused on survival and migrating abroad and lack awareness about the importance of legal issues.

2) The refugees have a lot of mistrust and do not trust others to deal with their legal papers.
3) The government do not want NGOs to work with the refugees since they see the refugees as the source of all their problems.

What are the key lessons learnt relating to the innovation (this should relate to the innovation itself, rather than project implementation)?

In Kenya, the challenges have shown that the innovation is easier in a more formal and developed context. Also in less developed and informal contexts, MJ4All is essential but requires serious longer time funding, a bigger, working closely with the existing humanitarian infrastructure and agencies.

METHODOLOGY

Was the methodology successful in producing credible evidence on the performance of the innovation?

See Annexes: 1 report on the pilots, and 5 & 6 impact reports in pilot areas in Peru,
See Annex 7 Feasibility Study in Kenya

What adjustments were made to the methodology during the course of the project? Why were these needed and how were they made?

Until now, Microjustice4All had developed its method – mainly working with MJ4All Country Organisations. But during this project, in humanitarian disaster context, the only way to have impact structurally worldwide is to develop MJ4All legal capacity within bigger humanitarian agencies. For this a lot of material has been developed, in the first place to promote the legal inclusion approach:

1) Promotional material developed for Humanitarian agencies, explaining the importance of integrating MJ4All activities in humanitarian interventions (Annex 10)
2) Proposal for a Legal Inclusion Index (Annex 11)

In the 2nd place, MJ4All has prepared Handbooks and toolkits to help to build up this capacity within humanitarian agencies:

1) MJ4All Handbook (Annex 8) and toolkits (Google Drive link)
2) MJ4Al Handbook which focuses on how to set up MJ4All activities in the humanitarian context. (Annex 9)

We have been working closely within the Peruvian Red Cross, both in Pisco and Iquitos.

Scale-up phase

Two main tools have been developed for the scale-up phase:

The proposal for a Legal Inclusion Index (Annex 11) is tool for scaling up the MJ4All approach and for making it mainstream worldwide. MJ4All is now working on setting up a consortium.

To make humanitarian agencies aware of the importance of addressing the legal issues of the victims promotional material has been developed (Annex 10).

PARTNERSHIPS AND COLLABORATION

Describe the partnership arrangements and how these may have changed during the course of the project.

The main MJ4All organizations worked as expected and planned: MJ4ll in Kenya, Haki Mashinani and Microjusticia Peru.

The cooperation in both pilots with the Peruvian Red Cross was essential.

The cooperation with A&O did not work out as expected due to the fact that in practice A&O wanted to limit its contributions to their areas of specialisation that is to say business and banking law.

DISSEMINATION

Indicate the steps taken to disseminate the outcomes of the project.

For humanitarian agencies we have developed the following materials:

1) Integrating MJ4All Services in Humanitarian Aid Agencies
2) MJ4All Handbook for Humanitarian Crises
3) Toolkit for setting up a MJ4All programs developed, other materials.

MJ4All now plans to contact bigger humanitarian agencies, and offer its expertise to them.

We also prepare a legal inclusion index with a focus on humanitarian disasters, and a conference on this topic. This will be used to promote MJ4All in humanitarian crises globally.

MJ4All hopes to continue working together with HIF on this, if possible in a scale-up program.

What dissemination activities have or will be conducted (whether or not included in the budget)?

What publications have resulted from the project, or are forthcoming (i.e. research and policy reports, journal articles, case studies, evaluations etc.)?

Has the project received any third party coverage during the project (from news media, third party blogs, researchers or academics etc.)?

The project was covered by local media of Pisco, Ica, and Iquitos, Loreto. Around 10 radio and TV interviews were transmitted in both project locations. To see samples, please visit the MJP Youtube channel:

Cadena SUR channel (Pisco): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JtwGiYWysVU

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7pIrbTBs4bU

21 Noticias (Iquitos): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7pIrbTBs4bU

A few documentaries were made in both pilot test areas in the earth quake affected area of Pisco / Ica and in flooding affected areas in Iquitos /Myanas /Loretto

Video documentary on the Maynas pilot project

Video documentary on the Pisco pilot project

TRANSFERABILITY

Please indicate if there is any potential to replicate the project and how.

What are the plans for scale-up beyond the pilot?

On the basis of our experience from the pilot, we are in the process of developing a Legal Inclusion Index. This will measure the degree of legal inclusion in all countries across the world. The focus will not only be on countries but also on humanitarian crisis and the legal inclusion of its victims on a cross-border basis.

 This will highlight where action needs to be taken and allow progress to be measured, promoting the replication and scale-up of MJ4All activities in humanitarian crises.

Are any other organisations planning to use or adapt the innovation?

With the Dutch development and humanitarian organisation Cordaid we are seriously discussing and analysing the opportunities and possibilities to integrate the MJ4All approach in their programs in war-torn societies in East DRC, South Sudan, Burundi, CAR, and Afghanistan.

For the Legal Inclusion Index we are building a consortium with research institutes, a global law firm and bigger development and humanitarian organisation(s). These development and humanitarian organisations will use and further adapt the innovation.

In Peru, the Peruvian Humanitarian Aid Network has expressed its interest to work with the MJ4All method and toolkits for legal rehabilitation, especially in the MJ4All Transparency & Accountability Tool "CRS". UNICEF, member of the Protection Chapter of the Peruvian Humanitarian Network, is interested in piloting a Microjustice program with adolescents living in vulnerable flooding areas of Loreto. The member organizations of the Peruvian Humanitarian Aid Network are awaiting for the presentation of the final method and toolkits.

What steps have been taken to ensure the transfer of the innovation and the learning from the project?

We have developed promotional material to raise awareness among humanitarian agencies about the legal issues during a humanitarian crisis. We have developed the Microjustice4All Handbook for Humanitarian Crises and the Microjustice4All Handbook on Legal Service Provision in Humanitarian Crises. These two handbooks will enable the innovation to be transferred worldwide because they enable other humanitarian and development organizations to integrate a MJ4All Program within their activities.

Furthermore, the Legal Inclusion Index that is being prepared as explained above, will facilitate systematic identification of areas where action needs to be taken and will enable progress to be tracked.

See again the annexes:

1) MJ4All Handbook (Annex 8) and toolkits (Google Drive link)
2) MJ4Al Handbook which focuses on how to set up MJ4All activities in the humanitarian context. (Annex 9)
3) Promotional material developed for Humanitarian agencies, explaining the importance of integrating MJ4All activities in humanitarian interventions (Annex 10)
4) Proposal for a Legal Inclusion Index (Annex 11)