



INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS

CHARTING A COURSE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED ENGAGEMENT



DISCLAIMER

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent those of the United Nations, including UNDP, UNICEF, UN Women, or the UN Member States. The research and analysis in the publication was conducted solely by the author(s); neither United Nations Member States, nor agencies of the UN system, including UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women, are in a position to verify the information contained within the study.

INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS

CHARTING A COURSE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED ENGAGEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER	5
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	6
SUMMARY	7
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	29
CHAPTER II SITUATING INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS	34
CHAPTER III THE INFLUENCE OF HISTORY AND LEGAL FAMILIES	46
CHAPTER IV TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS	54
CHAPTER V USER PREFERENCES AND PROVIDER PROFILES	74
CHAPTER VI HUMAN RIGHTS AND INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS	88
CHAPTER VII WOMEN AND GIRLS' HUMAN RIGHTS AND INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS ..	98
CHAPTER VIII CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS	122
CHAPTER IX PROGRAMMING WITH INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS	137
BIBLIOGRAPHY	178
LIST OF ANNEXES	193

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution	LADA	Law and Development Association (Zambia)
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development	LC	Local Council
BLAST	Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust	MHRC	Malawi Human Rights Commission
CBO	Community-Based Organisation	MGEP	Mainstreaming Gender Equity Programme (Nepal)
CCJP	Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace (Malawi)	MLAA	Madaripur Legal Aid Association (Bangladesh)
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women	NEB	National Equality Body
CIDTP	Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (see UNCAT)	NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child	NHRI	National Human Rights Institution
CS	Civil Society	NRM	National Resistance Movement
CVICT	Centre for Victims of Torture (Nepal)	NSJS	Non-State Justice Systems
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency	OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development	PASI	Paralegal Advisor Service Institute (PASI)
ECHR	European Convention on Human Rights	PNG	Papua New Guinea
EPWDA	Eastern Province Woman Development Association (Zambia)	PRI	Penal Reform International
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation	PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers
FRELIMO	The Liberation Front of Mozambique (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique)	SALRC	South African Law Reform Commission
GBV	Gender-Based Violence	SWAP	Sector Wide Approach
GJLOS	Kenya Governance Justice Law and Order Sector (reform programme)	ToR	Terms of Reference
GTZ	German Society for Technical Cooperation (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit)	UAE	United Arab Emirates
HRBA	Human Rights-Based Approach	UDHR	The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
HRC	Human Rights Council	UK	The United Kingdom
HURIPEC	Human Rights and Peace Centre (Uganda)	UN	The United Nations
ICC	International Criminal Court	UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
ICCCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	UNCAT	United Nations Convention Against Torture
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
ICHRP	International Council on Human Rights Policy	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
ICTJ	International Center for Transitional Justice	UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda	UN HABITAT	The United Nations Human Settlements Programme
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia	UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
IJS	Informal Justice Systems	UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
INGO	International Non-Governmental Organisation	UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
ILO	International Labour Organisation	UP	Union Parishad (Bangladesh)
JSC	Judicial Service Commission	UPR	Universal Periodic Review
JLOS	Justice Law and Order Sector	USIP	United States Institute of Peace
JSDP	Justice Sector Development Programme (Sierra Leone)	VAW	Violence Against Women
KSOL	Kathmandu School of Law (Nepal)	VMP	Village Mediation Project (Malawi)
		WLUMI	Women Living Under Muslim Laws
		VSU	Victim Support Unit
		YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The publication was commissioned by UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women. The three agencies would like to acknowledge and thank the team at the Danish Institute for Human Rights who conducted the research and drafted the study. The team consisted of Fergus Kerrigan as team leader and editor, Anne Louise McKay, Annali Kristiansen, Helene Kyed, Lise Dahl, Paul Dalton, Mie Roesdahl, and NuriaVehils. Contributions to the publication were also made by Stephanie Lagoutte, Charlotte Tolstrup, Torsten Arendrup, Katarzyna Cichos, Monica Odheim Nielsen and Malene Axelsen Mundt.

In conducting the research and drafting, the Danish Institute for Human Rights was also assisted by a number of authors and academics in clarifying concepts, providing input and giving helpful comments on drafts, in particular Anne Griffiths, Stephen Golub and Rubya Mehdi. The assistance provided by NGOs and academic institutions was essential to the carrying out of the qualitative and quantitative country studies including Bangladesh Legal Aid and Service Trust (BLAST), Fernando Garcia-Serrano of FLACSO (Ecuador), PASI (Malawi), Ibrahim Mairiga and Hadiza Mahaman (DIHR, Niger), Sarah Garap (Papua New Guinea) and Eleanor Chemonges of FHI (Uganda).

The country studies were significantly assisted by the expert staff at the country offices of the three agencies, both with advice and assistance, and in their significant expertise. The report was also significantly improved through the comments and advice provided by the peer reviewers.

UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women would also like to acknowledge Lance Garmer as copy editor of the final publication and WhatWorks, Inc. for design and layout.

SUMMARY

A. PLACING INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS IN CONTEXT

Until recently, informal justice systems (IJS) were relatively invisible in development partner-assisted justice interventions. Yet, IJS form a key part of individuals' and communities' experience of justice and the rule of law, with over 80 percent of disputes resolved through informal justice mechanisms in some countries.¹ IJS may be more accessible than formal mechanisms and may have the potential to provide quick, relatively inexpensive and culturally relevant remedies. Given this central role and increasing government and partnering donor interest in IJS, it is key to build an understanding of IJS and how best to engage with them for the strengthening of human rights, the rule of law and access to justice.

In many countries, there is a prevalence of IJS, which demands that governments and development partners take these systems more seriously, especially with regard to IJS and women's and children's rights. This does not mean that development organizations should promote IJS at the expense of a functioning unitary legal order or that they should oppose the existence of IJS. Rather, it is recognition that IJS are an empirical reality, albeit a complicated one.

At the same time, growing numbers of countries are requesting UN assistance to engage with IJS and strengthen their ability to provide justice and legal protection. The UN's approach to engagement on rule of law and access to justice is as an effort to ensure international norms and standards for all who come into contact with the formal and informal justice system, including victims, witnesses or alleged offenders. IJS are complex and deeply varied; many drawing their normative structures and legitimacy from the local communities and society in which they operate. The UN does not presume that engagement with IJS can adopt a 'one-size-fits-all' approach. Like all legal mechanisms, IJS function within changing societies and communities and can be responsive to the particular individual circumstances of a case in the application of cultural norms.

The obligation to respect, protect and fulfil human rights, including through the provision of justice and legal remedies, extends to formal and informal systems alike. Both types of justice systems can violate human rights, reinforce discrimination, and neglect principles of procedural fairness. IJS in many contexts deal with issues that have a direct bearing on the best interests of women and children, such as issues of customary marriage, custody, dissolution of marriage, inheritance and property rights. The operative questions surrounding IJS and the rights of women and children are significant. While it is especially important to note that the structures, procedures and substantive decisions of some IJS neither safeguard nor promote women's rights and children's rights, the existence of IJS does not of itself contravene international human rights principles. Indeed, IJS can provide avenues for the delivery of justice and the protection of human rights, particularly where formal justice systems lack capacity, and IJS can enjoy widespread community legitimacy and support.

The study seeks to identify how engagement with IJS can build greater respect and protection for human rights. It highlights the considerations that development partners should have when assessing whether to implement programmes involving IJS, the primary consideration being that engagement with the IJS neither directly nor inadvertently reinforces existing societal or structural discrimination – a consideration that applies to working with formal justice systems as well. The study also examines the value of IJS in offering, in certain contexts, flexible structures and processes, cost-effectiveness and outreach to grassroots communities.

¹ Wojkowska, Ewa 2006: *How Informal Justice Systems can contribute*, Oslo: United Nations Development Programme, Oslo Governance Centre.

In structure, this summary of the study, first describes IJS across the range of degrees of formality and informality and interaction with the state. It identifies the combination of factors that influence individuals' or communities' preferences and pressures to bring matters before IJS rather than before formal justice systems. These factors influencing preferences for IJS vary from geographical isolation, economic concerns, familiarity, trust and the perception that IJS better reflect local values. It then places IJS in the context of human rights, with particular attention to the rights of women and children. Finally, it frames the principles of programming engagement with IJS and suggests possible entry points for engagement with IJS, so that strategic engagement can strengthen IJS to better deliver justice and human rights.

METHODOLOGY

Commissioned by UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women, the study involved a comprehensive literature review and country-specific case studies. Qualitative and quantitative data collection was carried out in Bangladesh, Ecuador, Malawi, Niger, Papua New Guinea and Uganda. The country studies were selected in consultation with the three UN agencies and the methodology was developed through a pilot case study in Malawi. The country studies employed a uniform methodology, and all of the country studies use identical or very similar categories of analysis. Interviews were conducted with individuals and groups representing various stakeholders at the local and national levels on the basis of an interview guide developed for each of the target categories. The quantitative part of the country studies included surveys for users of informal justice and informal justice providers, following a generic questionnaire format that allowed comparison across countries.

Desk studies of 12 countries were also conducted on the basis of literature from academia, UN agencies, NGOs, governments, websites and conferences. Wherever possible, they were developed in consultation with national experts on the informal and the formal justice systems, including scholars and human rights experts. The desk studies assessed the nature and characteristics of IJS (composition, decision-making, procedures), linkages among the different justice providers (particularly with formal justice systems), legal frameworks, human rights aspects and efforts made to date in programming by governments, national and international NGOs, the UN and other development partners.

DEFINITIONS OF INFORMAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS

Any attempt to define IJS must acknowledge that no definition can be both very precise and sufficiently broad to encompass the range of systems and mechanisms that play a role in delivering rule of law and access to justice. IJS vary considerably, encompassing many mechanisms of differing degrees and forms of formality. Degrees of formality vary with respect to legal or normative framework, state recognition, appointment and interaction, control and accountability mechanisms and systems of monitoring and supervision including the maintenance

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_22271

