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Introduction

When the government of Georgia began the process of judicial reform in 1997, it became evident that technical measures alone would not be sufficient to promote the rule of law in the nation after decades of Soviet rule. Widespread corruption and political interference, coupled with inefficient management and poorly trained judges, meant that most citizens would do anything possible to stay away from the courts. Reforming the judicial system, therefore, had to be accompanied by a comprehensive communication effort to help regain trust in the judiciary as it was being revamped, in addition to educating members of the public about their newly acquired rights and helping users navigate the courts.

As an integral part of its Judicial Reform Project, the World Bank included an ambitious communication program. The project was well funded and provided with international technical assistance. It was implemented by a non-governmental organization (NGO) that was willing to work constructively with the judiciary. The communication program started off with an opinion research study that outlined Georgians’ attitudes toward the judiciary and their level of understanding of their rights and the mechanisms in place to protect those rights. With the results of the survey, a communication strategy with a corresponding action plan was put together and implemented between early 2001 and 2004 (annex CS4.1).
Background: The Court System in Disarray

In 1997, the government of Georgia launched a far-reaching judicial reform process. Georgia, until 1991 a republic of the USSR, had never enjoyed an independent, professional judiciary valued by society. On the contrary, judicial decisions were weak and often politicized, and the endorsement of the Politburo was more important than a credible case or a good defense. In turn, this state of affairs meant that the judiciary was never seen as a field in which a young professional could lead a meaningful career, and the system attracted rather mediocre individuals. Corruption became rampant and to this day remains a serious issue.

The World Bank was asked to assist with the process of judicial reform, first in the form of a Judicial Assessment, which was a detailed study of the status of the country’s judiciary, and then with a project aimed at addressing specific pressing issues identified in the assessment. The World Bank project was to assist in the area of court administration, judicial training, rehabilitation of infrastructure, and communication. During project preparation, a communication needs assessment was carried out to identify the most important issues to tackle in the area of communication and to help design the program. As part of this exercise, an opinion research project was commissioned, which consisted of a series of focus groups and a nationwide survey.

Opinion Research: Placing a Mirror in Front of the Judiciary

In 1998, the World Bank commissioned a baseline study of the perceptions of the Georgian public vis-à-vis the judicial system, the public’s understanding of its mode of operation, and the readiness to use it as a means of resolving potential disputes. The research, completed by an international consultant and a team of Georgian researchers, included a countrywide survey (a sample of 1,000 urban and rural residents), a series of focus groups, 30 in-depth interviews with key decision makers and civil society representatives, and a media content analysis.

This initial research indicated that there was a high degree of mistrust of the legal and judicial system in early 1998. The courts and law enforcement agencies were perceived by a large majority of the population as very corrupt, and money and political influence were seen as better guarantors of one’s rights. The research also pointed out, however, that despite the deep cynicism shown by most respondents toward the judicial system, a majority of Georgians still believed in the importance of the rule of law as the basis for a democratic society and a market economy. This specific finding became a vital tool to help design the communication strategy.

The media content analysis revealed that the level of legal knowledge of most reporters was extremely low and that very few of them understood the constructive role that the media could play in educating members of the
public about their rights and how to use the judicial system. Media coverage of the judicial world revolved more around personality issues and scandals rather than substantive matters.

The results of the opinion research were instrumental in demonstrating the need for the judiciary to be in constant dialogue with the public. The lack of knowledge of many basic issues showed that the public needed to be educated and continuously informed about the judicial system. Just as significant, the research also showed how important it was for the judiciary to listen regularly to what the public thought in order to be more responsive to the needs of the citizens it served.

**Program Design: Getting It Right at the Right Time**

With the results of the opinion research project in hand, the communication program had to be set up, its parameters and objectives outlined, the implementation arrangements worked out, and the indicators defined. This stage turned out to be one of the most crucial parts of the intervention, and the capacity to understand current and future challenges proved decisive in ensuring the program’s success. This section discusses some of the most difficult questions faced at that stage.

**How Large Should an Intervention Be?**

Up until the 1990s, few World Bank projects beyond the health sector allocated money to communication, and those that did limited their funding to side interventions, mainly public information activities such as producing brochures and leaflets, in the hope that someone would read them and find them useful.

The opinion research in Georgia clearly showed that this kind of intervention would not be enough. The lack of knowledge and low level of trust in the judiciary required much bigger thinking. The effort had to be comprehensive to help tackle issues on different fronts and in the long term so as to be able to get to the root of the problem and to count on adequate funding. The project’s communication program was given an allocation of $1.6 million for a four-year period.

**Was There a Real Need for International Technical Assistance?**

An important question raised at the time of program design was whether bringing in international consultants to assist in the project was justified. International technical assistance can be very expensive, and it is always difficult to justify the daily fees of senior consultants, which can be higher than annual per capita gross domestic product in the host country.

In Georgia, it was a tough decision. At the time, the country could boast little communication expertise beyond the field of journalism. There was, therefore, another real danger: the risk of investing substantial sums of money in a communication intervention without having a team of Georgian experts...
able to use these resources strategically and to develop an effective program. The decision was made to involve international experts to help design and launch the communication program but, more important, to build capacity in the country to be able to continue this work and take it further. As a result, training became a top priority of the international consultants and not an ancillary activity. As the local team became more skilled, the international consultants were phased out.

**How Broad Should the Scope of the Communications Effort Be?**

The idea of the communication program was to support the process of judicial reform. The opinion research showed, however, that the average citizen knew little about the workings of the judicial system and, more worrisomely, about the rule of law in general. It was felt that the communication program had to be broader than a campaign for the judiciary and must help advance the rule of law in the country.

Hence, the main challenge was how to avoid the risk of being too broad and of diluting the effect of the intervention. The decision was taken to focus on work on behalf of the judiciary but with an approach that would be broad enough to make the initiative of interest to the general public. The judiciary, after all, exists to protect citizens’ rights and to foster the establishment of an environment conducive to the social and economic well-being of society. It is within this general context that the communication program would be implemented.

**If the Court System Was So Discredited, What Impact Could a Communication Program Emanating from the Judiciary Have?**

This obstacle was the trickiest one faced during the design phase of the program. The results of the survey and focus groups were unequivocal: citizens thought very poorly of the judiciary and showed a strong mistrust toward the institution. The new leadership of the judiciary was capable and reform oriented. However, changes in the system were not going to happen overnight, and when they would take place, they would be perceived only by those using the courts. How effective could a communication program be if it were aimed, in part, at explaining those positive changes, but if the messenger enjoyed no credibility whatsoever? It was felt that the communication effort in support of judicial reform could be much more successful if it were to be carried out by a more neutral entity.

Several NGOs were active in Georgia in the field of justice, and the project convinced them to join forces in creating a new entity—the Association for Legal Public Education (ALPE)—to be responsible for implementing the communication program. Thus, four NGOs (Georgian Young Lawyers Association [GYLA], Open Society Institute Georgia, Liberty Institute, and the Judicial Training Center) and a state body, the Council of Justice, established ALPE and gave it guidance during the project. ALPE was given the responsibility of
walking a very thin line: while remaining an NGO with a strong, independent voice, it had to work constructively with and to engage the judiciary to become more open and transparent while at the same time helping the judiciary to reach out to society.

Once the idea of ALPE and its “bridge” position were envisioned, the difficult task became getting official approval for it. The World Bank gives loans to state entities, and it was unheard of that such a large share of a loan would go to an NGO. The project counterparts, the Ministry of Finance, and the management of the World Bank had to be convinced that this was a worthwhile undertaking and that the communication program in support of judicial reform would be more successful if implemented by ALPE than if carried out by the Ministry of Justice or the Supreme Court.

How Could the Sustainability of the Communication Program Be Guaranteed?

Would there be any continuity of the communication effort after the project’s end? As mentioned earlier, the project gave great emphasis to capacity building, both within the judiciary and within ALPE itself. One of the objectives of the international consultants brought on board was to leave behind a fully trained team, capable of implementing the communication program and of developing it further. The project also dedicated considerable resources to increasing the communication capacity within the judiciary. It provided continuous media training to select judges, customer relations training to court clerks, and strategic communication training to the Media Office of the Supreme Court.

In Such a Politicized Environment, Could the Communication Effort Be “Hijacked” and Used for a Different Purpose?

In the late 1990s, judicial reform was at the center of a political debate between reformists within Georgia and those who wanted to maintain the status quo. Even if the project counterparts were committed reformers who deserved support, there was a risk of the substantial resources committed to a sensitive issue as communication and of the media programs being diverted for political purposes.

The project was clear from the beginning: the communication program should support judicial reform. If the “champions” of the reform would later take credit for the success in their own political career, this approach would be fine. It would be a different story if the project were used to fight a political battle. By having the communication program implemented by ALPE, the project already achieved a high degree of insulation. In addition, the “champions” of reform quickly understood the value of having a third party endorse and highlight the positive developments that were taking place in the reform. There were very few attempts to try to capture the initiative for political purposes, attempts that were duly defused.
How Could the Communication Intervention Be Measured in a Meaningful Way?

Assessing the impact of the communication program posed several challenges. As was mentioned, World Bank projects had seldom funded initiatives of this kind, and the focus had tended to be on “deliverables”—outputs in the form of number of brochures printed or the training seminars for journalists organized—without paying sufficient attention to the quality and impact of those activities.

From the beginning, the issue of an increase in the level of trust in the system seemed to be a reliable indicator of success. However, the communication intervention was only one of various factors to have an effect on such an increase in trust. It was, therefore, too risky to use this as an indicator alone. The decision was made to assess the success of the intervention on the basis of four different criteria: (1) institutionalization of the communication approach, that is, succeeding in turning the judiciary into a more open and transparent institution; (2) building capacity in the form of teams, within and outside the judiciary, that are able to sustain an ongoing dialogue between citizens and the courts; (3) an increase in the level of understanding and trust of citizens in the judiciary measured through opinion research against the baseline study; and (4) improvement in the coverage of the courts by the media measured by regular media monitoring.

Objectives and Strategy Development: The Guiding Light

It is an unfortunate reality that many development initiatives see their communication strategies gather dust on a shelf, never to be implemented. For a communication strategy to be effective, it has to serve as a useful document from the outset, moving smoothly from the stated challenges to the objectives. It helps if the strategy is simple and has coherent principles that will guide the choice of activities to be implemented. Those activities need to be laid out in a way that they reinforce each other, so they can ensure that the sum is greater than its parts. The strategy has to be accompanied by a reasonable action plan, with its corresponding time line and budget.

In the case of the judicial reform initiative in Georgia, much effort was put into getting the strategy right. Although there was pressure to start implementing communication activities immediately and to show results from day one, sufficient time was allocated to developing a strategy that the judiciary and ALPE could work with.

The first task in designing the strategy was to determine its overarching goal. After long discussions, it was agreed that the goal of this undertaking was to “increase support for a society based on the rule of law.” Although the primary “client” of this effort was the judiciary, and although what the judiciary needed most in the year 2000 was to regain the trust of the Georgian citizens, the goal was broadly framed to provide a context within which to
foster trust in the institution of the judiciary. Devoid of this context, the communication program would have fallen into a vacuum.

To complement this general goal, six specific objectives existed against which the performance of the communication program would be measured:

- Build communication capacity within ALPE and among key officials in the judiciary.
- Help the judiciary become a user-friendly institution and responsive to the needs of the citizens it serves.
- Foster transparency in the judiciary and promote values of integrity.
- Increase public understanding of the judicial reform process.
- Inform members of the public on how the system works and help them “navigate” the courts.
- Help develop a responsible and accurate media reporting on legal and judicial issues.

The strategy was fleshed out by EurO&M, a public communication firm that is based in Brussels and was selected through an international tender to provide technical assistance to the project. EurO&M outlined a series of strategic principles that would help guide the implementation of the program: the communication tools had to reinforce each other so as to be more compelling and, equally important, to avoid contradictions and mixed messages. ALPE had to cooperate with existing initiatives from both civil society and the judiciary, thus building partnerships with likeminded organizations. It had to mobilize networks, like the school system or the trade associations, that would act as trustworthy multipliers and would carry the message to the relevant audiences. Finally, it had to maintain a sense of reality and proportion and to ensure that judicial reform was not “oversold.” The judicial system exhibited many shortcomings, but solutions for them were outside the scope of the project. The communication style, therefore, had to remain sober and to steer clear of glitzy formulas that would compromise the credibility of the effort and raise unrealistic expectations.

**Implementation: The Proof Is in the Pudding**

The implementation of the communication program started early in 2001 and continued for three years. Early into their contract, EurO&M launched an ambitious capacity-building effort that included specific workshops, on-the-job training, and internships in Western Europe for several ALPE members. The goal was to turn ALPE staff members into capable communication professionals. EurO&M had a full-time presence in Georgia until the end of 2002, after which ALPE was in the driver’s seat, and EurO&M helped guide the implementation of the communication program from Brussels and through periodic visits to Tbilisi by its team leader. As of June 2003, ALPE began operating without any
technical assistance and continues to do so today (early 2008), providing strategic communication services to a vast array of development initiatives.

An important share of the resources was spent to educate members of the general public about their rights and how to protect those rights. This endeavor required a substantial investment in the use of mass media. First, ALPE partnered with one of the leading national newspapers, *Kviris Palitra* (Weekly Palette), to create what became the first section dedicated to addressing legal issues published by any print media. With a focus on how the average citizen could exercise his or her rights, the legal supplement was an immediate success. It also provided many of the stories for the television program *Court TV*, produced by ALPE. The program, which ran for more than 20 episodes, was successful in that its soap opera format had wide appeal, and studio audience discussion was very lively and animated. It also had the benefit of showing, in a lively way, what a defendant in Georgia could expect to find in a courtroom. The *Court TV* program was educational and informative, but in an entertaining way, so that people didn’t feel they were being taught, which was the project’s aim.

It also provided many of the stories for the television program *Court TV*, produced by ALPE. The program, which ran for more than 20 episodes, was successful in that its soap opera format had wide appeal, and studio audience discussion was very lively and animated. It also had the benefit of showing, in a lively way, what a defendant in Georgia could expect to find in a courtroom. The *Court TV* program was educational and informative, but in an entertaining way, so that people didn’t feel they were being taught, which was the project’s aim.

A second TV series, *In Search of Justice*, was produced together with *Courier PS*, a very well-regarded current affairs TV program. The series highlighted real cases in which citizens had gone to court and received justice. One of the programs featured the story of Irakli Tsintsadze, a retired KGB employee who, against the advice of his colleagues and friends, decided to take the former secret police to court for not having granted him a special pension to which he was entitled. To the surprise of many in Georgia, the Tbilisi court ruled in favor of Mr. Tsintsadze, who was quickly awarded a compensation of lari 2,000 ($1,000). Soon after the program aired, 25 similar cases were filed, highlighting the potential of the mass media to educate citizens about the functioning of the judicial system.

In parallel with the public education work undertaken through the mass media, an initiative to bring young people into closer contact with the courts and the parliament was established. What started as a small activity became a big success, due in part to the enthusiasm of the education establishment, which saw this as a great opportunity to instill a sense of civic responsibility in students. By the end of the activity, more than 7,000 young people from various regions of the country had visited the Supreme Court in Tbilisi, the parliament, or their district court.

ALPE also launched a public relations campaign to support the actual reform process of the judiciary. Among other things, ALPE developed a monthly newsletter that was on reform issues and was circulated to key decision makers in the country, including parliamentarians, government officials, and judges, so they could be kept abreast of the project’s progress. Although this campaign seemed a minor intervention at first, providing timely and reliable information on the reform allowed a very important group of internal stakeholders to be kept in the loop as opposed to remaining in the dark or receiving partial and often inaccurate reports through the media. ALPE was always prompt to
mobilize the media to draw attention to important achievements of the reform, such as the adoption of a new code of ethics by judges.

The most challenging task for ALPE was trying to help the judiciary become a more open, transparent, and user-friendly institution. As mentioned earlier, the starting point was so low that a few well-conceived initiatives were able to go a long way. With the understanding that the first official that most citizens interact with in a court is not a judge but a low-level clerk trained in Soviet times, the project decided to focus initially on improving how these clerks interact with citizens. ALPE helped establish and train a network of court clerks responsible for information and customer service, and it provided them with a set of brochures and other materials to be distributed to the public. A small group of judges who had been identified as “spokespeople” for the judiciary, together with the Supreme Court’s public relations teams, were trained in communication and media relations to help them better articulate the views of their institutions both internally and vis-à-vis society. Although several of these initiatives did help the judiciary open up and show greater responsiveness to citizens’ needs, the disappointing reality is that their impact was limited. Regrettably, the momentum needed to make those transparency measures reach a point of no return was not achieved, and the attempts to promote openness in the institution were not continued.

Finally, the project had an ambitious plan to strengthen the media’s capacity to report on legal and judicial issues. Several workshops were organized for reporters covering the courts, in which they were acquainted with the basic tenets of the legal and judicial system. More interesting, however, was the course on legal and judicial reporting developed by ALPE and taught at an independent school of journalism financed by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Although training future journalists did not seem a priority at first—those receiving the instruction would become reporters only after the project ended—the partnership with the university helped institutionalize this activity and facilitate its sustainability. In retrospect, however, the media-strengthening aspect of the overall communication program was probably the least successful. Unfortunately, many constraints exist to ensuring the media’s constructive role in the promotion of the rule of law. Most editors and readers alike do not appreciate accurate reporting as much as sensational unqualified stories. Also, journalists’ salaries remain too low to attract talented young professionals to the field, and those who join the profession may be more susceptible to bribery.

**Conclusion: Was It Worth It?**

There are several ways to assess whether the communication intervention described here succeeded. First, one can look at the World Bank’s own ex post evaluation of the project. The Bank’s Implementation Completion Report considered that “the inclusion of the public information/education component
was thought to be critical to support the demand side for judicial services and accountability in Georgia. The choice to locate these activities in a new NGO … was deemed necessary to increase credibility with the public. This innovation proved to be an important one in Bank lending at the time and later one of the more successful components of the project.”

Another way to assess the impact of this effort is to review whether the objectives originally established in the strategy were achieved. Although not all of the specific objectives were attained, and some only partially, the results seem positive overall: the project helped build capacity within ALPE and the judiciary. At this writing, ALPE—four years after receiving the final disbursement of funds from the project—has established itself as a reputable organization providing strategic communication services for development initiatives in the justice sector. It has worked for a variety of clients, including the European Commission, USAID, and the Eurasia Foundation. The judiciary, although not having fully internalized the communication function nor having deepened its commitment to transparency, has become, on several accounts, a more open and citizen-oriented institution. Media monitoring carried out during the project confirms the earlier observation that strengthening the media was not as successful as anticipated. There was an increase in the coverage of judicial issues, but content of the stories remains too focused on scandals and personalities.

It is more difficult to ascertain whether there was an increase in public understanding of the judicial system and trust in the institution, or whether the program’s overarching objective, namely, to “increase support for a society based on the rule of law,” was met. The opinion research leaves room for ambiguity, and results can be read in different ways. According to a Business Environment and Enterprise Performance Survey, only 29 percent of firms operating in Georgia in 2002 were confident in the judicial system’s ability to uphold property and contractual rights. By 2005, this figure jumped to 71 percent.3 The studies surveying the general public, however, give a less rosy picture. Whereas they do tend to confirm a slight increase in understanding and appreciating the judicial system, the changes are too small to be attributed to the communication intervention. The reality is that overall trust in the institution remains alarmingly low.

With the benefit of hindsight, a lesson can be drawn from an impact evaluation of a communication program using opinion research studies. The surveys have to be designed to capture very subtle nuances, not only in the perceptions, but also in the expectations, of the respondents. Otherwise, there is a risk of falling into a paradoxical situation—as probably happened here—whereby a communication effort that may succeed in increasing the public’s understanding of the role of the judiciary will probably lead to a constituency that expects more of the system. Hence, the 2000 and 2004 survey answers about a “certain degree of dissatisfaction” with the judicial system may mean very different things, if by 2004 respondents have come to expect, in part
because of the communication intervention, a much higher level of performance from the courts.

There is, however, a very different way to assess whether Georgia experienced an increase in support for a society based on the rule of law. Although this evidence is anecdotal, its sheer magnitude makes it impossible to ignore. In November 2003, when Georgian and international election observers confirmed the suspicion by all opposition parties that the ruling regime had rigged the parliamentary elections, tens of thousands of citizens peacefully took to the streets of the country’s main cities to demonstrate against the fraud and to demand new elections. What came to be known as the Rose Revolution became the first instance in post-Soviet Georgia when society mobilized itself en masse to demand that a fundamental right that had been violated must be respected. An interesting further development, however, is that Georgians—who overwhelmingly elected the leader of the Rose Revolution, Mikhail Saakashvili, as president—did not grant him carte blanche. Citizens have become much more engaged in monitoring government policies and demanding that government take responsibility for its actions, as the public pressure on the government in late 2007 to review certain unpopular policies exemplifies.

As far as the judiciary is concerned, there are mixed views in the country on the success of the reforms of the 1990s. Nobody denies, however, that the institution is still burdened with many serious problems that fundamentally affect its performance and credibility. What is clearer now—and the opinion research confirms—is that the court system and not organized crime or any other form of “alternative” dispute resolution is the venue in which citizens expect to find justice. Although there have been many factors behind the increased awareness of citizens’ rights, as well as of the deeper understanding of institutions and of how they have to be accountable, the role that the communication campaigns may have had on these achievements cannot be underestimated.
### Annex CS4.1: Overview of Communication Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Messages</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Communications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Build communication capacity of ALPE.</td>
<td>ALPE staff, ALPE board</td>
<td>Build an organization that communicates issues important for the development of Georgia as a civil society.</td>
<td>ALPE is a modern communication organization that can run an independent judicial reform communication program.</td>
<td>Activity 1: Building ALPE staff capacity • On-the-job training • Governance training for board • Short training sessions, including Train the Trainers • Short placements in the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 2: Building ALPE logistic capacity • Office setup and staff recruitment • Design of ALPE visual identity • Set up of ALPE Web site • Development of ALPE resource center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Build communication capacity among key communicators involved in judicial reform.</td>
<td>PR officers in courts, Council of Justice, Ministry of Justice, Judges</td>
<td>Get the message out. Be partners in communication.</td>
<td>Key communicators are acting effectively as voices for judicial reform.</td>
<td>Activity 3: Building communication capacity among key communicators in judiciary • Identification of key communicators in judiciary • Analysis of training needs • Short training sessions by foreign trainers and ALPE • Regular information-sharing workshops • ALPE newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 4: Building feedback mechanism for judiciary • Assistance by ALPE in setting up a media-monitoring mechanism • Continuous opinion research and analysis • Feedback to judiciary through key communicators during regular meetings and ALPE newsletter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judiciary receives regular feedback on the public’s understanding and perceptions of the judicial system and the ongoing reform.
### Annex CS4.1: Overview of Communication Strategy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Messages</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Help judiciary to become a user-friendly institution. | Court employees judges, Legal associations, Ombudsmen, University journalism students | Remember, you are the face of the law. Remember, you are the servant of the people and the law. | Access to judiciary and to court decisions is improved. | Activity 5: Setting up a system of access to court decisions  
- Set up court officer network.  
- Design tailor-made notice boards for all courts and train court officer network to use and update them regularly.  
- Create ALPE newsletter. |
|                      |              |          |          | Activity 6: Media training for judges  
- Train judges on how to handle the media as part of the curriculum of the judicial training center and other judicial training initiatives.  
- Include questions on basic media relations in exams of judges. |

**External Communications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Messages</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Increase public understanding of the judicial reform process. | General public, International business community | The contract between citizen and state in a modern society is underwritten by trust. That trust did not exist previously. The reform process is developing a system in which this trust is created. | Mass media campaign informs about the achievements of reform and what still needs to be done. | Activity 7: Mass media campaign to increase understanding of judicial reform process  
- Production of public service announcements (for TV, radio)  
- Ads in print media  
- Court chronicle supplement in regular media  
- Media relations  
- Articles in journals that target international and local business community  
- Regular presentations and updates to organizations that target international and local business community |
### Annex CS4.1: Overview of Communication Strategy (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Messages</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Inform the public about how the judicial system works.</strong></td>
<td>General public with a focus on: • Schools: teachers and pupils • NGOs • Business community • Lawyers • Relevant media</td>
<td>You have rights; find out how to use them.</td>
<td>General mass media campaign informs about the basics of the judicial system.</td>
<td>Activity 8: Mass media campaign to inform about the basics of the judicial system • Series of Court TV programs in cooperation with other donors or private sector • Monthly TV insert in regular TV program • Media relations • Through the ALPE Web site • Creation of and dissemination of public education material, including a guide to the judicial system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved knowledge of judicial system exists in the educational system.</td>
<td>Activity 9: School program • Children’s visits to courts • “Street law project” that is run together with other donors (Soros and GYLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved understanding exists of the basics of alternative dispute resolution and where it could be used sensibly, in addition to the regular judicial system.</td>
<td>Activity 10: ADR awareness program • Organize ADR seminars for lawyers and business community. • Create and distribute literature on the subject. • Include articles on ADR in ALPE newsletter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Help to develop responsible and accurate media reporting on judicial/legal issues.</strong></td>
<td>Editors and political or legal correspondents in mainly 3 TV channels 5–6 newspapers 2 radio stations</td>
<td>Tell me the truth. Get the story right. Be just and find justice.</td>
<td>Quality of media reporting on judicial and legal issues has improved.</td>
<td>Activity 11: Legal reporting program • Develop a database of journalists who cover the subject. • Create a workshop for large group of journalists on basics of the judicial and legal system • Encourage editors to have regular court reporter columns. • Develop a workshop on legal journalism as part of the journalism degree course at the university. • Award the legal journalist of the year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author.
Notes

1. The World Bank has different mechanisms for giving smaller grants to civil society and other organizations but for a different purpose.
2. See Annex CS4.1 for an outline of the communication strategy.