

Advancing People-Centred Justice: Innovative Practices to Responsive and Inclusive Justice Systems

Marang'a Moses (Ph.D.)¹, Mwimali Jack (Ph.D.)², Ndemo Doreen³ & Olwande Cynthia⁴

ABSTRACT

This article explores global practices in People-Centred Justice (PCJ), emphasising their potential to transform justice systems to be fair, inclusive and responsive to the needs of justice seekers. Drawing on diverse evidence and practical examples from multiple jurisdictions, the study examines how innovative PCJ practices are being implemented to close the gap between formal justice delivery and users' lived experiences. Special emphasis is given to the practices that address the needs of vulnerable and underserved groups. Despite the PCJ approach gaining prominence, there is limited depth and uptake of a wide range of its practices within a particular jurisdiction. Addressing these challenges requires enhancing participatory and inclusive approaches, broadening alternative forms of dispute resolution, and emphasising restorative models that are responsive to the needs and lived experiences of justice seekers. This should be coupled with the intersection of PCJ with health, education and other social needs to achieve inclusive benefits. Further, PCJ practices should be integrated into the national public finance and planning systems to align resource allocation with justice needs. The justice sector institutions should also scale up capacity building for both justice seekers and providers. The realisation of the benefits of PCJ aspirations further requires co-designing and co-implementing interventions with justice seekers, strengthening leadership support, investing in digitisation, and developing country and context-specific institutional guidelines.

Key Words: People-Centred Justice (PCJ), Practices, Responsive, Inclusive, Justice Seekers

DOI: 10.7176/JLPG/154-01

Publication date: July 28th 2026

BACKGROUND

Introduction

Access to justice is widely recognised as a fundamental element of democratic governance and adherence to the rule of law. Nevertheless, for a substantial portion of the global population, formal legal systems are often viewed as inaccessible, overly complex, and insufficiently responsive to the practical needs of justice seekers. In response to these limitations, the concept of People-Centred Justice (PCJ) has emerged as a transformative paradigm for service delivery within justice systems. PCJ is an approach that shifts justice systems away from institutional formalism toward greater responsiveness to the unmet justice needs and rights of individuals (Hague Institute for Innovation of Law [HiIL], 2021; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2021 & 2025). As an approach, PCJ requires the active participation of those affected by injustice, focusing on their specific needs (World Justice Project, 2023). Additionally, PCJ addresses persistent challenges such as procedural delays, high costs and exclusivity, all of which impede access to justice (Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies, 2019).

People-centred justice is grounded in foundational principles that shape the interactions between justice seekers and justice providers. These principles include accessibility and responsiveness (OECD, 2021), fairness and impartiality (Tyler, 2017), as well as inclusivity and non-discrimination (OECD, 2025; Zehr, 2015). Additional principles are empowerment (UNDP, 2025), transparency and accountability (Irvita & Asriani, 2025), timeliness and efficiency (Pathfinders, 2019), and collaboration and coordination (NCAJ, 2025). Collectively, these principles serve as normative and operational anchors for justice institutions to design and implement context-specific practices that address the diverse needs, circumstances and lived experiences of justice seekers.

¹ Executive Director, National Council on the Administration of Justice (NCAJ)

² Professor of Law and Chief Executive Officer, Council for Legal Education in Kenya

³ Advocate and Head of Civil Justice Reforms Department at NCAJ

⁴ Head of Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Department at NCAJ

Given the anticipated positive impact of PCJ in contemporary society, the global justice community is increasingly embracing this approach. PCJ is recognised as essential for advancing Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16, which seeks to promote universal access to justice (OECD, 2021 & 2025). To achieve this objective, institutions across various jurisdictions have implemented a range of PCJ reforms and practices designed to enhance their responsiveness to the needs and experiences of justice seekers. Despite the existence of these reforms and practices, significant gaps in practice remain. Justice seekers frequently face barriers to accessing fair and responsive justice. The implementation of PCJ innovations remains limited, with formal justice approaches continuing to dominate. There is also insufficient quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the impacts of PCJ practices.

To address these gaps and propose solutions for ensuring justice seekers access fair and responsive justice, this study investigates practices to advance PCJ as its primary objective. Realising this objective is pivotal for the effective functioning of the justice systems. By emphasising a justice system that is more attuned to the needs, experiences and circumstances of justice seekers, this research also seeks to inform practices that improve access to justice, increase public trust and reinforce adherence to the rule of law.

Comparison of People-Centred Justice with Formal Justice Delivery Models

People-centred justice departs from formal justice systems in its foundational approach. It emerged from the integration of community-based dispute resolution, restorative justice, human rights, inclusive development, and rule-of-law dictates. Following World War II, international and regional human rights instruments reinforced the normative foundations of PCJ by promoting dignity, equality, inclusion, equity and access to justice. Subsequent frameworks addressing the rights of women, children and persons with disabilities further strengthened protections for vulnerable groups (CEDAW, 2015).

Whereas formal justice systems define justice as the outcome of formal adjudication and rule-based dispute resolution, PCJ conceptualises justice as a relational problem-solving process (World Justice Project, 2023). This framework marks a shift from state-centric justice delivery to approaches that prioritise human dignity, lived experiences and the substantive needs of individuals and communities. PCJ also draws on natural law and Kantian ethics, which emphasise the inherent dignity of every person and the moral foundations of law (Finnis, 2011; Kant, 2012).

Although formal legal theory prioritises legality and institutional order (Hart, 1961), PCJ extends these principles by requiring that justice processes and outcomes be fair, meaningful and empowering. PCJ is further informed by restorative justice, capabilities theory, participatory development and feminist jurisprudence, all of which emphasise repairing harm, restoring relationships, enabling participation and addressing exclusion within legal systems (Braithwaite, 2002; Nussbaum, 2011; Zehr, 2015).

Formal justice is typically associated with state-centric approaches, which can constrain adaptability and responsiveness. In contrast, PCJ recognises that standardised approaches often fail to address the complexities present in pluralistic societies (Denney & Domingo, 2023). Evidence from global justice needs surveys shows that a significant proportion of justice issues remain unresolved due to barriers that extend beyond strictly legal considerations (OECD, 2025). Furthermore, PCJ shifts the assessment of justice systems toward the quality of resolution, emphasising user satisfaction and the broader impact of justice interventions (Chapman et al., 2021).

By centring justice on individuals rather than institutions, PCJ advances principles of inclusion and meaningful outcomes. It empowers individuals, particularly those who are marginalised, by fostering their participation. PCJ also prioritises individuals' ability to understand, use and shape the law to improve their lives (UNDP, 2022). In contrast, formal systems frequently fail to address the diverse needs of vulnerable populations.

Statement of the Problem

Despite decades of prioritising justice sector reforms globally, significant portions of the population remain excluded from fair, effective and responsive systems. Evidence suggests that over two-thirds of the world's population encounter diverse justice problems, most of which remain unresolved. Additionally, conventional justice delivery models, characterised by procedural rigidity, adversarial processes and formalism, have not sufficiently provided responsive outcomes for justice seekers.

Structural barriers, such as complex procedures, prohibitive costs, language obstacles and geographic distance, further exacerbate the challenge. Individuals from vulnerable backgrounds are often denied opportunities to access justice that is relevant to their circumstances. These challenges indicate that justice systems are insufficiently responsive to the lived realities and needs of justice seekers.

Recent discourse has increasingly supported PCJ, recognising justice system users as rights-holders and active participants. The objective is to establish inclusive and equitable justice systems, as outlined in various legal and

normative frameworks. To achieve this, institutions across multiple jurisdictions have adopted innovative PCJ reforms to enhance their responsiveness to the realities faced by justice seekers.

Although there is an increasing consensus on PCJ practices, their implementation remains limited and fragmented. Many justice seekers continue to encounter barriers to accessing fair and responsive justice. While policy frameworks such as Sustainable Development Goal 16 promote inclusive, effective, and accountable justice, numerous jurisdictions fail to address the aspects most valued by justice seekers. This shortcoming has contributed to growing injustices, with justice system institutions perceived as unresponsive and disconnected from the needs of justice seekers. It is against this backdrop that this study examined PCJ practices with a broader aim of guiding the justice systems to be responsive and inclusive.

Methodology and Scope of the Study

An exploratory research design was predominantly adopted to achieve the study's objective. The research examined the real-world implementation of PCJ through documented institutional and jurisdictional practices. The justice system was defined broadly to include upstream, midstream and downstream justice-sector institutions. The analysis covered the primary functions of these institutions, including policing, adjudication, legal representation and aid, legislative and policy reforms, witness protection, victim support, correction and rehabilitation of offenders, as well as a wide range of civil justice mechanisms.

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF PEOPLE-CENTRED JUSTICE

The justice sector encompasses a range of institutions that serve different types of justice seekers. Each institution operates under distinct legal mandates that address diverse aspects of administration and access to justice. These mandates necessitate a nuanced understanding of the practical implementation of people-centred justice (PCJ). Accordingly, this study has examined the PCJ practices that prioritise the needs, rights and experiences of individuals interacting with justice systems. The analysis includes various forms and manifestations of PCJ across Africa, America, Asia-Pacific and Europe.

People-Centred Policing

People-Centred Policing (PCP) constitutes a significant component of PCJ, focusing on enhanced observance of human rights and increased community participation in police governance and practice. The conceptual foundations of PCP involve reforming authoritarian policing, advancing participatory and restorative justice, and adhering to international human rights instruments. Notably, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights serve as key human rights references.

Tyler and Huo (2002) assert that PCP prioritises the rights, needs and dignity of individuals within the context of public safety. PCP emphasises the co-production of security, requiring police to engage in sustained dialogue with communities through mechanisms such as town hall forums, advisory boards and citizen satisfaction audits (Modise, 2023). Rather than relying solely on deterrence or arrests, PCP seeks to enhance public trust, fairness and legal empowerment. In contexts marked by militarised or racially biased policing histories, PCP offers a framework for restoring institutional legitimacy and promoting social cohesion (Denney & Domingo, 2023).

People-centred policing further requires law enforcement agencies to address the distinct needs and rights of vulnerable populations. Examples include the establishment of gender desks, child and youth protection initiatives, and trauma-sensitive responses. Hadsel (2025) contends that trauma-informed policing equips officers with the necessary skills and empathy to identify, understand and respond appropriately to individuals who have experienced trauma. For instance, to enhance people-centred justice, the Victoria Police in Canada has institutionalised trauma-informed approaches by integrating frontline support for victims into its mainstream operations (Victoria Police, 2015).

A further central focus of PCP is increased community engagement. Community safety audits provide additional opportunities for engagement between communities and police. For example, in Nepal, women's safety audits have enabled participatory assessments of women's safety and security concerns in public spaces, identification of protection gaps related to gender-based violence, and strengthened awareness of safety risks and response measures among women (UNDP, 2023). In the United States, Braga et al. (2014) found that Boston's Operation Ceasefire, a focused deterrence strategy involving coordinated action by law enforcement, community partners, and service providers, contributed to reductions in gang-involved gun violence. In Kenya, community policing platforms, although facing challenges, are employed to improve safety at the grassroots level (Diphooorn & van Staple, 2020).

Police-community mediation represents another example of PCP, functioning as an alternative dispute resolution platform for minor disputes and grievances. Faith-based partnerships in policing also play a significant role. In Nigeria, for instance, religious leaders frequently act as informal mediators in interpersonal, family and

community disputes, reflecting their social authority in reconciliation and conflict resolution (Ezema et al., 2023). In New Zealand, interventions targeting youth offenders prioritise reconciliation between offenders and victims (McCold, 2008). In Canada, the Peel Police Service has implemented racial equity audits to inform recruitment, training, and community engagement (Owusu-Bempah et al., 2024). Evidence from Kent, United Kingdom, presented by Lay et al. (2023), demonstrates that victim-focused policing, supported by systematic analysis of police records, enables law enforcement agencies to identify repeat victimisation, prioritise responses, and enhance support for victims.

Digital policing further advances PCP by enhancing citizens' access to police services. Examples include electronic crime reporting, case tracking, complaint submission and access to legal resources (Elphick et al., 2021). In Spain, Crime Victims' Support Offices deliver multidisciplinary assistance, supplemented by digital justice tools that improve continuity and dignity in service delivery (Ministry of Justice of Spain, 2023). Additionally, cities are utilising predictive tools to allocate patrols. Amaral et al. (2023) report that in urban India, visible or uniformed police patrols reduced severe forms of public-space sexual harassment by 27 per cent, whereas undercover patrols did not yield a similar reduction.

People-Centred Prosecution and Court Services

The adjudication of cases in courts constitutes a fundamental function of the justice system. During this process, prosecutorial offices and courts are instrumental in ensuring responsiveness to the needs of justice seekers. Various examples of people-centred prosecution exist. In Colombia, specialised prosecutorial units collaborate with community mediators to divert minor cases from formal prosecution. In the United States, community prosecution models in cities such as Portland and San Francisco assign prosecutors to neighbourhoods to mediate disputes and prevent crime escalation through non-custodial interventions (Tyler & Huo, 2002). In Kenya, the diversion policy and plea bargaining mechanisms within the Prosecution Directorate enable the diversion of eligible offenders, particularly low-risk individuals, thereby reducing the inflow of new cases into courts and promoting fair, timely, and less adversarial case resolution (National Council on the Administration of Justice [NCAJ], 2025).

Courts in various jurisdictions have adopted people-centred justice (PCJ) practices within their adjudication processes. A primary focus of these initiatives is the protection of the rights of vulnerable justice seekers. For example, specialised courts for indigenous populations in Canada, particularly those addressing family and youth justice, engage community leaders in restorative practices to enhance procedural engagement and reduce recidivism (OECD, 2021). In Brazil, restorative justice pilot courts with community panels conduct structured victim-offender mediation for youth crimes and minor offences (Cabanellas, 2023). In Finland, juvenile and family courts incorporate mediation within formal proceedings as a restorative practice, resulting in high user satisfaction, reduced reoffending rates, and expedited dispute resolution (Lappi-Seppälä & Kivivuori, 2020).

Community-based participatory courts represent another essential aspect of PCJ practices. The involvement of community elders in court proceedings facilitates healing for the parties involved (Harris, 2006). In Ghana, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) centres have been integrated into district courts and are staffed by trained mediators to provide informal, yet judicially supervised, dispute resolution (Boateng & Darkwa, 2021). The Kenyan Judiciary has implemented PCJ through the innovations under the Social Transformation through Access to Justice Blueprint 2023–2033. This blueprint introduces a range of participatory and people-focused justice innovations, including court-annexed mediation, alternative justice systems (AJS) and open court days, to promote meaningful community engagement with the courts (Judiciary of Kenya, 2023). Additionally, in Kenya, Court Users Committees work directly with the community to address service delivery inefficiencies at the local level (NCAJ, 2025).

Several practical examples illustrate efforts to promote access to justice for vulnerable justice seekers. In Chile, unified family courts consolidate child custody, divorce, domestic violence and child support cases within a single institution to enhance coordination with social services (Correa, 2012). In Singapore, family justice courts have implemented child-inclusive proceedings, where judges initially act as conciliators before formal adjudication (Family Justice Courts Singapore, 2022). In South Africa, Small Claims Courts streamline court procedures by appointing magistrates as commissioners, thereby enabling more efficient dispute resolution for low-income communities (OECD, 2021).

In New Zealand, Marae Youth Courts offer a culturally grounded youth justice process that involves Māori elders alongside justice officials during hearings (Findlay, 2024). According to Findlay (2024), this model aims to strengthen cultural identity, family engagement and wellbeing, and has been linked to reductions in Māori youth reoffending. In Argentina, public satisfaction surveys have been institutionalised, with quarterly performance dashboards aggregating user feedback for judges to enhance institutional transparency and accountability (Bergallo & Polga-Hecimovich, 2022). In Georgia, an Open Court Dashboard and a public-facing

performance portal provide real-time data on court schedules, caseloads, and judge-specific performance indicators (Sakhokia, 2024). Similarly, Indonesia operates an online system for publishing court performance statistics, which is also incorporated into judicial promotion criteria to improve accountability (Simon, 2023).

The digitisation of courts, particularly in frontline services, represents a key practical intervention in people-centred justice (PCJ). In Estonia, the judiciary has implemented extensive e-filing, automated scheduling, and AI-supported triage tools, resulting in a reduction of administrative delays by approximately 25 per cent (OECD, 2023). In India, e-Courts enable virtual hearings, real-time case tracking, and SMS alerts for litigants (Sarkar & Bhattacharjee, 2023). In South Korea, courts offer online dispute resolution for small claims and virtual mediation sessions, supported by AI-assisted tools in drafting decisions (Valchuk, 2024).

People-Centred Witness Protection

Reorienting witness protection towards people-centredness is crucial for the proper functioning of the justice system. In PCJ, strengthened protection of witnesses promotes responsiveness to human rights and contributes to justice for victims. Various jurisdictions have implemented measures to reorient their witness protection programmes to be responsive to the needs of justice seekers.

Under PCJ, the needs of witnesses, particularly those who face various vulnerabilities, are considered. For example, in Estonia and South Korea, digital testimony systems have enabled remote, encrypted appearances by vulnerable witnesses (OECD, 2023). In Kenya, the Witness Protection Agency has institutionalised individualised protection plans that include trauma counselling and flexible testimonial arrangements (NCAJ, 2025). Therefore, once witnesses are accorded procedural support, choice in testimonial methods and avenues for feedback, their participation in the justice system improves.

People-Centred Correctional Services

People-Centred Correctional Services (PCCS) is a key component of PCJ that enhances service delivery to persons serving custodial and probation sentences, those remanded to prison, their relatives and the community at large. It stems from the realisation that the role of prisons and other correctional institutions extends beyond incarceration to encompass human rights-based rehabilitation and restorative repair (Shapland et al., 2024). Under the PCCS, incarceration is an opportunity for social healing and personal transformation rather than social exclusion (Hannah-Moffat & Shaw, 2000).

For instance, enhancing participation in correctional facilities supports PCJ. Edgar (2018) asserts that participation in conflict-resolution strategies within prisons can create safer environments and equip prisoners with emotional and interpersonal competencies that are also transferable after release. An example is Belgium's INSIDER Project, which actively involves inmates in decision-making to improve trust between them and staff and contribute to safer environments (Daems, 2017). Another example of this participatory approach is through faith-based initiatives in correctional settings. Research by Johnson (2002) suggests that participation in structured faith-based programmes may contribute to personal transformation and pro-social behaviour.

Programmes that address the justice needs of vulnerable or special category prisoners exist. For instance, reforming food policy for incarcerated women, including their participation in menu planning and nutritional education, is restorative and improves health outcomes (UNGA, 2015). Adams et al (2025) argue that institutional neglect of women's health, including food policy, reflects broader patterns of structural inequity in prison governance. Regarding neurodiverse prisoners, Kirby, Mercer and Wilson (2020) advocate for individualised assessment screening, highlighting how standardised processes may marginalise such prisoners. In New Zealand, the family group conferencing system empowers families, victims and offenders to co-create justice solutions, reinforcing community ownership and accountability (Maxwell & Morris, 2001).

To enhance post-release outcomes, various PCJ interventions are vital. In Germany, Hausam, Lehmann and Dahle (2020) developed a person-centred typology of prisoner behaviour and advocated individualised programming to improve institutional safety and post-release outcomes. Another example is engagement with environmental and nature-based programmes to support rehabilitation efforts. Such engagements with nature have been shown to lower stress levels, enhance mental health and equip inmates with valuable skills for reintegration (Toews et al, 2018). According to Mahlangu and Zivanai (2023), digital skills and e-learning also equip inmates with essential reintegration skills, thereby enhancing their opportunities post-release.

Strengthening intersectional approaches in prison programmes is vital. Effective interagency collaboration among prison officers, educationists, social workers, and health professionals is essential for rehabilitation. In Indonesia, Batubara (2025) emphasised the need for character development, particularly through structured educational and moral instruction programs. Another example is Norway's probation model, which treats probationers as citizens entitled to education, healthcare, and welfare, thus minimising social exclusion (Cavadino & Dignan, 2007).

Survivor-Centred Justice Practices

Survivor-Centred Justice (SCJ) is a key component of PCJ that prioritises the rights, dignity and wellbeing of survivors. A particular focus of SCJ is addressing structural barriers women and girls face, often resulting from historical marginalisation, and especially those related to SGBV. Improved participation of survivors requires informed consent and engagement to ensure authentic empowerment (Kensit, 2024). For instance, in Liberia, the GBV survivor taskforce enables individuals to directly influence service design and monitoring frameworks. In New Zealand, responses to family and sexual violence have incorporated Māori perspectives through partnership between the Crown and Te Rōpū, an independent Māori advisory body established to help shape culturally appropriate policies and services (Ministry of Justice, n.d.).

A trauma-informed SCJ system is ideal to address the psychological effects of harm, promote healing and prevent re-victimisation of survivors. For example, judicial training in Canada and trauma-awareness programs for prosecutors in Uganda show how system actors can implement empathetic practices that prioritise the voices and well-being of survivors (Rogers, 2020). In the Philippines, early intervention through Barangay Women's Desks facilitates safe disclosures and prompt support for victims of SGBV.

Effective protection mechanisms for survivors should address the specific experiences, especially those at increased risk due to their vulnerability. For example, in Ethiopia, the network of safe houses provides temporary shelter and legal and economic support for reintegration (Government of Ethiopia, 2017). Digitisation is important for scaling protection for survivors. An example is Pakistan's cybercrime laws, which offer protection against online violence directed at women (Government of Pakistan, 2016).

In any justice system, adjudication of cases is expected to be humane and centred on the dignity of survivors. An example is Bangladesh's women-only courts, which provide a supportive environment for survivors of domestic violence (Government of Bangladesh, 2013). In Kenya, gender justice courts also focus on survivors of GBV (Koome, 2026).

Establishing survivor-centred infrastructure that prioritises their interests is essential for realising justice. An example is South Africa's Thuthuzela Care Centres, which integrate health, legal and psychosocial support within a single location to streamline assistance (Qazi, 2024).

Learning also plays a vital role in survivor-centred justice by ensuring that responses are informed by survivors' lived experiences and evolving needs. For instance, in Canada, participatory research involving student-survivors has informed the development of trauma-informed policies within higher education institutions (Rogers, 2020).

Child-Centred Justice Practices

Child-Centred Justice (CCJ) is a subset of PCJ that acknowledges the rights, developmental needs and vulnerabilities of children as they interact with the justice system. As victims, witnesses, offenders or parties in civil matters, children require justice systems that are responsive, protective and rehabilitative.

Notable programmes promoting CCJ exist. For example, diversion practices are increasingly used as effective alternatives to punitive justice for children. In New Zealand, family group conferencing prioritises reintegration and community accountability (Zehr, 2015). In Kenya, diversion mechanisms promote the best interests of the child by helping to resolve minor offences outside formal court processes while ensuring victim participation (NCAJ, 2022; NCAJ, 2025).

Continuous adaptive learning and capacity-building mechanisms are fundamental to the effective implementation of CCJ. The Council of Europe (2010) has developed training manuals that have been adopted in more than 20 states. Elsewhere in Uganda and Sweden, judicial academies require mandatory curricula on child rights (OECD, 2025). Further, child participation is operationalised through child-friendly court procedures, the inclusion of children's perspectives within Court User Committees, and ensuring that children's views inform decisions and reforms (Koome, 2026; NCAJ, 2022).

The design of the CCJ infrastructure is essential to ensuring that children feel safe and respected by those in the justice chain. Examples include the Philippines and South Africa, where courtrooms have been redesigned to include child-appropriate waiting areas. This has reduced reliance on formal legal symbolism to safeguard children's privacy and safety (OECD, 2023).

Several jurisdictions have also adopted integrated service delivery and virtual courtrooms to enhance safety and comfort during proceedings. The Barnahus model in Nordic countries integrates forensic, medical and psychosocial services in a single location, reducing the need for children to repeatedly recount their experiences and preventing secondary trauma (Council of the Baltic Sea States, 2017). Elsewhere, the Council of Europe (2010) child consultation protocols strengthen engagement with children.

Prevention efforts commence with awareness and early access to justice mechanisms. Child Rights International Network (2026) documents community campaigns in various ways that promote understanding of children's rights. According to the UNODC (2013), custody should be considered only as a last resort for children. Alternative models, such as Brazil's socio-educational measures and the UK's youth referral orders, prioritise supervision and reintegration. Youth-specific justice programs should be structured to prioritise rehabilitation rather than punitive measures.

People-Centred Legislation

Parliaments play a crucial role in PCJ systems. As legislative and oversight bodies, they influence justice frameworks through inclusive law-making. They also support public accountability mechanisms and citizen engagement. Various examples attest to this. In Africa, Kenya's National Assembly Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs has a national digital submission portal for legislative feedback and conducts mobile parliamentary hearings in remote counties to promote inclusive law-making (Parliament of Kenya, 2024).

In Asia, the Philippines' House Committee on Justice emphasises community hearings and multi-agency consultations, particularly regarding detention reform, anti-torture legislation and expanded legal aid (House of Representatives of the Philippines, n.d.). Down in New Zealand, the Māori Affairs Committee specifically ensures that bicultural considerations are integrated into legal reforms (Findlay, 2024). In Europe, Finland's Parliament employs justice impact assessments when reviewing major legislative reforms to ensure that laws are evaluated for their potential effects on vulnerable populations (Lindström & Vartiainen, 2025).

In America, Brazil's National Congress has used public hearings and digital participation platforms to enable citizens to provide feedback on draft bills, participate in legislative debates and contribute to public policy consultations, thereby strengthening transparency and citizen engagement in law-making (OECD, 2022). Elsewhere in Canada, the Committee on Justice and Human Rights incorporated testimonies from indigenous peoples and survivors of violence to inform the Divorce Act and hate crime provisions (Azoulay et al., 2019).

People-Centred Bar Services

World over, the law Societies and bar associations are uniquely positioned to integrate PCJ values into legal practice. Through legal education, ethical oversight and community outreach, these organisations influence the culture and accessibility of legal services, directly impacting justice outcomes. Numerous practical initiatives attest to this.

In America, the New York State Court in the USA fosters a robust pro bono culture through formal reporting requirements and public interest partnerships with Attorneys being encouraged, and sometimes required, to complete a minimum number of pro bono hours annually (New York Court of Appeals, 2015). Further, the California State Bar maintains a public attorney rating and discipline database, providing clients with transparent information about service quality and complaint histories (State Bar Court of California, n.d.). In neighbouring Canada, the Law Society of Ontario requires licensees to complete continuing education in equity, diversity and inclusion to advance equality and address discrimination (Law Society of Ontario, n.d.). In Africa, the Law Society of Kenya has a digital rating and complaints system that enables clients to assess lawyers' performance and report misconduct, thereby increasing accountability and supporting the public (Law Society of Kenya, n.d.).

Alternative Disputes Resolution Mechanisms

Diverse alternative forms of dispute resolution (AFDR) are crucial examples of PCJ. Most of them focus on providing frontline justice services beyond formal mechanisms. Several countries have these alternatives.

In Africa, the Rwandan government has institutionalised a community-based dispute resolution model known as Abunzi, comprising local mediators or volunteers selected by their communities to resolve civil disputes, primarily involving land and property, or minor criminal offences, at the village level (Mutisi, 2012). In Zimbabwe, a plural legal system integrates traditional and formal dispute resolution mechanisms, supported by evidence-based reforms that strengthen community trust in justice systems (Maraire, 2024). In South Africa, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was a significant PCJ initiative. After apartheid ended, it emphasised truth-telling and healing rather than punitive measures (Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa, 1998). Kenya's Judiciary Social Transformation through Access to Justice Blueprint 2023–2033 provides PCJ avenues through mediation, arbitration and AJS (Koome, 2026). The AJS is one of the key innovations for Kenya's Judiciary.

In South America, Argentina introduced Justicia 2020, a participatory reform initiative aimed at modernising justice delivery through citizen engagement. The programme encompasses online citizen consultations, user experience surveys, a national mediation programme for civil disputes, and the development of digital legal

tools for self-represented litigants (OECD, 2021). A 25 per cent reduction in case duration, a 15 per cent increase in user satisfaction, and 30 per cent in cost savings, illustrate the programme's impact (OECD, 2021).

In North America, New York City's Community Courts handle low-level offences through a collaborative and participatory approach to justice. These courts integrate social services and community organisations to address the root causes of criminal behaviour (Berger, 2009).

In Europe, France has established proximity-based institutions such as the Maisons de la Justice et du Droit, which provide accessible legal information, mediation and support services at the community level (Ministère de la Justice, n.d). Additionally, Germany's Federal Ombudsman Scheme incorporated procedural justice principles, such as voice, impartiality and respect, into its alternative dispute resolution system to improve public trust (Bradford et al., 2023).

Provision of Legal Aid

Provision of legal aid is a key PCJ practise in various jurisdictions. In Europe, for instance, Belgium operationalises a structured legal aid system that serves as a primary access point for justice seekers, complemented by victim support services that provide information, referrals and procedural guidance throughout criminal proceedings (European Commission, 2025). In the neighbouring Netherlands, the *Juridisch Loket* serves as a first-line legal advice and triage service, giving assistance on mediation and subsidised legal assistance (Raad voor Rechtsbijstand, 2023).

In Africa, South Africa's Community Advice Offices provide a model that uses community-based paralegals to offer free basic legal advice, human rights information, referrals and dispute-resolution support, especially in poor and under-resourced communities (Open Government Partnership, n.d.). In Kenya, the National Legal Aid Service provides accessible legal aid to indigent and vulnerable persons through legal awareness, pro bono coordination, referrals and community outreach, including mobile legal aid clinics and public education programmes (National Legal Aid Service, n.d.). In the neighbouring Rwanda, Maisons D'Accès à La Justice Centres, present in every district, deliver integrated services such as legal aid, documentation and dispute resolution, emphasising proximity and simplicity to promote equitable access (Republic of Rwanda, 2026).

In Asia, Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust delivers legal aid through hybrid mobile clinics and paralegal networks, focusing on support for garment workers and women experiencing domestic violence (Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust, n.d). Additionally, Australia's Legal Aid Commissions provide structured guidance for engaging with trauma-affected individuals and survivors of violence (Law Council of Australia, 2018). Elsewhere in Australia, legal aid programs are increasingly adopting outreach models, particularly to meet the needs of indigenous and mentally ill individuals navigating tribunals (Curran et al, 2024).

Community/Local level Justice Services

Decentralisation of justice services improves access to justice and delivery of frontline services at the local level, which is a key PCJ imperative. In the Philippines, Alternative Law Groups train community-based paralegals to support housing, land and gender justice among marginalised groups (Golub, 2003). Further, the Philippines promotes access to justice at the local level through the Barangay Justice System, a legally recognised community-based mechanism for resolving disputes within villages before they proceed to formal courts. By providing a local forum for the amicable settlement of community disputes, the system reduces barriers associated with costs, distance, formal legal procedures, and court congestion, thereby reflecting a people-centred approach to justice delivery at the grassroots level (Supreme Court of the Philippines, 1993).

Various countries have been using mobile and decentralised courts as a PCJ imperative. For instance, Rwanda deploys mobile courts during Judicial Service Weeks (Republic of Rwanda, 2026). In the Americas, Brazil's 'Justice in the Neighbourhood' program sends judicial teams into rural areas, providing on-site resolution of civil, administrative and family disputes (Cabanellas, 2023). In the Philippines, the Justice on Wheels program uses mobile courtrooms to address jail congestion by processing pre-trial detainees and offering plea-bargain options (Carlos, Lalata & Despi, 2010).

Development partners and Civil society organisations (CSOs) have also supported legal empowerment and grassroots justice delivery worldwide. In Kenya, CSOs, notably Equality Now, Federation of Women Lawyers, International Commission of Jurists, International Justice Mission and Legal Resources Foundation, have supported diverse grassroots PCJ programmes to promote the observance of human rights for vulnerable persons (NCAJ, 2025). The EU-funded Program for Legal Empowerment and Aid Delivery (PLEAD) has also supported diverse PCJ practices across justice-sector agencies (NCAJ, 2025).

Argentina has also scaled up participatory justice by engaging communities in the development of access-to-justice centres situated in low-income urban and peri-urban areas to address localised legal needs (Maurino, 2020).

Intersectionality Practices

Justice systems recognise the intersections of factors such as gender, race, class, ability and culture that often influence access to justice. For example, Canada applies Gender-based Analysis Plus (GBA Plus) in the development and review of legislation, policies, programmes and services to assess how intersecting identity factors, including gender, race and disability, may produce different impacts across population groups (Government of Canada, 2022). In Brazil, the school-based gender education initiatives demonstrate that early intervention can foster sustained change (Government of Brazil, 2006)

Guatemala Justice Centres also co-locate judicial, prosecutorial, mediation and administrative services. Developed in contexts characterised by limited trust in formal institutions, these centres reduce transaction costs, procedural complexity and opportunities for corruption by simplifying access points for users (World Bank, 2011). In Mozambique, paralegals assist citizens in navigating the public health system, addressing rights violations and enhancing service delivery through legal advocacy (Feinglass, Gomes & Maru, 2016).

People-Centred Planning, Budgeting and Financing Practices

Justice is not only a human rights issue but also an enabling, often-overlooked infrastructure that serves as a foundation and driver of stability and economic growth (HiiL and World Bank, 2026). To drive economic growth, most governments, through their institutions, undertake strategic planning, work planning and budgeting to deliver public goods. The integration of PCJ considerations into national strategies and plans is thus crucial. According to the Justice Action Coalition (2025), the Justice Financing Framework promotes a people-centred approach by linking public expenditure to the needs of justice seekers and measurable outcomes. Further, it deviates from institution-centred financing to frontline justice services (Justice Action Coalition, 2025).

Effective strategic planning, work planning and budgeting are essential for institutionalising PCJ. The integration of PCJ considerations into national and sectoral justice strategies and plans is crucial. According to the Justice Action Coalition (2025), the justice financing framework promotes a people-centred approach by linking public expenditure to the needs of justice seekers and measurable outcomes. Further, it deviates from institution-centred financing models to frontline justice services (Justice Action Coalition, 2025). Hence, participatory budget consultations help to shape local justice needs.

In America, Chile has employed performance-based budgeting, linking justice-sector allocations to case resolution time and user satisfaction (Marcel, 2009). Similarly, access-to-justice metrics have shaped Argentina's national budget framework, with annual tracking of legal guidance centres and community mediation programs (Maurino, 2020). Additionally, the self-representation project in Canada provides individuals with the procedural knowledge to navigate the legal system independently at minimal cost (Leitch & Cornwall, 2024).

People-Centred Administrative Justice Practices

Administrative justice practices enhance PCJ principles of accessibility and accountability. In Europe, the UK has implemented plain-language principles through the Administrative Justice Council, benefiting self-represented litigants (McKeever et al., 2022). In Kenya, the Commission for Administrative Justice advances PCJ by providing citizens with channels to challenge delayed services, missing files, unfair treatment, abuse of office and maladministration by public institutions. In the Philippines, the Office of the Ombudsman addresses citizen complaints and provides civic education on public accountability (Brinkerhoff et al, 2002).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

This study has examined the application of PCJ practices worldwide. The findings demonstrate that PCJ is a progressive approach that enhances justice seekers' participation, fostering responsive and inclusive justice systems. In contrast to institution-focused models, PCJ prioritises the experiences, needs and rights of individuals. It seeks to eliminate barriers and reduce inequalities, particularly for the vulnerable and underserved populations.

There are many notable PCJ practices worldwide. Notably, there is a focus on hybrid systems that integrate informal systems with formal systems. Although there are contextual variations in the implementation of PCJ across jurisdictions, most practical applications focus on promoting the participation of justice seekers' as a common convergence or emphasis.

Upstream of the justice system, people-centred policing emphasises a deepened commitment to rights standards in policing. Evidence of diversion initiatives during prosecution appears midstream. In courts, community-based participation and restorative justice outcomes are prominent. There are also practices addressing the unique needs of the vulnerable children, witnesses and survivors of GBV.

Downstream in correctional services, there is an increasing involvement of prisoners in programming to improve rehabilitative and post-release outcomes. In legislation, parliaments are increasingly involving justice seekers for feedback. The bar associations also have notable initiatives, especially the on-pro bono legal clinics. There is also evidence of justice system moving towards people-centred budgeting and financing.

Despite the existence of diverse practical practices, non-standardised indicators applicable to different contexts hamper the overall measurement and reporting of PCJ outcomes. There is inadequate use of data and regular assessment of the impact of PCJ. Further, there is an analytical and underreporting of how overlapping identities such as gender, race, disability, age and geography interact to influence justice needs. Although digital tools have also been employed to facilitate PCJ, there is insufficient examination of data privacy risks and digital exclusion, particularly among marginalised and underserved populations. Additionally, there is insufficient synthesis of the performance of PCJ innovations across diverse local contexts, and of their contributions to the broader development agenda.

Recommendations and Implications to Policy and Practice

Scaling of PCJ requires refinement of practices to specific socio-cultural contexts. This should be coupled with sustained institutional investment, programme expansion and commitment to the timely delivery of justice for all. For instance, there is a need to intersect PCJ with health, education, environmental safeguards and other social needs to generate more inclusive benefits.

Strengthening PCJ implementation requires improving participatory approaches, broadening alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, and transitioning from adversarial to restorative models that better reflect the needs and lived experiences of justice seekers. Therefore, a hybrid justice system that effectively addresses the needs of justice seekers is recommended.

Establishing specialised desks and help centres, guided by explicit PCJ guidelines, would ensure that frontline justice services remain responsive and accessible. To enhance responsiveness, accessibility, inclusivity and sustainability of justice services, and to align resource allocation with justice needs, PCJ practices should be integrated into the national public finance and planning systems. Furthermore, capacity-building for both justice seekers and providers is vital. Embedding PCJ values into training, certification and incentive structures would promote a more empathetic and accountable workforce.

Further research on digital exclusion, particularly among marginalised and underserved populations, is necessary. Studies could also examine the performance of PCJ innovations across diverse local contexts and their contributions to the national development agenda.

By continuously bridging practice gaps, PCJ will remain inclusive and responsive to the needs of justice seekers. Once this is pursued and challenges addressed, PCJ will be strengthened as a novel approach for fostering inclusive and effective justice systems.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., Garland, J., Harman, V., McCarthy, D., Power, E., & Brown, T. (2025). *New approaches to women-centred food policy and practice in prison: A toolkit for women's prisons*. Economic and Social Research Council.
- Amaral, S., Borker, G., Fiala, N., Kumar, A., Prakash, N., & Sviatschi, M. M. (2023). *Sexual harassment in public spaces and police patrols: Experimental evidence from urban India (NBER Working Paper No. 31734)*. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Azoulay, K., Smith, A., & Sweeney, N. (2019). *Bill C-78: An Act to amend the Divorce Act, the Family Orders and Agreements Enforcement Assistance Act, and the Garnishment, Attachment and Pension Diversion Act, and to make consequential amendments to another Act*. Library of Parliament/Bibliothèque du Parlement.
- Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust. (n.d.). *Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST)*.
- Batubara, F. T., Manullang, H., & Esther, J. (2025). The role of correctional institutions in empowering prisoners for the character of prisoners. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Justice*.
- Bergallo, P., & Polga-Hecimovich, J. (2022). Measuring justice: Argentina's experience with judicial transparency and performance dashboards. In P. Contini & A. Uzelac (Eds.), *Judicial governance and performance in Latin America* (pp. 113–131). Springer.
- Berger, R. J. (2009). *Crime, justice, and society: An introduction to criminology (3rd ed.)*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Boateng, J. K., & Darkwa, E. (2021). Unpacking the dilemma of alternative dispute resolution and access to justice for women in the Ghanaian context. In J. F. Ofori-Dankwa (Ed.), *Advancing civil justice reform and conflict resolution in Africa*. IGI Global.
- Bradford, B., Creutzfeldt, N., & Steffek, F. (2023). Thinking holistically about procedural justice in alternative dispute resolution: A case study of the German Federal Ombudsman Scheme. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 48(3), 748–779.
- Braga, A. A., Hureau, D. M., & Papachristos, A. V. (2014). Deterring gang-involved gun violence: Measuring the impact of Boston’s Operation Ceasefire on street gang behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 30(1), 113–139.
- Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice and responsive regulation*. Oxford University Press.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Goldsmith, A. A. (2002). *Clientelism, patrimonialism, and democratic governance: An overview and framework for assessment and programming*. U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of Democracy and Governance.
- Cabanellas, C. A. (2023). Restorative justice in Brazil: Experiences, challenges, and opportunities in judicial innovation. In P. van Ness (Ed.), *Restorative justice around the world* (pp. 115–134). Springer.
- Carlos, C. R., Lalata, D. M., & Despi, D. C. (2010). *Democratic deficits in the Philippines: What is to be done?* Konrad Adenauer Foundation.
- Cavadino, M., & Dignan, J. (2007). *Penal systems: A comparative approach (2nd ed.)*. Sage Publications.
- Chapman, P., Alabab-Moser, J., Frerichs, E., González, K., Hulseman, K. G., Jandl, M., de Langen, M., Long, S. C., & Ponce, A. (2021). *Grasping the justice gap: Opportunities and challenges for people-centred justice data*. World Justice Project, Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies, & OECD.
- Child Rights International Network. (n.d.). *Access to justice: Country reports*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://home.crin.org/issues/access-to-justice/country-reports>
- Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women. (2015). *General recommendation No. 33 on women’s access to justice (CEDAW/C/GC/33)*. <https://undocs.org/CEDAW/C/GC/33>
- Correa, S. (2012). Family law and policy in Chile. *International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family*, 26(1), 55–70.
- Council of Europe. (2010). *Guidelines of the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on child-friendly justice*. Council of Europe Publishing.
- Council of the Baltic Sea States. (2017). *Barnahus: A multidisciplinary and interagency model for child-friendly justice*. CBSS Expert Group for Children at Risk.
- Curran, L., Ching, J., & Jarman, J. (2024). *Regulatory leadership on access to justice: Report to the Legal Services Consumer Panel on unmet legal need—Barriers and creative solutions to access to justice*. Nottingham Law School, Nottingham Trent University.
- Daems, T., & Robert, L. (Eds.). (2017). *Europe in prisons: Assessing the impact of European institutions on national prison systems*. Springer.
- Denney, L., & Domingo, P. (2023). *Taking people-centred justice to scale: The role of customary and informal justice in advancing people-centred justice*. ODI.
- Diphoom, T., & van Stapele, N. (2020). What is community policing? Divergent agendas, practices, and experiences of transforming the police in Kenya. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 15(1), 399–411.
- Edgar, K. (2018). *Ensuring a safe environment: A conflict-centred strategy*. Prison Reform Trust.
- Elphick, C., Philpot, R., Zhang, M., Stuart, A., Walkington, Z., Frumkin, L. A., et al. (2021). Building trust in digital policing: A scoping review of community policing apps. *Police Practice and Research*, 22(5), 1469–1491. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2020.1861449>
- European Commission. (2025, February 17). *Legal aid: Belgium*. European e-Justice Portal.
- Ezema, J., Medina Díaz, F. J., Munduate Jaca, M. L., & Euwema, M. (2023). Pray for improvement: Experiences with mediation of female victims of intimate partner violence in Nigeria. *Pastoral Psychology*, 72, 625–646.
- Family Justice Courts Singapore. (2022). *Annual report 2022*.

- Feinglass, E., Gomes, N., & Maru, V. (2016). Transforming policy into justice: The role of health advocates in Mozambique. *Health and Human Rights Journal*, 18(2), 233–246.
- Findlay, E. (2024). *Ngā Kōti Rangatahi (Marae Youth Courts): Impact on Māori youth offending* [Doctoral thesis, Massey University]. Massey Research Online.
- Finnis, J. (2011). *Natural law and natural rights* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Golub, S. (2003). *Non-state justice systems in Bangladesh and the Philippines*. United Kingdom Department for International Development.
- Government of Bangladesh. (2013). *The Women and Children Repression Prevention Act*. Ministry of Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs.
- Government of Brazil. (2006). *Lei No. 11.340, de 7 de Agosto de 2006 (Lei Maria da Penha)*. Diário Oficial da União.
- Government of Canada. (2022). *Gender-based analysis plus*. <https://www.canada.ca/en/departement-national-defence/corporate/reports-publications/departemental-plans/departemental-plan-2022-23/supplementary-information/gba-plus.html>
- Government of Ethiopia. (2017). *National strategy and action plan on harmful traditional practices against women and children*. Ministry of Women and Children Affairs.
- Government of Pakistan. (2016). *Prevention of Electronic Crimes Act, 2016*.
- Hadsel, L. (2025). *Elevating policing practices through mental health literacy: An analysis of law enforcement training curricula* [Doctoral dissertation, Johns Hopkins University]. JScholarship.
- Hannah-Moffat, K., & Shaw, M. (2000). *An ideal prison? Critical essays on women's imprisonment in Canada*. Fernwood Publishing.
- Harris, M. (2006). *A sentencing conversation: Evaluation of the Koori Courts Pilot Program, October 2002–October 2004*. Department of Justice.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1961). *The concept of law*. Oxford University Press.
- Hausam, J., Lehmann, A. I., & Dahle, K. P. (2020). A person-centered approach to prison behavior based on officers' observations: Relations to risk, prison misconduct, and recidivism. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, Article 241.
- HiiL. (2021). *Delivering people-centred justice rigorously* [Policy brief].
- HiiL & World Bank. (2026). *Justice is not only a human-rights issue: It is economic and stability infrastructure* [Webinar].
- House of Representatives of the Philippines. (n.d.). *Committee on Justice*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://www.congress.gov.ph/committees/view/>
- Irvita, M., & Asriani, A. (2025). Transparency and accountability in the justice system: Building public trust and justice. *Priviet Social Sciences Journal*, 5(4), 26–40.
- Johnson, B. R. (2002). Religious programs and recidivism among former inmates in Prison Fellowship programs: A long-term follow-up study. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(2), 329–354.
- Judiciary of Kenya. (2023). *A blueprint for social transformation through access to justice, 2023–2033: A PCJ approach*.
- Justice Action Coalition. (2025). *Justice financing framework: A guide to budgeting and financing for people-centred justice for the justice sector*. <https://www.sdg16.plus/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2025/11/Justice-Financing-Framework-Full-Report-2025.pdf>
- Justice Law and Order Sector. (2022). *Annual sector performance report 2021/2022*. Government of Uganda.
- Kant, I. (2012). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor & J. Timmermann, Eds. & Trans.; 2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Kensit, T. (2024). *Prevention, intervention and healing: Addressing adolescent relationship abuse*. The Churchill Fellowship.
- Kirby, A., Mercer, T., & Wilson, D. (2020). Justice rationale for a person-centred approach to screening for neurodiversity in prison. *Advances in Autism*, 6(2), 139–150.
- Koome, M. K. (2026). A multi-door exploration of dispute resolution in Kenya. In *Unlocking justice*. The African Research Consortium, Ssali Publishing House, & Unisa Press.

- Lappi-Seppälä, T., & Kivivuori, J. (2020). Restorative justice in Finland: Tradition, legislation, and implementation. In R. Johansen & I. Aertsen (Eds.), *Restorative justice in Europe: Safeguarding rights and integrity in the process* (pp. 65–86). Routledge.
- Law Council of Australia. (2018). *The Justice Project: Final report*.
- Law Society of Kenya. (n.d.). *Advocates' Complaints Commission*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://lsk.or.ke/public-resources/advocates-complaints-commission/>
- Law Society of Ontario. (n.d.). *Continuing professional development requirement*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://lso.ca/lawyers/enhancing-competence/continuing-professional-development-requirement>
- Lay, W., Ariel, B., & Harinam, V. (2023). Recalibrating the police to focus on victims using police records. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paac053>
- Leitch, A., & Cornwall, M. (2024). A school for self-represented litigants: A people-centred approach to access to justice in family law. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit et Société*, 39(3), 559–579.
- Lindström, E., & Vartiainen, N. (2025). Lessons to be learned from impact assessments in times of crisis: A qualitative analysis of Finnish law drafting during COVID-19. *Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis*, 16(2–3), 207–232.
- Mahlangu, G., & Zivanai, E. (2023). Offender eLearning: A systematic literature review on re-entry, recidivism, and life after prison. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(2), Article 2246706.
- Maraire, W. (2024). Systemic barriers and unfairness: Access to justice in Zimbabwe and beyond. *Revista Direito GV*, 20, e2433.
- Marcel, M. (2009). Budgeting for results in Chile: Institutional innovations and performance information systems. *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 9(2), 1–30.
- Maurino, G. (2020). *Putting people at the center: A case study on access to justice centers in Argentina*. Center on International Cooperation.
- Maxwell, G., & Morris, A. (2001). *Family group conferences and restorative justice: A report to the New Zealand Ministry of Justice*. New Zealand Ministry of Justice.
- McCold, P. (2008). Protocols for evaluating restorative justice programmes. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 6(2), 9–28.
- McKeever, G., & Royal-Dawson, L. (2022). Using human-centred design to break down barriers to legal participation. In *Design in legal education* (pp. 135–150). Routledge.
- Ministère de la Justice. (n.d.). *Maisons de la justice et du droit*. Government of France.
- Ministry of Justice of Spain. (2023). *Crime victims' support offices*.
- Modise, J. M. (2023). Community policing strategies include community patrols, neighborhood watch and community policing. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 8(7).
- Mutisi, M. (2012). Local conflict resolution in Rwanda: The case of Abunzi mediators. In S. Bronkhorst (Ed.), *Integrating traditional and modern conflict resolution: Experiences from selected cases*. ACCORD.
- National Council on the Administration of Justice. (2022). *National strategy on justice for children, 2023–2028*.
- National Council on the Administration of Justice. (2025). *Administration of justice in Kenya annual report 2024–2025*.
- National Legal Aid Service. (n.d.). *Who we are*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://www.nlas.go.ke/who-we-are>
- New York Court of Appeals. (2015). *22 NYCRR § 520.16: Pro bono requirement for bar admission*. New York Codes, Rules and Regulations.
- New Zealand Ministry of Justice. (n.d.). *Family violence and sexual violence work programme: Archived updates*. <https://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/key-initiatives/addressing-family-violence-and-sexual-violence/work-programme/family-violence-and-sexual-violence-work-programme-archived-updates/>
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Harvard University Press.
- OECD. (2021). *OECD framework and good practice principles for people-centred justice*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2022). *Open government review of Brazil: Towards an integrated open government agenda*. OECD Publishing.

- OECD. (2023). *Delivering people-centred justice: A framework for action*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD. (2025). *Toolkit for access to justice and people-centred justice systems*. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/aecf7f78-en>
- Open Government Partnership. (n.d.). *Institutionalisation of community advice offices as part of the wider justice network*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://www.opengovpartnership.org/members/south-africa/commitments/ZA0020/>
- Owusu-Bempah, A., Fitzgerald, R., & Gomez, M. (2024). *Police governance and human rights: A policy review for the Peel Police Service Board*. Peel Police Service Board.
- Parliament of Kenya. (2024). *Have your say: Constitution of Kenya (Amendment) Bill 2024—Public participation invitation*.
- Pathfinders for Peaceful, Just and Inclusive Societies. (2019). *Justice for all: Final report of the Task Force on Justice*. Center on International Cooperation.
- Qazi, R. (2024). *Survivor-centred and trauma-informed approaches to policies and tools in the international development sector* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa].
- Raad voor Rechtsbijstand. (2023). *Stand van de uitvoering 2023*. <https://www.raadvoorrechtsbijstand.org/>
- Republic of Rwanda. (n.d.). *Access to Justice Bureau (MAJ)*.
- Rogers, K. (2020). *Honouring the stories of student-survivors: Trauma-informed practice in post-secondary sexualized violence policy review* [Doctoral dissertation].
- Sakhokia, A. (2024). *Towards smart governance: Assessing government maturity, challenges, and opportunities in Georgia*. Georgian Institute of Politics.
- Sarkar, S. D., & Bhattacharjee, S. (2023). A study on resolving disputes in trial courts through online dispute resolution in India. *Revista Brasileira de Alternative Dispute Resolution*, 5(1), 22–34.
- Shapland, J., Buchan, J., Kirkwood, S., & Zinsstag, E. (2024). Creating a people-centred view of risk and restorative justice. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 24(5), 1047–1068.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958241269018>
- Simon, B. (2023). *Judicial dysfunction in Indonesia*. Melbourne University Publishing.
- State Bar Court of California. (n.d.). *Public records and information*. Retrieved June 3, 2026, from <https://www.statebarcourt.ca.gov/public-records-information>
- Supreme Court of the Philippines. (1993). *Administrative Circular No. 14-93: Guidelines on the Katarungang Pambarangay conciliation procedure*. Lawphil Project.
- Toews, B., Wagenfeld, A., & Stevens, J. (2018). Impact of a nature-based intervention on incarcerated women. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 14(4), 232–243.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa. (1998). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa report*.
- Tyler, T. R. (2017). Procedural justice and policing: A rush to judgment? *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 13, 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110316-113318>
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *The global programme for strengthening the rule of law, human rights, justice, and security for sustainable peace and development: Phase IV (2022–2025)*.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2023). *Women’s safety audit report 2022: UNDP Nepal*.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2025). *The UNDP people-centred approach to justice and security*. <https://www.undp.org/publications/undp-people-centred-approach-justice-and-security>
- United Nations General Assembly. (2015). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) (A/RES/70/175)*. <https://undocs.org/A/RES/70/175>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2013). *Justice in matters involving children in conflict with the law: Model law on juvenile justice and related commentary*. United Nations.
- Valchuk, N. (2024). *Potential and challenges of online dispute resolution for courts*. Vilnius University Institutional Repository.

- Victoria Police. (2015). *Policing with empathy: Integrating trauma-informed care into practice*. Government of Victoria. <https://www.police.vic.gov.au/sites/default/files/2019-03/Policing-Harm-Upholding-The-Right.pdf>
- World Bank. (2011). *Guatemala Judicial Reform Project*.
- World Justice Project. (2023). *What is people-centered justice?* <https://worldjusticeproject.org/>
- Zehr, H. (2015). *The little book of restorative justice* (Rev. & updated ed.). Good Books.