

FINANCING THE JUSTICE SECTOR IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

GONCEARENCO Ludmila

ORCID: 0009-0008-6976-8671

Ph.D. Student, Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova, www.ase.md, Republic of Moldova
e-mail: ludmilagoncearenco@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. *The justice sector in developing countries faces numerous challenges, including a lack of funding, corruption, inadequate infrastructure, and a shortage of skilled personnel. Despite these challenges, there are also growth opportunities, like utilizing technology for better efficiency and transparency. The paper examines the successful financing mechanisms implemented in the justice sector globally. Public-Private Partnerships have proven effective in Latin America, while performance-based financing has worked well in Africa, linking financing to specific results to enhance sector performance. Asia has successfully used social impact bonds to improve financing and access to justice. Crowdfunding is a popular method for financing justice in Europe, providing a new source of funding for legal aid organizations to help increase access to justice for vulnerable communities. It is essential to continue exploring innovative financing strategies to protect the public interest and sector integrity through clear goals, criteria, and ongoing monitoring and evaluation. The paper offers valuable insights into financing options for enhancing the justice sector in developing countries and ensuring citizens' access to adequate and accessible legal services.*

KEYWORDS: *justice sector development, financing strategies, innovative financing mechanisms*

JEL CLASSIFICATION: *O33, I22*

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of financing and development strategies in the justice sector of developing countries has been the subject of numerous scientific studies in recent years (Doss et al., 2012; Doss et al., 2013; Stone et al., 2005). The challenges faced by the justice sector, including insufficient funding, corruption, inadequate infrastructure, and a lack of trained personnel, have long been a concern and have hindered the sector's ability to provide accessible and effective legal services to citizens (Beck & Levine, 2005; Mintz, 2005). However, with a growing recognition of the importance of financing and development strategies in the justice sector, new mechanisms have been developed to address these challenges (Anderson & Gray, 2007). As a result, the sector has undergone a significant transformation, and various financing and development strategies have been implemented effectively in different regions worldwide.

This paper aims to examine the evolution of financing and development strategies in the justice sector of developing countries and provide valuable insights into the different mechanisms that have been successfully used to improve the sector. The paper will explore the experiences of different regions and provide a comprehensive understanding of the opportunities and challenges facing the justice sector. By highlighting the need for continued investment and support, this paper seeks to contribute to the ongoing effort to ensure that the justice sector in developing countries can provide effective and accessible services to citizens.

OVERVIEW OF THE JUSTICE SECTOR IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The justice sector in developing countries faces many challenges that can impact its ability to provide effective and accessible services to citizens. Here are a few key challenges that are often faced by the justice sector in developing countries:

- *Insufficient funding:* One of the biggest challenges facing the justice sector in developing countries is insufficient funding, which can lead to under-resourced courts,

prosecutors, and police, among other entities (Daniels & Trebilcock, 2004; Farrell & Clark, 2004; Webber, 2007).

- *Corruption*: Corruption within the justice sector can undermine public trust and prevent individuals from seeking justice when they need it (Daniels & Trebilcock, 2004; Tolbert & Solomon, 2006).

- *Inadequate infrastructure*: Many developing countries need more infrastructure to support a functioning justice sector, including courts, police stations, and prisons (Daniels & Trebilcock, 2004; Tolbert & Solomon, 2006).

- *Lack of trained personnel*: Another common challenge facing the justice sector in developing countries is the need for more trained personnel, including judges, prosecutors, and police officers, which can lead to inefficiencies and delays in the administration of justice (Daniels & Trebilcock, 2004; Tolbert & Solomon, 2006).

Despite these challenges, there are also opportunities for improvement and growth within the justice sector in developing countries. For example, many developing countries are exploring the use of technology to improve the efficiency and transparency of the justice sector, such as using digital tools to track cases and increase public access to legal information (Donoghue, 2017; Sushina & Sobenin, 2020).

For example, Romania has made significant efforts to improve its justice sector in recent years, particularly in the area of corruption (Lacatus & Sedelmeier, 2020; Toma, 2015). The country has established anti-corruption agencies and implemented reforms to increase transparency and accountability within the justice sector (Matiuta, 2019; Zerilli, 2013).

TYPES OF FINANCING FOR THE JUSTICE SECTOR

The financing of entities within the justice sector in developing countries can come from a variety of sources, including both domestic and international sources. Here are a few of the most common types of financing available for entities in the justice sector:

- *Grants*: Grants are a form of financing that can be done without repaying and can come from international organizations, governments, or philanthropic organizations (Gramlich, 1997). For example, the (European Commission, 2023) European Commission provides grants to support projects in the justice sector in developing countries, including projects to improve access to justice and combat corruption.

- *Loans*: Loans are a form of financing that must be repaid and can come from international financial institutions, such as the World Bank or national governments (Bulow & Rogoff, 2005). For example, the World Bank provides loans to support justice sector reforms in developing countries, including projects to strengthen the rule of law and increase access to justice (Shihata, 2021; World Bank, 2020).

- *Public-Private Partnerships*: Public-private partnerships (PPP) are a form of financing in which the public and private sectors collaborate to finance and deliver a project or service (Satish & Shah, 2009). For example, a government may partner with a private sector company to build and operate a new court building or with a non-government organization to provide legal services to underserved communities (Kang et al., 2019; Ma et al., 2022).

These are just a few of the most common types of financing available for entities in the justice sector in developing countries. The specific types of financing used will depend on the needs and goals of the entity, as well as the availability of funding from various sources.

ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT FINANCING MECHANISMS

The financing mechanisms in place for the justice sector in developing countries can vary greatly (Ketkar & Ratha, 2008). Their effectiveness can depend on several factors, including the availability of funding, the financing mechanism's structure, and the entities' goals and priorities (Drunen, 2009).

When assessing the current financing mechanisms in place for the justice sector in developing countries, it is essential to consider their effectiveness and limitations (Drunen, 2009). Here are a few factors that can impact the effectiveness of financing mechanisms (Hammergren, 2014; Nash, 2013; Viapiana, 2019):

- *Adequacy of funding*: The adequacy of funding is a critical factor in the effectiveness of financing mechanisms, as insufficient funding can limit the ability of entities within the justice sector to carry out their work.

- *Transparency and accountability*: Transparency and accountability in financing can increase public trust in the justice sector and improve the overall effectiveness of financing mechanisms.

- *Alignment with sector goals and priorities*: The effectiveness of financing mechanisms can also depend on their alignment with the goals and priorities of the justice sector, including access to justice and combating corruption.

Despite these factors, there are also limitations to current financing mechanisms for the justice sector in developing countries, including (Hammergren, 2014; Nash, 2013; Viapiana, 2019):

- *Inadequate coordination*: There can be a need for coordination between financing mechanisms and the entities within the justice sector, which can lead to inefficiencies and duplicated efforts.

- *Dependence on external funding*: Many developing countries are heavily dependent on external funding, limiting their ability to sustain long-term financing mechanisms and making them vulnerable to changes in external funding patterns.

- *Limited access to finance*: Many entities within the justice sector in developing countries need help accessing financing, including limited access to credit and a lack of investment in the sector.

For example, in Europe, the financing mechanisms for the justice sector in some Central and Eastern European countries have been criticized for being insufficient and lacking transparency (Flander & Ručman, 2014). Despite some improvements in recent years, there is still room for improvement in the financing mechanisms in place for the justice sector in these countries.

INNOVATIVE FINANCING STRATEGIES

In recent years, there has been growing interest in innovative financing strategies to increase financing for the justice sector in developing countries (Viapiana, 2019; Webber, 2007). These strategies can overcome traditional financing mechanisms' limitations and provide new funding and support opportunities.

Here are a few examples of innovative financing strategies that could be implemented to increase financing for the justice sector in developing countries:

- *Social Impact Bonds (SIBs)*: Social impact bonds are a form of financing in which private investors provide funding for a project or program, with the government repaying the investors based on the achievement of agreed-upon outcomes (Annarita et al., 2015). This can be an effective way to increase financing for the justice sector, as it provides a way for private investors to support initiatives to improve access to justice and combat corruption (Fraser et al., 2018; Warner, 2013).

- *Performance-based financing*: Performance-based financing is a form of financing in which entities within the justice sector receive funding based on their performance, as measured by agreed-upon indicators (Fritsche et al., 2014). This can be an effective way to increase accountability and improve the overall effectiveness of financing mechanisms for the justice sector (Contini & Mohr, 2007).

- *Crowdfunding*: Crowdfunding is a form of financing in which individuals and organizations can collectively contribute small amounts of money to support a project or initiative (Hong & Ryu, 2019). This can effectively increase financing for the justice sector, especially for initiatives aimed at serving underserved communities or promoting access to justice (Sancak, 2016; Tomlinson, 2018).

For example, some European countries have started experimenting with social impact bonds to increase financing for initiatives to reduce reoffending rates among prisoners (Mulgan et

al., 2011). In addition, performance-based financing has been used to support legal aid programs in some European countries, with funding based on the number of clients served and the outcomes achieved (Manuel & Manuel, 2018).

Innovative financing strategies, such as social impact bonds, performance-based financing, and crowdfunding, can provide new opportunities for financing and support for the justice sector in developing countries. These strategies help to overcome some of the limitations of traditional financing mechanisms and provide new avenues for financing and support.

ROLE OF TECHNOLOGY IN FINANCING AND DEVELOPMENT

Technology has the potential to play a significant role in financing and development of the justice sector in developing countries, particularly by increasing transparency, accountability, and efficiency (Saurombe, 2014). Here are a few ways in which technology can contribute to this goal:

- *Digital tools for transparency and accountability:* Digital tools, such as blockchain and e-payment systems, can help to increase transparency and accountability in the justice sector by creating secure and transparent record-keeping systems (Donoghue, 2017; Sushina & Sobenin, 2020). For example, in Europe, some countries are exploring blockchain technology to create secure and transparent land registry systems, which can help prevent corruption and improve access to justice (Belchior et al., 2019; Haridas et al., 2022; Verma et al., 2021).

- *Use of mobile technology:* Mobile technology, such as smartphones and tablets, can provide access to legal information and services, increasing the efficiency of the justice sector (Brescia et al., 2014). For example, in Europe, several legal aid organizations have developed mobile apps that provide access to legal information and services for underserved communities (Cabral et al., 2012).

- *E-Justice portals:* E-justice portals can provide access to legal information, services, and dispute resolution mechanisms (Lupo & Bailey, 2014). This can help to improve access to justice and reduce the time and costs associated with legal processes (Ontanu, 2019). For example, in Europe, many e-justice portals provide access to information and services related to civil and criminal matters, as well as alternative dispute-resolution mechanisms (Velicogna, 2017).

- *Big data analytics:* Big data analytics can be used to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the justice sector by providing insights into critical issues and trends (Završnik, 2021). For example, in Europe, some countries are using big data analytics to analyze court data and identify patterns and trends that can help improve the justice system's efficiency and effectiveness (Simmons, 2016, 2017).

Technology has the potential to play a significant role in financing and development of the justice sector in developing countries. By increasing transparency, accountability, and efficiency, technology can improve access to justice and reduce the time and costs associated with legal processes. Additionally, technology can provide new opportunities for financing and support for the justice sector, such as using digital tools to increase transparency and accountability and developing innovative financing mechanisms, such as e-justice portals (Donoghue, 2017; Sushina & Sobenin, 2020).

A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE ON BEST PRACTICES AND SUCCESS STORIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

There are many best practices and successful case studies of financing and development strategies for entities related to the justice sector in developing countries.

Public-Private Partnerships have proven to be an effective model for financing and improving the delivery of justice services in many countries in Latin America (Berrone et al., 2018). These partnerships bring together public, private, and civil society organizations to work together toward common goals in the justice sector .

One example of a successful PPP in the justice sector in Latin America is the partnership established in Mexico to improve access to justice for marginalized communities (ESCAP & ECLAC, 2021; Fuentes et al., 2021). This partnership involved the government, private sector companies, and civil society organizations working together to provide legal aid services, improve the infrastructure of the justice system, and raise awareness about legal rights and obligations. In

addition, the partnership leveraged the resources and expertise of each partner to achieve its goals. For instance, the government provided funding and policy support. At the same time, private sector companies contributed technical expertise and financial resources, and civil society organizations brought a strong focus on community engagement and outreach.

The benefits of PPPs in the justice sector in Latin America are many. PPPs can bring much-needed financing to the sector and leverage the resources and expertise of private-sector companies to improve the delivery of justice services. They can also promote greater collaboration and coordination among justice sector entities and help to address challenges such as access to justice, corruption, and human rights abuses.

However, it is vital to ensure that PPPs are structured to protect the public interest and ensure that the justice sector remains accountable and transparent. This may involve setting clear goals and objectives for the partnership, establishing clear roles and responsibilities for each partner, and monitoring and evaluating the impact of the partnership over time.

Performance-based financing (PBF) is a financing mechanism that has been used effectively in a number of African countries to increase financing and improve the performance of the justice sector. The principle behind PBF is that financing is tied to the achievement of specific results, such as the delivery of justice services, and that funding is disbursed based on the performance of the recipient organizations.

One example of the successful use of performance-based financing in the justice sector in Africa is in Rwanda, where a PBF program was established to improve access to justice and reduce corruption (Rusa et al., 2009). The program provided financing to legal aid organizations based on their performance in providing legal services to marginalized communities, including women and children (UNDP, 2018). The PBF program incentivized legal aid organizations to improve their performance by providing more and better legal services, as well as by reducing corruption and promoting transparency and accountability in the justice sector.

The benefits of PBF in the justice sector in Africa are numerous. PBF can help to increase financing for the justice sector by leveraging private sector financing and other forms of investment. It can also improve the performance of justice sector entities by incentivizing them to deliver high-quality services, reduce corruption, and promote transparency and accountability.

However, it is important to ensure that PBF is implemented in a way that serves the public interest and does not compromise the integrity of the justice sector. This may involve setting clear and measurable performance targets, establishing clear criteria for the disbursement of funds, and monitoring and evaluating the impact of the PBF program over time.

Social impact bonds are a financing mechanism that have been used effectively in a number of countries in Asia to increase financing for the justice sector and improve access to justice (Moldogaziev et al., 2022). A social impact bond is a type of financing tool that enables private sector investors to finance social programs and receive a return on their investment if certain predetermined outcomes are achieved (Mishra & Dash, 2022).

One example of the successful use of social impact bonds in the justice sector in Asia is in India, where a SIB was established to provide legal aid services to marginalized communities, including women and children (Nazim, 2023; Soman, 2022). The bond provided financing to legal aid organizations based on their performance in providing legal services, with the government repaying the investors based on the success of the program. This financing mechanism allowed the government to leverage private sector financing and investment to improve access to justice and support legal aid organizations in their efforts to serve marginalized communities.

The benefits of social impact bonds in the justice sector in Asia are many. SIBs can help to increase financing for the justice sector and support legal aid organizations in their efforts to improve access to justice. They can also provide a new source of financing for social programs and incentivize organizations to focus on achieving specific outcomes and delivering high-quality services.

However, it is important to ensure that SIBs are implemented in a way that serves the public interest and does not compromise the integrity of the justice sector. This may involve setting clear

and measurable outcomes, establishing clear criteria for the disbursement of funds, and monitoring and evaluating the impact of the SIB over time.

Crowdfunding has become a popular and effective method for financing various initiatives, including those related to the justice sector, in a number of European countries (Gomez, 2015). Crowdfunding involves the collective effort of individuals who pool their money, often via the internet, to support a cause or project (Röthler & Wenzlaff, 2011).

In Europe, crowdfunding has been used to increase financing for the justice sector and improve access to justice for vulnerable communities. For example, in the United Kingdom, a number of crowdfunding campaigns have been launched to provide legal aid to refugees and asylum seekers (Guy, 2021). These campaigns have been successful in raising significant funds and providing access to justice to communities that may otherwise have been underserved.

The benefits of crowdfunding in the justice sector in Europe are many (Perry, 2018). Crowdfunding can provide a new source of financing for legal aid organizations and support their efforts to improve access to justice for vulnerable communities (Higgins, 2018). It can also help to engage the public in supporting the justice sector and raise awareness about the challenges faced by marginalized communities.

However, it is important to consider some of the limitations and risks of crowdfunding in the justice sector. Crowdfunding can be subject to fluctuations in demand, and it may be difficult to predict the success of a particular campaign (Gomez, 2015). It is also important to ensure that crowdfunding campaigns are transparent and that the funds raised are used in a responsible and accountable manner.

CONCLUSION

The justice sector in developing countries is faced with numerous challenges, including underfunding, corruption, poor infrastructure, and a shortage of trained personnel. Despite these hurdles, there are ample opportunities for growth and improvement, particularly through the integration of technology to enhance transparency and efficiency. Financing for the justice sector can come from a range of sources, including grants, loans, and public-private partnerships, and it is crucial to evaluate their effectiveness and limitations to identify areas for improvement. Innovative financing strategies such as social impact bonds can offer new funding opportunities and overcome the limitations of traditional financing methods. To ensure that the justice sector in developing countries can provide effective and accessible services to citizens, it is vital to continuously seek out innovative financing strategies and improve existing financing mechanisms.

Different financing and development strategies have been successfully implemented in various regions worldwide. Public-Private Partnerships have proven effective in Latin America as they bring together public, private, and civil society organizations to work towards common justice sector goals. Performance-based financing has been utilized with success in Africa, linking financing to specific results, thereby improving the justice sector's performance. Social impact bonds have been effectively employed in Asia to increase financing and improve access to justice. In Europe, crowdfunding has become a popular way to finance justice initiatives, providing new financing for legal aid organizations and supporting their efforts to enhance access to justice for vulnerable communities.

However, it is crucial to ensure that these financing mechanisms serve the public interest and maintain the integrity of the justice sector. This can be achieved by setting clear goals, establishing clear criteria, and regularly monitoring and evaluating their impact over time.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, J. H., & Gray, C. W. (2007). Transforming judicial systems in Europe and Central Asia. *ABCDE*, 329.
2. Annarita, T., Caré, R., Raffaella, S., & Migliazza, M. C. (2015). Mobilizing private finance for public good: Challenges and opportunities of social impact bonds. *European Scientific Journal*, 1(1), 259-279.
3. Beck, T., & Levine, R. (2005). *Legal institutions and financial development*. Springer.

4. Belchior, R., Correia, M., & Vasconcelos, A. (2019). Justicechain: Using blockchain to protect justice logs. On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: OTM 2019 Conferences: Confederated International Conferences: CoopIS, ODBASE, C&TC 2019, Rhodes, Greece, October 21–25, 2019, Proceedings,[Record #1336 is using a reference type undefined in this output style.]
5. Brescia, R. H., McCarthy, W., McDonald, A., Potts, K., & Rivais, C. (2014). Embracing disruption: How technological change in the delivery of legal services can improve access to justice. *Alb. L. Rev.*, 78, 553.
6. Bulow, J., & Rogoff, K. (2005). Grants versus loans for development banks. *American Economic Review*, 95(2), 393-397.
7. Cabral, J. E., Chavan, A., Clarke, T. M., & Greacen, J. (2012). Using technology to enhance access to justice. *Harv. JL & Tech.*, 26, 241.
8. Contini, F., & Mohr, R. (2007). Reconciling independence and accountability in judicial systems. *Utrecht L. Rev.*, 3, 26.
9. Daniels, R. J., & Trebilcock, M. (2004). The political economy of rule of law reform in developing countries. *Mich. J. Int'l L.*, 26, 99.
10. Donoghue, J. (2017). The rise of digital justice: Courtroom technology, public participation and access to justice. *The Modern Law Review*, 80(6), 995-1025.
11. Doss, D. A., Sumrall III, W. H., & Jones, D. W. (2012). *Strategic finance for criminal justice organizations*. CRC Press.
12. Doss, D. A., Sumrall III, W. H., McElreath, D. H., & Jones, D. W. (2013). *Economic and financial analysis for criminal justice organizations*. CRC Press.
13. Drunen, M. v. (2009). Financing adaptation in developing countries: assessing new mechanisms.
14. ESCAP, U., & ECLAC, U. (2021). Public-private partnerships for reducing inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean: the cases of Colombia and Mexico.
15. European Commission. (2023). *Justice and Consumers Funding, Tenders*. European Commission,. https://commission.europa.eu/about-european-commission/departments-and-executive-agencies/justice-and-consumers/justice-and-consumers-funding-tenders_en
16. Farrell, G., & Clark, K. (2004). What does the world spend on criminal justice?
17. Flander, B., & Ručman, A. B. (2014). Lost in transition: Criminal justice reforms and the crises of legitimacy in Central and Eastern Europe. In *Trust and legitimacy in criminal justice: European perspectives* (pp. 111-133). Springer.
18. Fraser, A., Tan, S., Lagarde, M., & Mays, N. (2018). Narratives of promise, narratives of caution: A review of the literature on Social Impact Bonds. *Social policy & administration*, 52(1), 4-28.
19. Fritsche, G. B., Soeters, R., & Meessen, B. (2014). *Performance-based financing toolkit*. world bank publications.
20. Fuentes, H. J., Mendoza, G., Montoya, M. A., & Aguilar, I. (2021). Public-private partnerships in Mexico: Challenges and opportunities at local level. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, 22(1), 35-52.
21. Gomez, M. A. (2015). Crowdfunded justice: on the potential benefits and challenges of crowdfunding as a litigation financing tool. *USFL Rev.*, 49, 307.
22. Gramlich, E. (1997). Intergovernmental grants: A review of the empirical literature. *Financing federal systems*, 106-126.
23. Guy, S. (2021). Access to justice on the market: An empirical case study on the dynamics of crowdfunding judicial reviews. *PUBLIC LAW*(4), 678-687.
24. Hammergren, L. A. (2014). *Justice reform and development: Rethinking donor assistance to developing and transitional countries*. Routledge.
25. Haridas, S., Saroj, S., Maddala, S. T., & Kiruthika, M. (2022). LegalLedger–Blockchain in Judicial System. In *Innovative Data Communication Technologies and Application: Proceedings of ICIDCA 2021* (pp. 471-482). Springer.

26. Higgins, T. Q. (2018). Bridging the Gap: Providing Access to Justice for Middle-Market Litigants. *Suffolk UL Rev.*, 51, 289.
27. Hong, S., & Ryu, J. (2019). Crowdfunding public projects: Collaborative governance for achieving citizen co-funding of public goods. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(1), 145-153.
28. Kang, S., Mulaphong, D., Hwang, E., & Chang, C.-K. (2019). Public-private partnerships in developing countries: Factors for successful adoption and implementation. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 32(4), 334-351.
29. Ketkar, S., & Ratha, D. (2008). *Innovative financing for development*. World Bank Publications.
30. Lacatus, C., & Sedelmeier, U. (2020). Does monitoring without enforcement make a difference? The European Union and anti-corruption policies in Bulgaria and Romania after accession. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 27(8), 1236-1255.
31. Lupo, G., & Bailey, J. (2014). Designing and implementing e-Justice Systems: Some lessons learned from EU and Canadian Examples. *Laws*, 3(2), 353-387.
32. Ma, M., Wang, N., Mu, W., & Zhang, L. (2022). The Instrumentality of Public-Private Partnerships for Achieving Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability*, 14(21), 13756.
33. Manuel, M., & Manuel, C. (2018). Achieving equal access to justice for all by 2030.
34. Matiuta, C. (2019). The ICT and its uses: fighting corruption and promoting participatory democracy—the case of Romania. In *Politics and Technology in the Post-Truth Era* (pp. 159-169). Emerald Publishing Limited.
35. Mintz, S. M. (2005). Corporate governance in an international context: Legal systems, financing patterns and cultural variables. *Corporate governance: an international review*, 13(5), 582-597.
36. Mishra, A. K., & Dash, A. K. (2022). Development impact bonds in developing countries: an emerging innovation for achieving social outcomes. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, 1-27.
37. Moldogaziev, T. T., Liu, C., & Ivonchyk, M. (2022). Policy experimentation with impact financing: a systematic review of research on social impact bonds. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*, 44(1), 81-99.
38. Mulgan, G., Reeder, N., Aylott, M., & Bo'sher, L. (2011). Social impact investment: the challenge and opportunity of social impact bonds. *London: The Young Foundation*.
39. Nash, R. (2013). Financing access to justice: Innovating possibilities to promote access for all. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 5(1), 96-118.
40. Nazim, S. (2023). Historical Development of Legal Aid System in India: A Legal Perspectives. *History and Sociology of South Asia*, 17(1), 69-84.
41. Ontanu, E. (2019). Adapting Justice to Technology and Technology to Justice. A Coevolution Process to e-Justice in Cross-border Litigation. *East European Quarterly*, 8(2), 54-74.
42. Perry, R. (2018). Crowdfunding civil justice. *BCL Rev.*, 59, 1357.
43. Röthler, D., & Wenzlaff, K. (2011). Crowdfunding schemes in Europe. *EENC report*, 9, 2011.
44. Rusa, L., Schneidman, M., Fritsche, G., & Musango, L. (2009). Rwanda: Performance-based financing in the public sector. *Performance incentives for global health: potential and pitfalls*, 189-214.
45. Sancak, I. E. (2016). Applicability and readiness of crowdfunding in Turkey. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 7(1).
46. Satish, D., & Shah, P. (2009). A study of public private partnership models. *IUP Journal of Infrastructure*, 7(1), 22.
47. Saurombe, A. (2014). Towards the adoption of e-justice in South Africa and the developing world: prospects and challenges. *ESARBICA Journal*, 33, 83.
48. Shihata, I. F. (2021). *The World Bank Legal Papers*. Brill.

49. Simmons, R. (2016). Quantifying criminal procedure: how to unlock the potential of big data in our criminal justice system. *Mich. St. L. Rev.*, 947.
50. Simmons, R. (2017). Big data and procedural justice: Legitimizing algorithms in the criminal justice system. *Ohio St. J. Crim. L.*, 15, 573.
51. Soman, A. (2022). Social Impact Investing in India- A Road Less Travelled. <https://indiacorplaw.in/2022/02/social-impact-investing-in-india-a-road-less-travelled.html>
52. Stone, C., Miller, J., Thornton, M., & Trone, J. (2005). Supporting Security, Justice, and Development: lessons for a new era. *New York: Vera Institute of Justice.*
53. Sushina, T., & Sobenin, A. (2020). Artificial intelligence in the criminal justice system: leading trends and possibilities. 6th International Conference on Social, economic, and academic leadership (ICSEAL-6-2019),
54. Tolbert, D., & Solomon, A. (2006). United Nations reform and supporting the rule of law in post-conflict societies. *Harv. Hum Rts. J.*, 19, 29.
55. Toma, R. (2015). Twenty-Five Years After the Fall of Communism: The Cultural Peculiarities of Fighting Corruption and Building Civil Society in Romania. *Sociology Compass*, 9(11), 951-961.
56. Tomlinson, J. (2018). Crowdfunding public interest judicial reviews: A risky new resource and the case for a practical ethics. *Public Law (Forthcoming).*
57. UNDP. (2018). *Strengthening the Rule of Law in Rwanda: Justice, peace and security for the people.* UNDP. <https://info.undp.org/docs/pdc/Documents/RWA/Final%20A2J%20prod%20Signed.pdf>
58. Velicogna, M. (2017). In search of smartness: The EU e-Justice challenge. Informatics,
59. Verma, A., Bhattacharya, P., Saraswat, D., & Tanwar, S. (2021). NyaYa: Blockchain-based electronic law record management scheme for judicial investigations. *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, 63, 103025.
60. Viapiana, F. (2019). Funding the Judiciary: How Budgeting System Shapes Justice: A Comparative Analysis of Three Case Studies. IJCA,
61. Warner, M. E. (2013). Private finance for public goods: social impact bonds. *Journal of economic policy reform*, 16(4), 303-319.
62. Webber, D. (2007). *Good budgeting, better justice: modern budget practices for the judicial sector.* World Bank Washington, DC.
63. World Bank. (2020). World Bank Provides Additional Support to Improving Efficiency and Innovation in Azerbaijan's Judicial System. Retrieved 2023/02/23, from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2020/03/26/world-bank-provides-additional-support-to-improving-efficiency-and-innovation-in-azerbaijans-judicial-system>
64. Završnik, A. (2021). Algorithmic justice: Algorithms and big data in criminal justice settings. *European Journal of criminology*, 18(5), 623-642.
65. Zerilli, F. M. (2013). Corruption and anti-corruption local discourses and international practices in post-socialist Romania. *Human Affairs*, 23(2), 212-229.