ASSESSMENT REPORT:
SUSTAINABILITY OF DONOR PROJECTS ON DECENTRALIZATION AND GOVERNANCE REFORM IN INDONESIA

FEBRUARY 2018

ASSESSMENT REPORT: SUSTAINABILITY OF DONOR PROJECTS ON DECENTRALIZATION AND GOVERNANCE REFORM IN INDONESIA

Contracted under AID-497-C-16-00006

Indonesia Monitoring & Evaluation Support Project

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report represents the aggregation of inputs from a wide range of people and institutions, including donor agencies, project implementing partners, national and local governments across Indonesia, non-governmental project partners and stakeholders, and beneficiary groups.

The assessment team would like to thank everyone who offered their opinions and talked about their experiences interacting with the projects that were assessed. In particular, we offer sincere thanks to the following:

CONTENTS

List of Tables

ACRONYMS

ACCESS	Australia Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme
ADB	Asian Development Bank
AIPD	Australia Indonesia Partnership for Decentralization
AIPHSS	Australia Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
Bappeda	Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah (Regional Planning and Development Agency)
Bappenas	Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (National Development Planning Agency)
BPD	Badan Permusyawaratan Deas (Village Deliberation Agency)
BPKAD	Badan Pengelola Keuangan dan Aset Daerah (Local Government Office for Finance and Asset Management)
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DEO	District Education Office
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (Australia)
DFATD	Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development (Canada)
DHA	District Health Account
DHO	District Health Office
Disdukcapil	Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil (Population and Civil Registration Service)
DPKAD	Dinas Pengelolaan Keuangan dan Aset Daerah (Governance Finance and Asset Affairs Office)
DPMD	Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa (Community Empowerment Office)
DPPKAD	Dinas Pengelolaan Pendapatan Keuangan dan Aset Daerah (Governance Finance and Asset Management Office)
DPR	Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (House of Representatives)
DPRD	Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah (Local Legislative Council)
DPWGD	Development Partner Working Group on Decentralization
DRG	Democracy, Rights, and Governance
GAC	Global Affairs Canada
GAS	Government Accounting Standard
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GOI	Government of Indonesia
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IT	Information Technology
JKN	Jaminan Kesehatan Nasional (National Health Insurance)
KemenPANRB	Kementerian Pendayagunaan Aparatur Negara dan Reformasi Birokrasi (Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform)
Kemendagri	Kementerian Dalam Negeri (Ministry of Home Affairs)
KPK	Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (Corruption Eradication Commission)
KSI	Knowledge Sector Initiative
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
KemPAN-RB	Ministry for Administrative and Bureaucracy Reform
MESP	Monitoring and Evaluation Support Project
MOH	Ministry of Health
MSF	Multi-Stakeholder Forum
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NTT	Nusa Tenggara Timur (East Nusa Tenggara)
OSS	One Stop Service
P3BM	Pro-Poor Planning, Budgeting, and Monitoring
Perdesa	Peraturan Desa (Village Regulation)

Pergub	Peraturan Gubernur (Governor Regulation)
Permendagri	Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri (Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation)
Permenkes	Peraturan Menteri Kesehatan (Ministry of Health Regulation)
PGSP	Provincial Governance Strengthening Programme
PIAK	Penilaian Inisiatif Anti Korupsi (Assessment of Anti-Corruption Initiatives)
PINDU	Pusat Informasi dan Pengaduan (Center for Public Information and Complaint)
PKK	Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga (Family Welfare Movement)
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PNPM	Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (National Community Empowerment Program)
Poltekkes	Politeknik Kesehatan (Government Health Polytechnic)
ProRep	Program Representasi (Representation Programme)
PTSD	Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu (One-Stop Service Center)
Puskesmas	Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat (Community Health Center)
ROCCIPI	Rule, Opportunity, Capacity, Communication, Interest, Process, and Ideology
RPJMD	Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (District Medium-Term Development Plan)
RSUD	Rumah Sakit Umum Daerah (Local General Hospital)
SAID	Sistem Administrasi dan Informasi Desa (Village Administration and Information System)
SBD	Sumba Barat Daya (Sumba Southwest)
SBM	School-Based Management
SIPS	Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi
SMS	Short Message Service
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SOW	Scope of Work
Transformasi	Transforming Administration – Strengthening Innovation
TSP	Technical Service Provider
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this assessment is to inform future program design and implementation by donor agencies, implementing partners, and Government of Indonesia (GOI) counterparts. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of Democracy, Rights, and Governance (DRG) worked with other international donor members of the Sub-Working Group of the Development Partner Working Group on Decentralization (DPWGD) to arrange a sustainability assessment to determine ways to better ensure sustainable results from their investments in governance projects in Indonesia.

The primary audience of this assessment is USAID/Indonesia and the partners of the DPWGD Sub-Working Group, including Global Affairs Canada, Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Relevant GOI agencies include the Ministry of National Development Planning (Bappenas), Ministry of Home Affairs, and Ministry of State Administration and Bureaucracy Reform, along with participating Indonesian local governments.

USAID and its donor partners identified the following questions for this assessment:

1. How has sustainability been defined by donors, counterparts, and implementing partners related to the decentralized governance projects being assessed?

2. What aspects of the projects being assessed show signs of sustainability, in terms of methodology, interventions, policies, cooperation, coordination, et al.?

3. What factors led to the sustainability of project interventions? What factors inhibited sustainability?

4. How can USAID and other donors best use lessons from assessed projects in rolling out or encouraging sustainability aspects in their current and future portfolios?

The following projects were reviewed as part of this assessment:

*   USAID: Program Representasi (ProRep) and Kinerja (Local Governance Service Improvement Program)

*   DFAT: Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Development (AIPD), Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening (AIPHSS), and Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme (ACCESS)

*   GIZ: Transformasi Phase 1

*   UNDP: Provincial Governance Strengthening Programme (PGSP)

*   Canada: Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi (SIPS)

The assessment was carried out primarily using qualitative data collected through project document reviews, key informant interviews, and group discussions. The research aimed to capture and analyze lessons learned from the eight projects listed above which addressed multiple aspects of local governance in Indonesia and all ended in the last one to three years. USAID's DRG Office undertook the assessment of the Kinerja project and provided their findings to the DPSA assessment team for incorporation into the overall results and report for this assessment.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Q1: Sustainability Definition

Findings

- The definition of sustainability was not explicitly found in most project planning documents. Nevertheless, donor and GOI perspectives about sustainability can be identified through their use of related terms such as "buy-in," "government ownership," "adoption," "replication," "scaling up," "modification," and "exit strategy." We use this diction of sustainability as a proxy for how donors and implementing partners take into account the concept of sustainability in their project designs and implementation strategies.

- Each project had developed a logical framework, results framework, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan. However, only three of the eight projects included measures and indicators of sustainability in their planning and implementation. These measures included items such as replication (e.g., number of Kinerja-supported practices adopted by local governments; sustained increases in SIPS-PIAK scores [business licensing] by sub-national government partners; or continued operations of local One Stop Service [OSS] centers). Of the three projects, two (Kinerja and ACCESS) developed clear exit strategies from the beginning, and the other (SIPS) developed an exit strategy in its final year work plan (including plans to enhance sustainability of results after project completion). The other five projects had no performance indicators to measure project sustainability explicitly.

- Project GOI counterparts acknowledged there is no regulation that can be used as a standard for defining sustainability for development assistance projects. Those counterparts defined sustainability (at both the national and local levels) variably as: an adopted approach based on regulations and policies, incorporating innovation into program priorities, shared budgets, and integration of project intervention approaches into their organizations' main tasks and responsibilities.

- There is similarity in the use of words related to sustainability among donors and counterparts, such as "adoption," "government ownership," "replication," "modification" and "new initiatives." These words are used to describe how projects should manage programs to sustain their benefits for the people, particularly after implementation ends.

Conclusions

- International donors and GOI counterparts did not systematically or formally incorporate sustainability definitions and concepts into the design and implementation of the projects reviewed for this assessment.

- Sustainability concepts and plans are being addressed indirectly, or through proxy measures that do not always explicitly target sustainability.

- The projects reviewed did not have a standard donor or GOI definition of sustainability to use as a reference when developing implementation strategies and work plans.

- Definitions of sustainability provided by donors or GOI agencies for their projects, as well as the performance measures used, tended to focus on the continuation of outputs and institutional processes rather than on outcomes for the ultimate beneficiary groups (citizens).

Q2: Signs of Sustainability

Findings

- The assessment team found demonstrable signs of sustainability in the initial years following the completion of the assessed field-based projects.

- There were two broad categories for these sustainability signs: 1) processes, and 2) results. In the processes category, sustainability was assessed by examining the internalization of practices at the field level by the projects' government partners. In the results category, sustainability was assessed by examining projects' lasting impacts on policies, institutions, and skills of counterparts and other beneficiaries.

- The assessment found three main patterns of process-related sustainability in the field:
  1. Local public service providers adopted a project methodology and are using it as a standard system to improve quality of service delivery.
  2. National policies supported by the project were adopted and translated into local practices, internalized within the local system, and/or widely scaled up.
  3. Local governments created new initiatives to respond to public service challenges identified and quantified through project support.

- The assessment also found three main patterns of results-related sustainability:
  1. Formulation of a legal foundation for continued implementation of project-supported government initiatives, which have become the reference for activity expansion by local stakeholders.
  2. GOI continuation of project-introduced initiatives combined with organizational or institutional changes undertaken in order to operate those initiatives.
  3. Increased knowledge and skills of development partners, providing greater room for local agents to create additional initiatives and enhancing impacts from ongoing efforts.

- The strength of these sustainability signs varies, with many dependent on the continued presence of key counterpart or stakeholder personnel, on institutional capacity and processes, on budget availability, and/or on political will.

- Identified signs of sustainability were predominantly related to outputs or results, rather than outcomes.

Conclusions

- The donor-funded projects reviewed for this assessment have achieved a variety of initial sustainability impacts on government and nongovernment institutions and on beneficiary groups.

- Internalization of project practices – *process sustainability* – was found in various degrees among assessed projects at the field level, including adoption, replication, modification, scaling-up, and creation of new initiatives by government partners during and after project implementation.

- Impacts of project initiatives – *results sustainability* – were found in new policy development, organizational changes, and increased capacity of partners from transfered skills and knowledge.

- These signs were not widespread, and in some cases were fragile due to their dependence on local personnel, institutions, budget realities, and other factors.

- Project and donor agency staff were generally not measuring and not necessarily achieving (yet) the sustained outcomes targeted by the overall goals and results frameworks of the projects.

Q3: Factors of Sustainability

Findings

- The assessment identified five underlying factors that contributed to the signs of sustainability that emerged:

  1. Commitment of local government and nongovernment leaders – particularly middle and upper mananagement – to pursuing project outcomes, often evidenced through development of strategic plans, sufficient allocation of resources, or replication of adopted practices in other units, institutions, or districts.
  2. Alignment with priorities of national or local policy and regulatory frameworks.
  3. Stakeholder participation in project planning and implementation, including routine coordination and feedback mechanisms.
  4. Counterpart funding support, including cost-sharing, cost contributions, and other forms of in-kind or direct support.
  5. Project management by implementing partners, including field staff relationships with counterparts, use of local expertise and organizations, and close proximity to partners.

- The assessment also identified several factors that appeared to inhibit sustainability:

  1. Implementation environments with highly politically influenced counterparts or stakeholders, resulting in less certainty of support or counterproductive motivations among those partners.

  2. Absence of dedicated project strategies to transfer capacity and practices to local stakeholders, in particular lack of strategies to address the shifting authorities and high staff turnover of local government counterparts.

  3. Limited involvement of project partners in planning or executing project interventions, leading to less certainty or willingness to carry on useful – but complex or expensive – approaches post-project.

  4. Strong dependence on the donor agency and project team for execution, management, capacity, technologies, or funding.

  5. Lack of capacity, support, or initiative from mid-level bureaucrats. Internalization and incorporation of ideas or practices require support from these middle managers. A related factor is lack of authority or political support for such mid-level officials who are innovators but do not control agency resources. The frequent rotation of civil servants out of target districts and agencies can multiply the impact of this inhibiting factor.

Conclusions

- There were a multitude of different – and in some cases, related – factors that led to or inhibited aspects of sustainability from the assessed donor projects.

- Many of those factors boil down to the nature of counterpart agencies, the resources available to them, and their bureaucratic systems.

- The variety and balanced frequency of factors identified suggests that they were all important in their respective situations and local contexts. This is one reason, along with data limitations, why it was not possible to rank the importance of each factor. Also, many of the sustained impacts identified by the assessment were the result of multiple factors.

Q4: Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Project Design and Implementation

- Donors should explicitly define and incorporate sustainability into the design and implementation of projects.

- Projects should establish measurable indicators and targets to monitor progress towards sustainability goals.

- Project exit strategies should be in place for at least the last year (final annual work plan) before the planned completion date of a project, and ideally from the beginning of implementation. Project timeframes need to be considered when planning for sustainability.

- Donors should work with GOI counterparts to raise the importance of sustainability considerations and to adopt formal rules or approaches to pursue sustainability on donor-funded projects. Such donor-GOI collaboration could also include joint evaluation efforts to gauge sustainability of outcomes post-project.

- Donors and project staff should establish measurement systems to gauge the potential for and realization of sustainability of project interventions and impacts. In particular, donors and their projects should measure outcomes. These systems should be put in place at the design stage and adjusted as needed during the life of a project. Performance management plans should detail how the project team will seek to achieve the outcomes, set up measures to gauge progress toward them, and report on progress and adjust accordingly. Project implementers and the donor agencies should create and execute sustainability plans or exit strategies to increase likelihood of achieving them.

- When designing programs in the context of decentralized local governance, donors should closely examine the different factors identified through this assessment – as well as others – and consider how those factors play out in their targeted locations, to determine which factors are likely to be most critical to achieving sustainability of their planned interventions.

- Donors should then address the specific key factors in those locations through inclusion not only in project designs and work plans, but in explicit sustainability plans and exit strategies.

- Donors and implementing partners should actively pursue and incorporate some mechanisms to engage local counterparts and stakeholders directly in project design, planning, budgeting, and execution. These mechanisms should operate throughout implementation at the levels where the project in present – i.e., community, district, provincial, and/or national.

I.   BACKGROUND

All donors want their projects to be as effective as possible during the implementation phase, and they hope and expect project impacts will be sustained at a reasonable level once their funded activities cease. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in Indonesia and other international donor agencies belonging to the Sub-Working Group of the Development Partner Working Group on Decentralization (DPWGD) agreed to carry out an assessment of sustainability of eight long-term (multiyear) governance projects that ended over the period 2014-2017. USAID served as the lead agency to fund and implement this sustainability assessment, working through the Mission's Monitoring and Evaluation Support Project (MESP).

This assessment provides information that can be used to increase the likelihood that governance projects in Indonesia – both current and future – will be more sustainable in their outcomes. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations from this assessment are expected to enable DPWGD members and other practitioners to:

- Maximize the effectiveness and impact of decentralized governance projects in Indonesia.

- Incorporate sustainability lessons into project designs and portfolio strategies.

- Increase the spread of effective, sustainable development interventions.

- Inform the Sub-Working Group partners of the DPWGD.

- Increase capacity of GOI and local government counterparts, and help donors prepare exit strategies for their programming in these areas.

To achieve these objectives, the assessment seeks answers to the following four questions:

Assessment Questions
1.   How has sustainability been defined by donors, counterparts, and implementing partners related to the decentralized governance projects being assessed?
2.   What aspects of the projects being assessed show signs of sustainability, in terms of methodology, interventions, policies, cooperation, coordination, et al.?
3.   What factors led to the sustainability of project interventions? What factors inhibited sustainability?
4.   How can USAID and other donors best use lessons from assessed projects in rolling out or encouraging sustainability aspects in their current and future portfolios?

The following projects were reviewed as part of this assessment:

- **USAID: Program Representasi (ProRep) and Kinerja (Local Governance Service Improvement Program).** ProRep worked with the Parliament, civil society organizations (CSOs), and policy research institutes (universities, think tanks) on advocacy, representation, and policymaking for strengthening democracy and good governance in the country. Kinerja initially worked with 24 district governments in five provinces. In a later stage, Kinerja expanded to more than 50 additional districts.

- **Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT): Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Decentralization (AIPD), Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening (AIPHSS), and Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme (ACCESS).** AIPD worked in

East Java, West Nusa Tenggara (Nusa Tenggara Barat [NTB]), East Nusa Tenggara (Nusa Tenggara Timur [NTT]), West Papua, and Papua. AIPHSS worked in East Java and NTT. ACCESS worked with 69 local CSOs in NTB, NTT, South Sulawesi, and Southeast Sulawesi.

- **Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ): Transformasi Phase 1.** Transformasi worked with the Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform (KemPAN-RB), focusing in North Sumatra, West Kalimantan, and East Java.

- **United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Provincial Governance Strengthening Programme (PGSP).** PGSP worked in Bangka Belitung, NTT, and Gorontalo.

- **Canada: Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi (SIPS).** SIPS supported e-procurement and certification in North and South Sulawesi.

Data collected and analyzed for this assessment came from global literature on sustainability, as well as from project documents, key informant interviews, and group discussions. Interviews and discussions included members of the donor Sub-Group of the DPWGD whose projects were assessed, GOI counterparts, and project stakeholders (through field visits). Interviews and discussions were based on the four questions listed above. The table below summarizes the data collection process completed by the assessment team.

Table 1: Projects and Data Collection Locations for the Assessment

Province	Districts and Cities	Projects and Sources
Jakarta and National Level	• Jakarta	• Project donor agency offices: DFAT Australia, DFATD Canada, GIZ, UNDP, USAID • GOI counterpart agencies*: Bappenas, Kemdagri, Kemenkes, Kemenkeu, Kemen PANRB, KPK
West Kalimantan	• Pontianak City • Bengkayang • Kubu Raya • Sambas • Sekadau	• USAID Kinerja**
East Java	• Surabaya, Provincial Government	• GIZ Transformasi • All provincial counterpart agencies
	• Gresik • Malang	• GIZ Transformasi
	• Situbondo	• DFAT AIPD • DFAT AIPHSS
	• Probolinggo • Jember • Lumajang • Pacitan	• USAID Kinerja**
East Nusa Tenggara	• Kupang, Provincial Government	• UNDP PGSP
	• Ngada • Sumba Barat Daya	• DFAT AIPD • AIPHSS • DFAT ACCESS

South Sulawesi	• Pinrang	• Canada SIPS
	• Makassar City • Barru • Luwu • Luwu Utara	• USAID Kinerja
Gorontalo	• Gorontalo City • Pohuwatu	• UNDP PGSP

* Bappenas=National Development Planning Agency; Kemdagri=Ministry of Home Affairs; Kemenkes=Ministry of Health; Kemenkeu=Ministry of Finance; Kemen PANRB=Ministry of Administrative and Bureaucracy Reform; KPK= Corruption Eradication Commission.

** USAID DRG Office personnel carried out the assessment of the Kinerja project. DRG then provided the findings from their review to the MESP assessment team for incorporation into this report. The full Kinerja Assessment Report is included as Annex I.

The assessment team wishes to highlight the excellent cooperation received at all levels, particularly from the people interviewed or those who joined discussions during field visits. Stakeholders readily shared their views and experiences with the assessed projects and were, generally, very positive about the opportunities they experienced during the implementation periods. Their wishes were consistently that the projects could have been extended, or that similar projects could be implemented following the completion of the activities.

Section II below presents assessment findings and conclusions, organized by the first three questions of the scope of work (SOW). Section III presents lessons and recommendations (Question 4), offering guidance on how to use the sustainability-related findings when designing and implementing new projects. In the annexes, we present the assessment, analytical framework, data collection instruments, and list of organizations interviewed, among other supporting information.

II.   ASSESSMENT FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

In developing the conclusions presented below, the assessment team recognized that they are based on a limited number of observations and a purposive selection process to identify informants in Jakarta and the provinces. These approaches do not lend themselves to inferring conclusions for a larger population. We note this limitation to ensure that the results from this assessment are understood within the context of the issues, processes, and results from the eight projects that were assessed. That said, the findings and conclusions may be indicative of other projects in similar environments, and the assessment team recommends further investigation to provide more statistically significant findings that could have broader implications.

Q1: SUSTAINABILITY DEFINITIONS BY DONORS AND STAKEHOLDERS: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

How has sustainability been defined by donors, counterparts, and implementing partners related to the decentralized governance projects being assessed?

The first assessment question looks at sustainability definitions as used by the projects themselves, as well as stated or perceived definitions by donors and Indonesian counterparts. To provide context for this question and the findings from donor-funded projects in Indonesia, the assessment first examined relevant studies by donors and other stakeholders regarding sustainability issues in

international assistance programs. Findings from that literature serve as a cross-reference for Indonesia's experience, and offer insights into how to identify – and thus to engender – sustainability in decentralization and governance programming in this country.

Analysis of Sustainability Definitions from Donor Agencies and Projects

Below is an analysis of how sustainability has been defined and practiced by donor agencies funding governance reform and decentralization activities in other countries. In general, donors have supported this sector through three types of interventions:

1. Creating a favorable legal and political environment through technical assistance to frame relevant legislation and policies.
2. Supporting implementation of decentralization policies by assisting government partners.
3. Deepening and sustaining decentralization practices on the ground.[1]

These intervention types are often not mutually exclusive, and many projects cover more than one within their SOWs. That said, the eight projects reviewed for this assessment can generally be categorized as follows:

Type 1: PGSP, ProRep

Type 2: AIPD, AIPHSS

Type 3: ACCESS, Kinerja, SIPS, Transformasi

Donor agencies have focused on the concept of sustainability since the 1970s, following the publication of the report "Limits to Growth" (Meadows, Meadows, Randers, Behrens III, 1972). While each donor has its own specific definition, most agree that project sustainability is defined as capacity to maintain some entity, outcome, or process over time (Hodgkin, 1994; Bamber & Cheema of World Bank, 1990), or the continuation of benefits over time after donor assistance – including technical, managerial, and financial assistance is completed.[2] Project sustainability is also often defined in terms of time periods – i.e., short-term vs. long-term sustainability. A project's short-term sustainability usually is evidenced by outcomes ranging from two to five years after project termination (Bossert, 1998 and 1990; Honadle and VanSant, 1985), while long-term sustainability denotes lasting outcomes beyond that five-year period.[3]

Many assessments and evaluations over the past couple of decades have highlighted the difficulty in achieving sustainability, particularly given the scarcity of dedicated project sustainability strategies or plans. Heeks and Baark remarked (1998) that donors often focus on short-term, project-driven interests and do not factor into their strategies or funding any mechanisms to ensure that project approaches or impacts remain sustainable after the donor funds are withdrawn. In past projects, the focus was often placed on achieving outputs, which are relatively easy to produce and measure, as opposed to outcomes. As a result, there have been growing concerns among researchers about the lack of sustainability among donor-funded development programs.[4]

According to the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), only 50% of evaluated projects in 2007 were viewed as moderately sustainable or more than moderately sustainable.

---

[1] OECD (2004). Lessons Learned on Donor Support to Decentralization and Local Governance, Development Assistance Commitee Evaluation Series.
[2] Sabih, Soliman Adam & Adam Mastour Omer, Factors Affecting Project Sustainability Beyond Donor's Support: The Case of Area Development Scheme (ADS) in Umkada Locality, North Darfur State, Western Sudan, The International Journal of Technical Research and Aplications e-ISSN 2320-8163, Vol. 3, page 94-101, May-June 2015; and Australian Agency for International Development (2000), Promoting Practical Sustainability.
[3] Sabih, Soliman Adam & Adam Mastour Omer, 2015, op. cit.
[4] OECD, 2004, op. cit.

Among UK-funded projects, Thompson and Holgeid (2009) revealed that projects exceeded their intended budgets by an average of 30%, and exceeded their planned durations by an average of 70% due to a lack of local stakeholders to take over ownership of project interventions.[5] Similarly, a UN Joint Monitoring study found the failure rate for sustainability among projects implemented in Africa as ranging between 30%-60%, with effective approaches and impacts relying heavily on donor funds.

Studies like this Indonesia assessment, which examines the forces affecting the sustainability of donor-funded projects, generally list several common contributing factors, as described below.

Active involvement of key stakeholders is consistently found as an important factor for engendering project sustainability, whether the stakeholders are from government, NGOs/CSOs, or communities. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005), signed by development donor and partner countries and by multilateral aid organizations, included commitments regarding ownership of development assistance interventions. Specifically, donors committed to "respect partner country leadership and help strengthen their capacity to exercise it." Partner countries, for their part, committed to exercise leadership over their development strategies and policies, and to coordinate their development actions.

As a step toward implementing the Paris Declaration, the GOI and donor agencies working in Indonesia signed the Jakarta Commitment: Aid for Development Effectiveness, in 2009. This Commitment was founded on three pillars that emphasize partnership, ownership, and inclusion by GOI and donor partners: Country Ownership over Development; Effective and Inclusive Partnership for Development; and Delivering and Accounting for Development Results.

Harvey and Reed (2007, cited in Kuria Elijah and Wanyonike Daniel, 2016) state that the participation of project beneficiaries is essential to boost a sense of ownership. They noted the importance of this involvement at all stages – not only during implementation, but during project identification and design, planning, and monitoring and evaluation as well. This conclusion is strengthened by consistent findings of donor program evaluations in Africa[6] and a recent sustainability assessment of donor projects in Kenya (Kuria Elijah and Wanyonike Daniel, 2016), Western Sudan (Sabbih Soliman Adam and Adam mastour Omer, 2015), and Zambia (Lungo M, Mavole Jonhson, Martin Otieno, 2017), where stakeholder involvement in all project phases was found to be a strong determinant of sustainability compared to other factors. In addition, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) in 2000 produced a project sustainability guideline paper that identified stakeholder roles and genuine participation as the main factors of sustainability and offered six practical steps to make it happen.

Other important factors supporting project sustainability identified by recent research include a compatible policy environment and alignment with government partners' policy priorities. These have yielded high-level political and institutional support for effective approaches both during and beyond donor-funded implementation.[7]

The provision of stakeholder resources – including financial contributions – was also consistently found to be a strong contributing factor to sustainability. Studies of sustained community projects in Africa showed cost recovery provided by stakeholders was a key factor.[8] Moreover, the 2000 AusAID paper noted that financial sustainability is a critical dimension of overall sustainability, and that donors should conduct financial and economic analyses to quantify the benefits of engaging stakeholders in this manner, and that the ongoing financing of specific interventions or general

---

[5] Lungo M, Protazio, Mavole Jonhson, and Martin Otieno. (2017). Determinants of Project Sustainability Beyond Donor Support: case of Caritas Norway Supported Governance Project in Mansa Dieocese, Zambia, Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya: Catholic University of Eastern Africa.

[6] Kuria Elijah and Wanyoike M. Daniel, 2016, op. cit.

[7] Australian Agency for International Development, 2000, op. cit.

[8] Kuria Elijah and Wanyoike M. Daniel, 2016, opcit and Lungo M Protazio, Mavole Jonhson, Martin Otieno, 2017, op. cit.

practices should be addressed in project strategies. AusAID also recommended that project designers and managers conduct their financial planning jointly with counterparts, particularly to identify costs and contributions by those partners, either cash or in-kind.

In addition to the frequently identified factors described above, studies have reported (though less frequently) other factors influencing sustainability, including the deliberately planned phasing-out of project assistance (and funding), with a sustainability or exit strategy integrated in final work plans. Such strategies are more effective when they address the likely available – and needed – organizational structures, staff capacities, management processes – including budgets – that will be required for approaches to be sustained by local entities.[9]

Looking at the factors that emerge from global research on this issue, we see many consistencies with the findings from the current assessment of eight donor-funded projects in Indonesia. The details of these findings will be discussed in the following sections of this report.

Sustainability Defined for Indonesia Decentralization and Governance Reform Projects

Information related to answering Question 1 of this assessment comes from sources such as project design documents, work plans, M&E plans and associated results frameworks, and progress reports, as well as from interviews with representatives of donor organizations, counterpart agencies, implementing partners, and project beneficiaries. The assessment team and USAID DRG personnel interviewed more than 150 informants in Jakarta and selected sites where the eight projects worked.

The review of project documents shows that the eight projects investigated for this assessment varied significantly in their definitions of sustainability and how they set goals and measured performance related to their lasting impacts beyond project completion. Three of the eight projects assessed – ACCESS, Kinerja, and SIPS – explicitly incorporated "sustainability" into some of their design, planning, and/or implementation materials, including a few exit strategies crafted in advance of project completion. Of the eight projects, only UNDP PGSP specifically defined sustainability in its documentation:

> "The extent to which project benefits will continue after assistance has come to an end. Sustainability looks to the relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions present and, based on that assessment, assess whether capacities are in place to maintain, manage and ensure the development results in the future."

While this definition is generally consistent with the global literature examined above, it is notable for the emphasis on capacity and conditions (i.e., outputs or results within partner institutions and their processes) rather than on outcomes for Indonesians, who are the ultimate beneficiaries of PGSP. Inherent in this definition is an assumption that increased capacity and institutionalized processes will lead to improved services, accountability, or welfare for citizens in the project's target districts – an assumption that is not yet proven or explicitly measured by this or other assessed projects. We discuss this difference between sustainable outputs and outcomes further in the section on sustainability signs below (Question 2).

The remaining five projects only addressed aspects of lasting impact – i.e., sustainability – implicitly in their designs and during implementation. That is, they used other words and concepts as proxies for what is broadly thought of as sustainability (per the general analysis presented above).

---

[9] Australian Agency for International Development, 2000 and from Petrovich, Janice (2011). Exiting Responsibly: Best Donor Practices in Ending Support, A study for the Robert Wood Jonhson Foundation.

The most frequently used terms used in project design, planning, and implementation documents to address sustainability concepts were "replication" and "adoption" of project approaches or impacts by counterparts and stakeholder entities. These two terms were used significantly more often than others related to sustainability, such as "buy-in" and "ownership" (including government ownership and government recognition); "scaling-up;" and "new initiatives" or "modifications."

Below we discuss these sustainability terms more fully, providing examples of how they were used by the donors and implementing partners executing the projects in question.

- **Replication, including scaling-up.** The most frequently found words related to sustainability were "replication" and "scaling up," which were found repeatedly in the documents produced by seven of eight projects assessed (all except AIPD). Replication and scaling up were defined by the ACCESS, Kinerja, and SIPS projects as the expansion of project approaches in non-intervention sites. This includes adoption of approaches, platforms, or activities in additional facilities or communities in the same district, or in other non-intervention locations, with or without the involvement of project implementing partners. In practice, local policies, guidelines, or regulations – either supported by the projects or pre-existing – generally laid the foundation for replication where it occurred. That said, Kinerja was the only project that had a solid, detailed plan to foster replication, starting with the production and dissemination of replication packages designed as how-to guides, and its establishment of regional hubs for replication in each of the target provinces to serve additional district governments. Other assessed projects did not develop specific replication strategies during their design or implementation phases, or even in the final years of implementation.

- **Adoption of approaches, practices, or innovations.** The second most frequently used term for aspects of sustainability was "adoption" – i.e., adoption of project approaches, practices, or innovations by counterparts or other stakeholder entities. Four of the eight projects frequently used these terms to describe their efforts toward achieving sustainability: ACCESS, SIPS, AIPHSS, and Kinerja. As an example, the Performance Management Plan (PMP) for Kinerja defined adoption as the process and result of using the methodology, approach, and good practices of innovations to improve service delivery for frontline services and at the district level. A similar definition was presented in the SIPS work plan and final report.

- **Buy-in and ownership.** These terms were found most frequently in documents produced by AIPHSS, PGSP, and Transformasi, which described the process of working through existing counterpart structures at national and sub-national levels so that project initiatives are treated by those counterparts as part of their own programs, thus engendering investment, leadership, and greater potential for scaling up. In some cases, projects used adoption as a pre-condition to expanding assistance to new locations or partners, thus creating an incentive to establish a stronger foundation for sustainability. For example, PGSP and AIPHSS worked through the Ministry of Health (MOH) as the lead institution for scaling up project-supported management and decision-making processes across different districts, including some locations that were not directly supported by the projects. On this topic, the AIPD Delivery Strategy did not specifically mention sustainability or provide measures for it. It did, however, incorporate approaches to increase the likelihood of local ownership, such as basing technical assistance (TA) on local demand, building organizational capacity, and using local resources.

- **Modification or new initiative.** Several projects – ProRep, Kinerja, AIPHSS, and PGSP – used the terms "modification" or "new initiative" to denote counterpart-initiated programs that were modified (adopted with adjustments) from project approaches. Such initiatives can take the form of new policies, approaches, or processes. One example is the new initiative

from one-stop service center (Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu [PTSP]) offices in Lumajang and Luwu Utara districts to develop staff training for service excellence, which is based on Kinerja activities.

Counterpart Definitions of Sustainability

National government counterparts interviewed by the assessment team – Bappenas (National Development Planning Agency), Ministry of Administration and Bureaucratic Reform (Kemenpan RB), and Ministry of Home Affairs (Kemdagri) – noted that the GOI does not set forth an official or common definition of sustainability for local governance projects, nor do they have any legal reference for development partners or counterpart agencies for use in planning, budgeting, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating their programs. One individual definition comes from Kemenpan RB Ministerial Decree No 30/2014 on Guidelines for Public Service Innovation, which defines sustainability as agency adoption of innovations in local governance, decentralization, and public service improvement, per the governance requirements delineated in Law 23/2014 on Regional Autonomy.

According to Kemen PANRB officials, factors that could enable such sustainable adoption include existence of supporting laws, policies, and regulations; integration of approaches into GOI programs and allocated budgets; and inclusion of specific implementation responsibilities in job descriptions of agency personnel. In a separate interview, the Bappenas Director of Politics and Security stated that to be sustainable, approaches must link with national priorities and become part of the key indicators used by technical ministries to measure performance against those priority targets.

At the province and district levels, counterparts of the assessed projects offered similar "local adoption" definitions for sustainability in the context of donor activities. Local agencies for planning (Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah [Bappeda]), health (Provincial and District Health Offices), and legislatures (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah [DPRD]) all talked about adoption by and integration into local regulations, programs, and budgets.

Similar to the donor and project definitions of sustainability discussed above, GOI definitions tend to focus on institutional outputs and results – processes and capacities – and not on outcomes for the constituent populations being served by these ministries. This output-oriented focus is consistent with what GOI agencies, donors, and projects measure most frequently during and after implementation.

Measurement and indicators of sustainability. As noted above, all the assessed projects used logical frameworks or results frameworks. They also established PMPs or M&E Plans. However, most did not set up performance indicators explicitly to measure sustainable outcomes. The exceptions were ACCESS, Kinerja, and SIPS. These three projects used specific plans, assessments, or measures of sustainability. Specifically, all three measured or assessed replication of project approaches by counterparts and other partners. In addition, SIPS assessed improvements in OSS services. In general, however, indicators used by these projects gauged the act of replication only, and not the effectiveness of services over time. Thus, those indicators are not by themselves adequate to determine sustainability of outcomes.

Exit strategies. The assessment found clear exit strategies in three projects: ACCESS, Kinerja, and SIPS. ACCESS developed its exit strategy from the beginning of the program, while Kinerja and SIPS included them in their final year work plans. Each of these exit strategies outlined follow-up steps by key local partners, including replication plans where appropriate. For example, the ACCESS and SIPS exit strategies each identified key institutions to support replication and future implementation, while the Kinerja exit strategy included a more detailed replication plan including cost recovery and implementation details.

In the case of ACCESS, replication of approaches was done at the village level, but no local government partner was assigned the specific responsibility of overseeing and supporting this process, although some partner district governments in NTB and South Sulawesi requested that interventions be replicated in other villages and subsequently provided funding for this. Kinerja's exit strategy included activities to train future local partners and their staffs, and to develop local networks of other partners. Kinerja also used its district-based staff to provide technical assistance toward the end of the project to lay the groundwork for a transition to local counterpart implementation or replication of effective approaches.

Local government officials and stakeholders viewed these project exit strategies positively, seeing them as a way to transfer activities and practices to stakeholders and, to some extent, preparing these stakeholders to plan future interventions. However, it emerged that establishing clear technical responsibilities among stakeholders is critical, as is aligning exit plans with the needs, capacities, and resources of local partners slated to carry on the desired approaches.

For the other five projects, one reason cited for the lack of exit strategies was the expectation that the projects would be continued or followed by similar projects from the same donor. In addition, AIPD and AIPHSS faced difficulties crafting exit strategies due to the funding cuts from DFAT.

Translation of sustainability planning into activities. The assessment found two ways projects translated their concepts of sustainability into activities. The first involved systematic efforts starting with project design and strategy and eventually culminating in an exit strategy. The SIPS and ACCESS projects followed this approach, with SIPS defining sustainability through expected results such as ongoing operation of complaint management systems, and routinely measuring progress toward the achievement of these outputs.

The second approach addressed sustainability in a more opportunistic fashion, adjusting interventions during the course of execution and in work plans based on perceived openings to engender lasting impacts. This approach, taken by AIPD and AIPHSS, did not include specific indicators to measure sustainability. For example, AIPD applied principles to help ensure that sustainability would be part of its implementation strategy.[10] However, that strategy was changed following a program review in 2013, which found that the intended outcomes of improved service delivery were not likely to be achieved within the life of the project if a focus on systems reform alone was maintained. In response, AIPD shifted to a problem-solving strategy focused on achieving sustained – and sustainable – service delivery outcomes. Given AIPD's short implementation period, this shift was effective because it helped districts implement national regulations, resulting in locally institutionalized practices in supported agencies – something that was more realisitically achieveable during AIPD's short duration. That said, local government officials noted that the sudden cessation of activities under AIPD and AIPHSS created confusion among stakeholders.

Question I Conclusions

- International donors and GOI counterparts did not systematically or formally incorporate sustainability definitions and concepts into the design and implementation of the projects reviewed for this assessment.

- Sustainability concepts and plans were addressed indirectly or through proxy measures that did not always explicitly target sustainability.

- The projects reviewed did not have a standard donor agency or GOI definition of sustainability as a reference for developing their implementation strategies and work plans.

---

[10] A comprehensive list of sustainability principles was prepared. AIPD engaged with the targeted provincial and district legislatures as key partners. It did not directly engage in delivery of services.

- Donors and GOI counterparts generally used similar terms and concepts to define sustainability.

- Definitions provided by donors and GOI for their projects, as well as the performance measures used, tended to focus on the continuation of outputs and institutional processes rather than on outcomes for ultimate beneficiary groups (citizens).

- There was a lack of sufficient information and solid evidence for determining a causal relationship between the existence of specific sustainability-related plans, measures, and exit strategies for the eight assessed projects and the extent and nature of signs of sustainability from their activities.

Q2: PROJECT ASPECTS SHOWING SIGNS OF SUSTAINABILITY: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

What aspects of the projects being assessed show signs of sustainability, in terms of methodology, interventions, policies, cooperation, coordination, et al.?

The assessment team identified two broad categories for signs of sustainability: 1) processes, and 2) results. In the processes category, sustainability was evident through the internalization of practices at the field level by projects' government partners. This internalization entailed adoption, replication, modification, or scaling-up of project interventions and practices, or creation of new initiatives. Although clear and strict definitions of sustainability were largely absent, the team found various methodologies, interventions, policies, and forms of cooperation and coordination that indicated (initially) sustainable impacts.

In the results category, sustainability was evident in lasting impacts on policies, institutions, and skills among counterpart staffs and other beneficiaries resulting from project activities. Here again, initial examples and patterns of sustainability signs emerged from the assessment findings.

1. Sustainability Signs from Processes: Internalization by Government Partners

Internalization occurred at various stages in the sequence of local government partner adoption and implementation of effective practices introduced by the assessed projects. Three main patterns of internalization were found:

- Local government public service providers adopted a project methodology and now use it as a standard system to improve service delivery.

- National policies supported by the project were adopted, translated into local practices, and internalized within local government systems for implementing regulations and for resource allocation (e.g., budget), or were scaled up.

- Local governments created initiatives to respond to public service challenges identified and quantified through project support.

The most commonly found sign of sustainability was new work processes in counterpart agencies – a result sustained to some extent for seven of eight assessed projects. While the team encountered this type of sign most frequently, there was considerable variation in the specific nature of these processes across projects, provinces, and institutions. In most cases, the sustained processes were continuations of project interventions. The second most frequent sign of sustainability was adoption and execution of local regulations that aligned with national policies. Below we present details and examples of process sustainability signs identified by the assessment team.

New work processes in counterpart agencies. This was the most commonly found sign of process sustainability among project counterparts, with examples identified in nearly all the assessed projects. Key local government agencies used their authority granted through decentralization to replicate adopted practices beyond their institutions – both across other work units in the same district and in other districts. These signs encompassed methods aimed at improving delivery of public services, though the impacts measured were more often about the enabling steps toward improved services, such as institutionalized processes and capacities that resulted from agencies incorporating project-supported practices and methodologies into how their work units operate on a routine basis. These practices included standard operating procedures (SOPs), associated manuals, or trainings, and in some cases these have become standard functions of the agencies in question.

For example, at least four *puskesmas* (community health centers) supported by the Transformasi project have continued the practice introduced through the project of integrated electronic frontline customer service and unified medical records for integrated health services. The assessment team witnessed examples of this in centers in Malang, East Java (Turen, Kepanjen, Sumberbojong, and Gondanglegi), as well as at a local district hospital. In another example, the complaint handling mechanism introduced through AIPHSS is still being used by *puskesmas* in Sumba Barat Daya, NTT, including modified SOPs to incorporate this work process.

Speaking more broadly about AIPHSS impacts, Mr. Winston, the head of Commission V on People's Welfare in the NTT DPRD, noted three signs of sustainability from that project: 1) approaches adopted through local regulations and policies; 2) approaches integrated into provincial and district programs; and 3) budgets allocated by former counterparts to continue implementation of project activities. Similar statements were made by provincial and district officials in locations visited by the team.

Other examples came from the Kinerja-supported districts of Lumajang, Luwu Utara, and Barru where local PTSP offices continue to provide online licensing services. In the education sector, Barru District is continuing teacher distribution and school-based management approaches supported by Kinerja, and is allocating local funds and providing incentives to support implementation. In the health sector, the Probolinggo, East Java government is still using integrated, online medical records and fingerprint-based check-ins for patients in order to provide quicker and more accurate health services (see box below).

Puskesmas Sumberasih's "Best Service Program" in Probolinggo, East Java

Like many community health centers in Indonesia, the Puskesmas Sumberasih provides a range of community health services, from simple emergency services to basic health check-ups, dentistry, and obstetric services. Working through a multi-stakeholder forum (MSF) set up through the Kinerja project, the center conducted a public satisfaction survey in 2012. Results revealed that patients were unhappy with the long waiting times. Although the center had been using the electronic patient database SIMPUSTRONIK since 2007, the center decided to add fingerprint recognition to the patient intake process. This innovation has reduced check-in times from an average of three minutes to mere seconds, even if a patient has forgotten his/her ID card at home. All patients have to do is scan their finger, and their recent medical history is automatically called up in the database and displayed on the receptionist's computer, the doctor's desktop, and at the in-house pharmacy. This step also eases integration with the national universal health insurance program Jaminan Kesehatan Nasional (JKN).

Today, the district health office continues to support expansion of the Kinerja model throughout Probolinggo, and thus far the program has been replicated in an additional 10 puskesmas. Sumberasih center staff promote their model at conferences and seminars, while managers from other clinics visit to learn how to adopt these kinds of management tools.

Local government execution of national policies by enacting regulations. In some cases, sustainability was seen through the enactment of implementing regulations by projects' local government counterparts in order to comply with national policies or initiatives. Such policies included accreditation, minimum service standards, or more general governance management requirements such as finance and accounting systems. This type of process sustainability was seen in several of the assessed projects. Examples included:

- Local regulation (Perda) No. 10/2016 in Ngada District, enacted with support from AIPHSS.

- Bupati (Regent) regulations 20/2015 and 68/2014 in Situbondo on organization and governance of provincial health service providers in Madura, enacted with assistance from AIPD.

- *Puskesmas* accreditation implementation, supported by Transformasi.

- Regulations on village participatory planning, budgeting, and reporting per Village Law 5/1979, enacted with support from ACCESS.

The AIPD and AIPHSS projects supported local implementation of national policies, including helping district administrations operationalize new requirements into their governance systems. In Situbondo, East Java, AIPD supported the local financial management office (Dinas Pengelolaan Keuangan dan Aset Daerah [DPKAD]) to adopt a new GOI accrual accounting and asset record-keeping system. The DPKAD then introduced the system to other units and made it the standard for financial management and bookkeeping in the district. A similar pattern of national policy adoption and replication was also found in Situbondo; Ngada and Sumba Barat Daya, NTT (AIPHSS); and Malang (Transformasi) where the donor projects assisted local governments to implement *puskesmas* accreditation as required by national policy. In Situbondo, accreditation is now in process in all centers.

Working with Stakeholders to Strengthen Health Systems in Ngada District

Regulation (Perda) 10/2016 on Local Health Systems is the result of collaboration between Kabupaten Ngada's Health Agency (Dinas Kesehatan) and the AIPHSS project. The Perda was aimed at executing Indonesia's Presidential Regulation on the National Health System and Decentralization Law, under which authority for health development resides with local governments. Prior to the development of this regulation, health services delivery in the district was considered ineffective by the general public.

The regulation was designed to address multiple aspects of the district health system, including public health services, health financing, human resource development, medicines and health equipment, community empowerment, and health management. As such, AIPHSS worked with the local government to involve multiple stakeholders in the formulation process, including the DPRD, district agencies (for law and human rights, women's development, family planning, community development, finance, and government administration), as well as community members, traditional leaders, and CSOs.

Even though the project ended before the regulation was issued, the Ngada government included it in their Regional Medium-Term Development Plan targets and local Health Strategic Plan. Those plans called for programs and performance indicators to ensure compliance with the new regulation. In the end, the integrated way in which local government took on – and then took ownership of – the regulation led to its becoming widely acceptable to stakeholders and, it is hoped, more likely to be sustained.

AIPD supported implementation in Madura of a new hospital governance policy per Law 61/2007. The project worked with the Office for Finance and Asset Management (Badan Pengelola Keuangan dan Aset Daerah [BPKAD]) in Pamekasan, Madura, helping draft Governor Regulation (Peraturan Gubernur [Pergub]) 68/2014 on organization and governance of provincial health service providers in order to elevate the status and function of the Balai Pemberantasan dan Pencegahan Penyakit Paru

– a special health unit for lung care – to a general public hospital. This unit is now a frontline provincial hospital and enjoys better management and independent financing. It is also serving as a learning center for other hospitals operated by district governments on Madura Island. Impacts are being sustained as a result of incorporating the approaches (introduced through AIPD) into local laws and regulations.

Another example comes from Sumba, NTT, where ACCESS supported enactment of regulations for village participatory planning, budgeting, and reporting, all based on Village Law No. 5/1979 and No. 6/2014.

Local government initiatives spurred by project interventions. In some cases, stimulated by project activities, counterparts created new initiatives, aligned with national policy imperatives, to meet needs faced by their constituents. This pattern was demonstrated in Situbondo, where AIPHSS interventions aligned with local government efforts to improve health services. Building on project interventions to enhance *puskesmas* performance, the government created an initiative to expand their functions, adding specialized health services based on each center's niche expertise, such as malnutrition, mental health, HIV and AIDS, children with special needs, etc. As a result, all 17 *puskesmas* in Situbondo now have their own brands that reflect the additional services that each provides.

2. Sustainability Signs from Results: Impacts of Project Initiatives

The activities of the assessed projects resulted in a diverse collection of sustained impacts in districts and provinces across Indonesia. These impacts generally fell into three areas: changes in policies, in institutions, and in knowledge and skills. The first two areas relate to counterpart's organizational systems, while the third – knowledge and skills – concerns individual officers within those systems.

Among these sustained results, new or changed policies were the most frequently found signs across assessed projects, followed by changes in institutions. The identified impacts are not exclusively the result of interventions by the assessed projects; other factors, actors, and donor projects contributed to these results as well. However, interventions by the assessed projects contributed notably to the impacts detailed in the examples below.

Changes in policies. Several regulations and policies resulted from donor assistance at the national and sub-national levels, including the following examples (described more fully below):

- Drafting of Law No. 23/2014 on Decentralization, undertaken with assistance by PGSP.

- Gubernatorial Regulation No. 12/2013 on OSS for business services in 19 districts in South Sulawesi, a result supported by SIPS; and

- Local regulation on asset governance practices in Sumba Barat Daya District, an initiative supported by AIPD.

Working with Bappenas and the Ministry of Home Affairs, and building on prior donor support, PGSP provided technical assistance to draft the (then) new Decentralization Law, in particular the provisions addressing the roles of provincial governments and the recognition of island provinces. The legislation was signed by the President in September 2014, and has become the foundation for relations among the three levels of government – central, provincial, and district – with clearer distribution of authorities.

As part of the SIPS effort to help establish and operationalize OSS for issuance of business and investment permits, the project supported development of a gubernatorial regulation that served as the basis of standardized OSS procedures for use across South Sulawesi Province.

AIPD supported the newly created district of Sumba Barat Daya, NTT with its asset governance. After project completion, the district issued a local regulation (Perda No. 27/2016) on district asset management practices, which, as of 2017, was under review by the DPRD.

Changes in institutions. Institutional changes stemming from donor project assistance have led to initial sustainability in a variety of ways, such as the creation of new public service systems that continue to operate; reallocation of agency resources to initiate or scale up an effective practice on an ongoing basis; and restructuring of work units. Examples include the following:

- **Transformasi.** The Gresik, East Java, Population and Civil Affairs Office (Dinas Pendukcapil) revised its staffing and workspace utlization to realize the vision of IT-based population data management. Work teams now use simpler processes – including offering online services – that make the civil registration system more client-oriented. For example, services for ID cards, birth certificates, et al., now use a single, more up-to-date population database.

- **AIPHSS.** A project-supported *puskesmas* in Rada Mata, Sumba Barat Daya restructured staff workloads and established new task forces to work on public health promotion and disease prevention, clinical services, and administrative management. These changes, which have been institutionalized, aim to ensure that the *puskesmas* can deploy staff to serve the public at the right time with the right skills.

- **SIPS.** A new one-stop service (PTSP) work unit was established in Pinrang. This office issued 21,000 permits in 2016 and now provides services for 188 business and investment permits on behalf of 20 government offices. One result has been increased investment in the district, including for a new seaweed factory.

While some of these examples demonstrate the effectiveness of project interventions, it is important to determine – now and in the future – the extent to which these changes are codified, and whether they are being rolled out on a wider, more systematic basis. Part of that determination will likely depend on the existence of support systems within these institutions to maintain and expand the new practices that have been put in place. Such support could include technology, operational and management skills, and budgets to maintain the system going forward. The subsection below on changes in knowledge and skills addresses some of these issues.

Changes in knowledge and skills. All of the projects assessed provided capacity building in some form during implementation, through a combination of formal training courses, workshops, mentoring, and other mechanisms. The knowledge and skills accumulated by project counterparts and stakeholders have contributed to sustained changes. Below are examples of sustainability signs stemming directly from projects' capacity building interventions.

- **AIPD.** In Situbondo, East Java, AIPD staff trained BPKAD officials in how to implement financial accrual systems, as required by national policy. Following project completion, the provincial office provided regular mentoring to all 52 district offices to ensure staff know how to operate the new systems. As a result, all district offices now use the new system and practices, and are completing more on-time financial management.

- **ACCESS.** In Kupang, NTT, the project-initiated ROCCIPI (Rule, Opportunity, Capacity, Communication, Interest, Process, and Ideology) problem-solving methodology is routinely being implemented by village officials and cadres. For example, Dondes, a local CSO in Sumba Barat Daya that was supported by ACCESS, has been hired by the district government to tutor community officers in 75 villages on how to advocate to sub district and district agencies on issues related to village planning and budgeting.

- **AIPHSS.** In Sumba Barat Daya, the health college (Politeknik Kesehatan [Poltekkes]) is continuing the project-supported effort to increase midwivery staff qualifications from certificate-level to the equivalent of bachelor's degree, while also continuing to offer technical trainings. As a result, health center staff and midwives are viewed as more disciplined and professional, and more services are being provided to patients.

Sustainable Outputs vs. Outcomes

In general, the instances of sustainability found by the assessment team were predominantly signs of outputs – i.e., processes and results within government agencies or other partner institutions. There were few if any outcome-oriented signs, such as sustained improved services or lasting, measurable improvements in the lives of beneficiaries or in the performance of businesses.

Based on the review of project documents and informant interviews, the assessment team suggests two main reasons for this finding: 1) donors and project staff have designed their projects and set up their performance management systems to achieve and measure outputs far more than outcomes; and 2) insufficient time has passed since project completion to gauge whether public services or people's welfare have improved in areas supported by the assessed donor activities.

Question 2 Conclusions

- Donor-funded projects reviewed for this assessment have achieved a variety of sustainability impacts among government and nongovernment institutions and beneficiary groups.

- Internalization of project practices – *process sustainability* – was found in various degrees among assessed projects at the field level, including adoption, replication, modification, scaling up, and creation of new initiatives by government partners during and after project implementation. The extent to which such practices have been or will be codified within institutions, and the degree to which the institutions will have the necessary systems in place to support these practices on an ongoing basis is uncertain.

- Impacts of project initiatives – *results sustainability* – were found in new policy development, organizational changes, and increased capacity of partners due to transfered skills and knolwedge.

- Overall, sustainability signs were not widespread, and in some cases were fragile due to their dependence on local personnel, institutions, budget realities, and other factors.

- Project design and performance measurement efforts are focused on outputs (processes, results) more than outcomes (changes in the lives of beneficiaries or in the quality of services provided by counterparts). As such, it is difficult – and possibly too early – to gauge the outcome-level sustainability of the assessed projects.

Q3: FACTORS SUPPORTING AND INHIBITING SUSTAINABILITY: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

What factors led to the sustainability of project interventions? What factors inhibited sustainability?

In the course of identifying signs of sustainability from the eight projects – through reviewing reports and visiting selected sites – the assessment team examined what factors supported or led to these signs, and what factors inhibited them.

The team found five distinct sets of factors that led to – or increased the likelihood of – sustainability from the activities of the assessed projects. These factors were:

1. Commitment of local government and nongovernment leaders.
2. Alignment with national or local policy priorities and regulatory frameworks.
3. Stakeholder participation in project planning and implementation.
4. Counterpart funding support.
5. Implementing partner management.

Based on the team's analysis, the significance of each factor to the achievement of sustainable aspects of each donor activity varied based on project-specific conditions. That is, any of these factors could play the most influential role in creating sustainability in a given location or situation, but that same factor might be less important or even immaterial in another situation on another project. There was no single or smaller group of factors that seemed more likely to lead to sustainability, and thus this assessment does not rank these factors in terms of their importance. Our research indicates that this was due in large part to the unique nature of each project and its context – the counterparts, conditions, challenges, and collection of stakeholders that made up the environment in which each project operated.

The variability of these factors and their influences on sustainability are illustrated by the experiences in different districts supported by the Kinerja project. In Sambas, West Kalimantan, Kinerja-introduced practices in the health and education sectors remain in place, primarily because they coincided with the local government's bureaucratic reform efforts, and because of commitment by local leaders and strong engagement with local CSOs. In Jember, East Java, however, these practices have faded due to changes in local government leadership and shifts in implementation responsibilities. Meanwhile, in Makassar, Kinerja the practices are continuing thanks to their alignment with district priorities, the bupati's commitment to improving public service delivery, and the cohesive relationships among staff in district agencies, local offices, and delivery units.

Not surprisingly, given the variable conditions in each project and location, there are multiple examples of sustainable processes or impacts enabled by multiple factors. For example, in East Java and NTT a series of initiatives came together around the same time: *puskesmas* accreditation, local public service agency improvement, and new national health insurance (JKN) financing. All of these initiatives stemmed from national-level policies – one of the factors identified in this assessment. In addition, the development of a complaint handling process represents the engagement mechanism through which the centers now routinely receive and address issues raised by their customers. This sign of sustainable impact is seen in districts where Kinerja and other projects supported local service delivery and governance. The project's legacy is public providers understanding how best to deliver high-quality services to the public.

Another example of multiple factors converging is found in Luwu Utara District, South Sulawesi, where local leadership commitment, alignment with government policy priorities, and stakeholder participation combined to yield impacts sustained beyond the end of the Kinerja project. According to local officials, the shared commitment and understanding by the bupati, department office (*dinas*) heads, and service unit heads led to joint program planning, implementation, and evaluation, and these processes contributed to sustaining positive project results. Officials in Luwu Utara are empowered with the capacity and authority to make decisions and deploy resources. As a result, decrees, guidelines, and new SOPs supported or introduced by Kinerja have been internalized by district institutions such as schools and health centers. Overall, it seems that a change of mindset has taken place among district government stakeholders. Office heads interviewed for the assessment stated that their offices are now more efficient, transparent, and accountable.

Below we present more information about the identified factors, including examples of how they led to spects of sustainability from the assessed projects.

A. Individual Factors Supporting Sustainability

The factors listed above are split between those that were internal to a project – such as its approach, personnel, funding sources – and external factors such as the policy and legal environment, counterpart commitment and leadership, and the presence of post-project implementation agents.

These factors, singularly or in some combination, helped lead to processes of internalization or to impact results – i.e., the signs of sustainability identified in this assessment and described above under Question 2. Each factor supporting the sustainability of project results was manifested in different ways during implementation.

A1. Commitment of Local Government and Non-governmental Leaders

This factor refers to the attitudes and actions of individuals who hold positions of leadership or management authority within project counterpart or stakeholder institutions. They include *bupatis*, *dinas* office directors, members of parliament, frontline service heads, leaders of constituency or advocacy organizations, etc. Within the local government bureaucracy, these are upper and middle mananagement officials – often people with responsibility for functions such as strategic planning, resource allocation, and replication of adopted practices in other units, institutions, or districts.

These individuals have the ability to stimulate and drive organizations toward change. Their motivation and willingness to act can mean the difference between success or stagnation of a given initiative in which their institution plays a significant role.

Most projects depend on key people who are responsible for getting the heavy work done, including those in charge of particular aspects of a project, the people in charge of training, some facilitators, etc. These key staff can sometimes determine how successful a project is, or contribute to its failure. One of the traits of these key people is the ability to work independently. They tend to work better without micromanagers supervising them, and they show a strong will to be creative in their work.

In the context of the donor projects assessed, this factor's attributes, or modes of expression, included actions such as:

- Building strong relationships and confidence among implementing stakeholders.
- Directing organizations to revamp old systems and create new ones.
- Creating innovations or adopting practices from other places, and then internalizing them into their organizations' work routines.
- Translating commitment into strategies, plans, programs, and budget allocations.

Committed actors were found in all the assessed projects except ProRep. They tended to initiate reform and exert themselves, even in the absence of an enabling environment or supporting resources. They demonstrated how to achieve results, and "mainstreamed" those results into regulations, as well as in planning and budgeting systems for both the short and medium terms.

A typical example is Mr. Abustan, head of the Dinas Pendidikan in Barru, South Sulawesi, which was supported by the Kinerja project. Mr. Abustan initiated reform in the education sector and continues to advocate tirelessly for service delivery reform in education, focusing on schools and the policy for teacher distribution, an area where it was very difficult to implement reforms in the past. To improve governance in schools, he continues to adopt school-based management processes and other relevant interventions supported by Kinerja. A similar situation was found with the *bupati* of Luwu Utara, South Sulawesi, another Kinerja district.

Leaders can also articulate a vision for their organizations to achieve pre-defined standards. In Situbondo, East Java, with support from AIPHSS, two *puskesmas* directors led staff in preparing their organizations for changes related to accreditation and service standards, continuing project efforts to improve service delivery. The directors transformed the vision into actions, even with limited resources, ultimately achieving accreditation and becoming national models. Now, standardized rules apply in these centers, and the public has benefited from the new governance of service provision.

Similarly, a *puskesmas* director in Malang District, East Java was inspired by the boot camp program of Transformasi. He led the development of a new IT system to improve center governance and services, and later initiated a home care program for post-treatment patients. To realize these improvements, the director convinced his staff that organizational change was both needed and possible. Now patients are guided easily through the system to obtain services – from registration through treatment, data recording, and pharmacy services. Moreover, the home care initiative functions as a part of health promotion and disease prevention.

The *Dinas Kesehatan* in Probolinggo, East Java is continuing initiatives begun with assistance from Kinerja, pioneering new IT systems and addressing mental illness, HIV and AIDS prevention, and improved nutrition via natural supplements. Local officers say that these actions have been fueled by strong leadership from the *dinas* director who saw the potential for improving organizational performance.

In Pinrang, South Sulawesi, the bupati was committed to better service provision, and he worked extensively with SIPS to pilot an OSS program which continues today at the district and sub district levels. This bupati was recently awarded the Parasamya Purnakarya Nugraha award for 2017, given for excellence in local governance.

A2. Alignment with Policy Priorities and Regulatory Frameworks

This factor refers to the array of laws, regulations, procedures, and technical guidelines in place that potentially enable or facilitate processes of change targeted by donor projects, and to the stakeholders who continue effective processes after these projects end. It includes policies targeted for revision by the projects, or whose design or drafting were supported by donor activities. In many cases, this factor also encompasses local government enforcement or compliance with national policies or initiatives.

It is common for a project to be designed based on a new national policy. For example, once Law 22 and Law 25/1999 on decentralization were in place, donors and GOI designed numerous governance projects to address the emerging needs and to take advantage of opportunities to assist local government development. New or revised laws can provide a framework for donor assistance for their implementation, including the introduction of new knowledge or processes. At the local level, a donor might identify new laws or regulations and develop initiatives to support their execution. More often, new regulations are developed during project implementation. In these cases, it often becomes apparent that a law or regulation requires a new system, policy, or institution to ensure sustainability of project-supported outcomes.

All of the projects assessed here explicitly sought to achieve impacts targeted by laws and regulations issued from one or more GOI agencies. The role of the projects was to help local government to contextualize their actions within the overall governance system, and thereby secure desired resource allocations or institutional backing. Alignment with national policies or initiatives offered the additional advantage of potential widespread replication or scalng up of successful activities undertaken in initial districts.

One example is the new Government Accounting Standard (GAS) issued by the GOI in Jakarta. In East Java and NTT, AIPD assisted district governments to manage their finances and assets according

to the GAS. Because the GAS is still being used, the capacity support provided by AIPD is more likely to be sustained, as long as the knowledge, skills, and processes introduced by the project are internalized by the local governments with which it worked.

More generally, some regulatory frameworks have been created through cooperation of donor partners and civil society with GOI, leading to policies that enshrine project objectives. Kinerja worked on the business enabling environment in three provinces, focusing on business licensing simplification and OSS processes and governance. The initiative succeeded to the point where the local governments started using their own budgets to create and execute simplified business licensing processes. Indonesian CSOs then used these local experiences to advocate for national policies, resulting in Presidential Decree (Perpres) 98/2014 and Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation (Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri [Permendagri]) 83/2014 on Micro-Small Enterprises Business Licensing. The small bussiness licensing model is now used as a legal reference within the three provinces supported by Kinerja and by other districts around the country.

The timing of policy formulation and implementation is another important part of this enabling factor for sustainability. Local counterparts interviewed by the assessment team emphasized that many of the process internalization signs of sustainability for OSS (resulting from Transformasi and Kinerja activities) or public service standards (related to AIPHSS support), for example, stemmed from the alignment of district priorities with national policy agendas during the periods in question.

A3. Stakeholder Participation in Project Planning and Implementation

This factor refers to stakeholder participation in project planning and implementation, including routine coordination and feedback mechanisms. It boils down to effective engagement of project stakeholders on all sides. More specifically, these engagement mechanisms refer to the space and opportunity provided for local groups (government agencies, donors, CSOs, private companies, and citizens) to articulate and advocate for their interests, express their concerns, and conduct oversight of project activities. Engagement mechanisms under donor projects are primarily about stakeholder participation. Where this engagement occurred, results improved and there were more instances of sustained impacts. Interventions and approaches were more locally owned, and this was evident in many ways, including:

- Development of stakeholder forums to coordinate and share views, plans, and information among stakeholders.

- Establishment of user feedback mechanisms for public services.

These expressions of stakeholder engagement – e.g., coordination forums and feedback mechanisms – were employed by several projects, including ACCESS, AIPHSS, Kinerja, and Transformasi. Forums included both coordination bodies where implementing stakeholders (government agencies, CSOs, donors) deliberated development issues, as well as groupings involving a broader range of stakeholders (local parliaments, government units and service providers, mass media, CSOs, local leaders, private companies, and/or community members) where thematic or programmatic issues were addressed. These engagement mechanisms became important channels for policy formulation and implementation, helping to realize the sustained impacts of processes and results initiated through donor projects.

Representatives of half of the projects assessed mentioned the importance of having engagement mechanisms and working with both "demand-side" and the "supply side" stakeholders. This included both formal and informal forums. Due to the projects' efforts to increase and strengthen the oversight role of community groups, such as through multi-stakeholder forum (MSFs) or other forums, service quality improved in health, education, and business licensing, and improvements were found in procurement and village governance. However, civic engagement increased more and

was more sustainable in places where civil society was already active. For all of these reasons, stakeholder mapping is a critical step for donors and implementing partners to implement at the start of a project.

In Ngada and Sumba Barat Daya, NTT, ACCESS supported formation of a MSF that continues to operate today. This cross-sector platform at the district level generates dialogue on public aspirations and development issues, and relevant field information from across the district is shared. The MSF provides inputs to the local development planning process (called *musrenbang*) and advocates on issues that may not be included in official *musrenbang* procedures. Comprising representatives from cultural and religious groups, women's groups, the private sector, and government, a MSF can extend down to the village level. In 2014, advocacy by a MSF on human trafficking in Sumba Barat Daya led the bupati to issue a regulation on the subject. Health *dinas* officers in Ngada said they use a MSF to conduct participatory monitoring and evaluation in their programs.

In Lumajang, East Java, MSFs and citizen engagement processes initiated by AIPHSS are still active. In Makassar, South Sulawesi, MSF members visit local *puskesmas* on a regular basis to urge the centers to develop new ways to improve services. *Puskesmas* managers and local citizens have started to collect community inputs via phone text messages (SMS) and regularly discuss the issues raised by the public to see how they can be addressed. The center directors have full confidence in the capabilities of the citizen cadres and in the support from the community networks. AIPHSS created a channel for public involvement and it has become a part of the permanent public accountability system in the project districts.

A4. Counterpart Funding Support

This factor refers to the use of co-funding, cost sharing, or post-project financing mechanisms agreed between donors and GOI counterparts for implementation of the activities reviewed for this assessment. It can also refer to the ways in which donors or projects themselves released funds for sequential tranches of assistance. It encompasses cost sharing, cost contributions, and other forms of in-kind or direct support.

Funding for the eight projects and for selected follow-on activities generally fell into one of three categories: 1) full donor financing for all activities and associated costs; 2) co-financing, wherein a partnership was executed between the donor and GOI entity; and 3) post-project counterpart financing, wherein the GOI counterpart paid for the continuation of donor-funded activities after the project ended, based on evidence of effectiveness and alignment with GOI priorities. The assessment team found that certain funding approaches – in particular, the second and third schemes described above – appeared to provide greater potential for sustainability. For example, ACCESS and Kinerja used co-funding mechanisms, which formed the basis for replication of effective project-supported approaches. There was less evidence of project practices being continued that had been fully funded by the donor projects (e.g., ProRep and AIPD).

While the causal relationship suggested above cannot be proven through this assessment, the three projects (ACCESS, Kinerja and AIPHSS' frontline services) that involved either co-funding or post-project financing reportedly enjoyed a greater degree of counterpart engagement and ownership, and government partners usually played a more active role in decision-making during and after implementation. Local government partners contributed to and are now continuing practices using their own funds; for example, improved PTSP practices in Lumajang and Luwu Utara initially supported by Kinerja, and village planning and budgeting practices in four NTT districts previously supported by ACCESS.

Different types of cost-sharing included:

- Cash contributions by counterparts or third parties.

- In-kind contributions in the form of real property, equipment, supplies, other expendable property, or services that benefitted the project and its activities.

As found in this assessment, local governments are often willing to provide in-kind contributions, including allocating funds in annual budgets that complement donor funding. Whatever level of funding or in-kind resources are committed, cost sharing is an indicator that the local government has bought into the objectives of the project, and the probability that the local government will cover future costs after the project ends are higher.

A5. Implementing Partner Management

This factor includes management functions of implementing partners such as field staff relationships with counterparts; close proximity to partners; and use of local organizations and expertise, including technical service providers (TSPs) as implementation subcontractors. TSPs refer to entities that work with or for donor projects to provide technical services. Such entities can also continue providing services for local counterparts and stakeholders after projects end. Across the reviewed projects, these TSPs included CSOs, academic institutions, and individual technical experts (consultants). TSPs often act as partners for local governments and communities in activity implementation, and can build capacity and advocate for use of project-supported methodologies or tools. Working through – and thereby empowering – these local service providers yields additional benefits as the TSPs can help local governments pursue their reform agendas over the long term.

For example, the assessment found that CSOs in NTT have lower levels of skill and knowledge compared to other regions, and lower levels than what are deemed necessary to execute their activities optimally. For this reason, AIPD relied on CSOs from outside that province to work with government counterparts on technical issues. In another case, the ACCESS project had success in strengthening local CSOs in NTT to work on community empowerment and civil society engagement, and as a result the CSOs had sufficient capacity to complete the work required in these areas. These local NGOs became ACCESS partners, and they are currently also viewed as partners by the communities that are continuing project-initiated activities such as village budget planning.

Lasting Impact of SIPS, Based on Multiple Supporting Factors

South Sulawesi ranked low in the 2009-2010 Integrity Survey by Indonesia's Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi [KPK]) due to poor levels of governance and public sector accountability. KPK and the Canadian International Development Agency selected the province for SIPS (Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi), and one of the districts targeted for assistance was Pinrang. SIPS provided financial support, training, and capacity building, combining project and KPK resources to build local government capacity.

KPK worked closely with various Pinrang government units to: simplify the processes for issuing permits, seeking more of a "one-roof" approach through its One Stop Service (OSS) center; use technology for electronic auctions (e-procurement); and make the local bureaucracy's attitude more client-oriented when providing services. Today, the Pinrang OSS continues to serve the public more efficiently than before, following the procedures established under SIPS.

This impact is an example of the factors of sustainability already described: committed counterpart leaders and middle management staff; stakeholder participation in project planning and implementation; and alignment with government policy priorities. In addition, there was relatively high capacity among staff in the KPK, SIPS' prime counterpart.

Unlike the national counterpart ministries involved in the other assessed projects, KPK had no branches at the local level, and so KPK built close relationships with local governments involved in SIPS project activities in 10 districts in the provinces of North Sulawesi and South Sulawesi. With support from SIPS, KPK assisted these local governments with provision of three services: e-procurement, OSS, and population data administration. KPK performed a dual role in SIPS – as national counterpart and co-implementing partner.

Consistent with this expanded role in project administration and implementation, KPK also played a major role in project design and strategic planning, including devising annual work plans. KPK selected SIPS target districts, drawing on the data in its own Public Sector Integrity Index to identify the best locations for interventions.

The South Sulawesi OSS system still operates in all 10 participating districts and is being upgraded to meet national compliance requirements, including for e-procurement and population administration services. Following this successful experience, KPK has disseminated the story and details of the Pinrang pilot. As a result, other district governments in Sulawesi and elsewhere have followed suit. In addition, the Pinrang Bappeda has been involved in continuing SIPS initiatives after the project ended. In March 2017, South Sulawesi Province received the highest score of any province in the national KPK Integrity Index.

B. Factors Inhibiting Sustainability

Inhibiting factors suppress or restrain process that enable sustainability, in many cases because they decrease, limit, or block the actions or functions of a project. In the field, inhibiting factors take various forms, and the assessment team identified five related to the projects reviewed:

1. Politically influenced stakeholders.
2. Absence of a forward strategy or capacity transfer plan.
3. Limited involvement of project partners.
4. Reliance on donor support.
5. Lack of capacity, support, or initiative from mid-level bureaucrats.

B1. Politically Influenced Stakeholders

This inhibiting factor refers to project implementation environments with highly politically influenced counterparts or stakeholders, resulting in less certainty of support or counterproductive motivations among those partners. For example, unlike the other projects assessed, USAID's ProRep worked with Indonesia's national Parliament (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat [DPR]), CSOs, and policy think tanks. Controlled largely by the interests of national political parties, the DPR's actions were often well beyond the influence of the project and its interventions. The project's room to maneuver was limited, relying as it did on the political mood of the legislature and its constituent parties. In addition, unlike national and local executive agencies, however, the DPR and other ProRep counterparts lack the authority, funds, and organizational and human resources that other project counterparts possess. While important results were achieved by ProRep, it was hard to find signs of sustainability in the ongoing efforts of the DPR.

B2. Absence of a Forward Strategy or Capacity Transfer Plan

This factor refers to the absence of dedicated project strategies to transfer capacities and practices to local stakeholders, in particular to address the shifting authorities and high staff turnover of local government counterparts. Leadership and commitment from counterparts have been demonstrated as important factors in increasing the likelihood of sustainable project impacts. These factors cannot stand alone, however; a project's successful approaches must be incorporated into specific plans to transfer the necessary capacity and facilities required to continue them in the future. These approaches should also become part of the partner organization's strategy – particularly if they entail changes in established work procedures and resource (budget) allocation.

The Development Data Center (Pusat Data Pembangunan) in Situbondo, East Java, established with AIPD assistance, is an example of how the absence of these steps held back potential sustainability. The project's stakeholders were aware of the importance and utility of the Data Center, and AIPD supported its construction, which the counterpart also backed. The Center was to be managed by Bappeda, but there was no strategy or detailed plan that addressed the transfer of authority. As a result, when the data center was handed over to Bappeda's Information Center Unit, there was no program initiative ready to demonstrate or take advantage of the functions of the center. As a result, the potential benefits were not sustained to the degree hoped for by the project.

In addition, informants in many districts noted the negative impact on potential sustainability caused by frequent staff rotations and retirements in government offices – i.e., in project counterpart agencies. This high rate of turnover, which often affects project leaders and champions, significantly impacts the retained capacity of project partners following even the most successful interventions. It remains a major challenge for achieving sustainable impacts for projects in governance reform, decentralization, and other areas.

B3. Limited Involvement of Project Partners

The factors identified as supporting sustainability demonstrate that meaningful engagement of key partners and stakeholders is crucial for a project to succeed and sustain its impacts. This positive correlation is even stronger if partners are involved starting from the project design phase. It is at this point that counterparts become more equal partners and as a result are generally more active during the subsequent planning and execution phases. Selecting the most appropriate partners is also important; partners should have authority and influence over the issues being addressed by the project. Conversely, if a project's key partners withdraw or are less involved in planning and implementation, the chances are lower that effective practices will continue after the project ends. This inhibiting factor applies in situations where there is limited involvement of partners in planning or executing project interventions, leading to less certainty or willingness to carry on useful – but complex or expensive – approaches post-project.

An example can be seen from PGSP's work in Gorontalo. The project introduced a fiscal management tool called Pro-Poor Planning, Budgeting, and Monitoring (P3BM) to help local government staff better allocate resources, direct activities, and oversee their programs. While different agencies are responsible for the planning, budgeting, and monitoring functions, PGSP worked mainly with the planning agency Bappeda. As a result, while the introduction of P3BM was successful, the tool is no longer being used by other agencies in charge of local financial management and oversight.

B4. Reliance on Donor Support

Not surprisingly, the team found less probability of achieving sustainability in situations where local counterparts were highly dependent on donor support for funding, decision-making, and the implementation and management of project interventions. Dependency can also extend beyond these aspects to include needed institutional capacity and technologies.

In cases where this dependency was significant, activities were often discontinued once donor support ended. This phenomonen was evident in the case of District Health Accounts (DHAs), which were to be institutionalized in districts of East Java and NTT through AIPD. The project had conducted a series of studies on DHAs in targeted districts, but the sudden cessation of funding from DFAT in the middle of the project period led to the DHA work being discontinued before those studies could be translated into workable policies and practices for local governments. Thus, even though there was a ministerial decree backing up DHAs (Kep. MenKes 922/2008), little is seen or heard about ongoing implementation of DHA since the donor funds were cut off.

B5. Lack of Support, Capacity, or Initiative from Mid-level Bureaucracy

As noted above, support from counterpart leaders ideally needs to be supplemented by the readiness of mid-level staff if project-supported approaches are to be internalized as agency practices. Such mid-level bureaucrats are the ones who put technical programs into action. Thus, their support and capacity to do that are important factors in determining the likelihood of process sustainability.

In short, internalization and incorporation require support from and capacity for middle managers, and thus sustainability will be inhibited by the lack of capacity, support, or initiative from these bureaucrats. Sustainability may also be hindered by a lack of authority or political support for mid-level officials who are innovators but do not control agency resources. The frequent rotation of civil servants out of target districts and agencies can exacerbate the impacts of this inhibiting factor.

In Sekadau district, West Kalimantan, the assessment team found fewer services and fading quality of those services in health centers because middle-management staff were not given support or encouragement to continue the practices introduced under Kinerja. Similarly, in Puskesmas Kepanjen, Malang, the director of the center initiated a process of inputting health data collected in the field onto a server at the center. This innovation enabled centralized analysis as well as programmatic follow-up back in the field, and the new approach attracted attention and support from the Malang government. However, the envisioned scaling up did not take place because the relevant agencies (e.g., District Health Office) did not make the practical investment to either upgrade the existing server or purchase a newer version.

Question 3 Conclusions

- There were a variety of different – and in some cases, related – factors that led to or inhibited aspects of sustainability from the assessed donor projects.

- Many of those factors boil down to the nature of counterpart agencies, the resources available to them, and their bureaucratic systems.

- The variety and balanced frequency of factors identified suggests that they were all important in their situations and local contexts. It was not possible to rank the importance of each factor, due to this finding and to data limitations. In addition, many of the sustained impacts identified by the assessment were the result of multiple factors. That said, it was generally found that the most effective way to ensure continuation of innovations post-project is to work through local government structures.

III.   LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Question 4 of the Assessment SOW asks: "How can USAID and other donors best use lessons from assessed projects in rolling out or encouraging sustainability aspects in their current and future portfolios?"

This section presents lessons and recommendations stemming from the findings and analysis detailed above. The purpose is to inform the design and implementation of future donor-funded projects supporting governance reform and decentralization in Indonesia, with an eye toward ensuring sustainability of project benefits.

In essence, the recommendations listed below offer a menu of next steps that could be taken by USAID, other members of the DPWGD, and the GOI to achieve and demonstrate a greater degree of sustainable impacts and outcomes from development programs.

Donors should incorporate sustainability strategies in project designs and execute them during implementation. The existence – or lack – of explicit sustainability targets and detailed sustainability plans did not necessarily impact the extent of initial sustainability signs from the assessed projects. That said, there were some common signs of sustainability found, and common factors that led to those lasting impacts.

Sustainability strategies should include specific approaches to minimize the influence of factors that inhibit the likelihood of achieving sustainability, as described above under Question 3. Suggested steps should include the following:

- Involve partners in the program design and implementation phases, including joint M&E, to align needs, priorities, and the project structure.
- Plan deliberate, detailed efforts for adoption or replication of project processes and practices with partners and stakeholders, including SOPs for particularly effective approaches. Clarify roles and responsibilities, and build in ways to address needed capacity.

A plan or strategy by itself is not sufficient. Such plans and strategies must be carefully thought out and then followed up.

Projects should include exit strategies. Exit strategies should clearly lay out the responsibilities of the project team, the donor, and the counterparts and other stakeholders over the final year of the project and for the years after completion. Who will be responsible for design, implementation, funding, and management of programs in the future? Such exit strategies can – and ideally would – be created earlier than the final year of project implementation, but should be ready at least by that point. Project staff should plan deliberate, detailed efforts for adoption or replication of project

approaches and practices together with partners and other stakeholders, including SOPs for particularly effective processes. Roles and responsibilities should be clarified, as well as ways to address needed capacity.

Projects should establish measurable indicators to monitor progress towards sustainability goals. Establishing sustainability indicators at the onset of a project helps focus all parties on achieving long-term, sustainable results. By monitoring progress against these indicators, the project has a constant view of where it stands vis-à-vis those goals. Moreover, this performance measurement – and management – system should be put in place as soon as the project goals, objectives, and implementation plans have been developed. M&E personnel – from the donor as well as counterpart entities – should be thoroughly involved in program planning, and should provide input to management on program direction. Either quantitative or qualitative indicators can be used, depending on the nature of project interventions and the availability and reliability of data.

Since achieving sustainability goals requires a partnership, these indicators should be discussed periodically between GOI and project and donor representatives to ensure that sustainability as a concept receives ongoing attention. In this way, projects implementers and funders can make adjustments during implementation.

The desired degree of sustainability should inform project timeframes. In determining the timing and duration of the projects they fund, donors should allow sufficient time for the planned approaches to be adopted by partners and for achieving sufficient traction for process (internalization) and results (impacts) sustainability to take place. In general, projects require a minimum of three years, and ideally longer. This is particularly important for projects seeking to achieve or lay the groundwork for scaling up of initiatives or approaches by their partners.

Donors should involve prospective government partners in project design. Donors should engage likely counterpart agencies in planning, design, and budgeting of new projects, at both national and local levels. This should continue during implementation, including cooperation on project strategies and plans, on execution and oversight, and on exit and sustainability strategies. Discussions on an exit strategy is recommended even during the mid-project period, in order to clarity roles and plans for transition. Partner involvement in all of these program phases provides an advantage as the process positions government counterparts as active partners, builds their sense of ownership, and prepares them to engage in the program. In addition, establishing performance targets and M&E approaches will align desired outcomes and more clearly define sustainability for all involved.

Projects should maximize their alignment with local counterpart priorities and structures. The most effective way to ensure continuation of innovations post-project is to work through local government institutional structures. The utility of this approach was clearly demonstrated by several assessed projects, including Kinerja, SIPS, and AIPHSS. A related point is that cost-share partners should be identified at the proposal stage and cost-sharing arrangements made with the local government from the start.

Projects should invest in building the capacity of local technical service providers, particularly in underdeveloped regions. A systematic approach to strengthen CSOs and other non-government institutions to engage with local government agencies on programmatic matters would significantly increase the impacts of the projects, and would better prepare local stakeholders to continue useful interventions post-project. Systematic capacity building could be provided through trainings or mentoring on technical topics, and should be addressed in project designs.

Donors should conduct post-project follow-up visits to former project areas. Over the course of a project, donor-partner relationships grow significantly in terms of mutual understanding, trust, and comfort, and as a result the effectiveness of interventions increases. These relationships are themselves avenues for enabling development and improvement among local counterparts, and

as such they are considered extremely important to the future of the institutions and people touched by the project. In most cases, however, these connections between donors and partners cease once the project is completed. This is one reason it is especially important to measure long-term sustainability and sustained outcomes as opposed to outputs.

There is an important opportunity in Indonesia for donors to show their understanding of and concern for their local partners by making planned, routine visits to project areas no longer receiving donor support. Such visits – perhaps on anniversary dates of project initiation or completion – would maintain relationships developed during implementation and, more importantly, would provide motivation and encouragement to the people and former partner agencies/organizations working to continue effective practices and overcome the numerous obstacles to achieving sustainability.

USAID/INDONESIA

SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT OF THE KINERJA PUBLIC SERVICE DELIVERY PROGRAM IN INDONESIA

DECEMBER 2017

FRANK FEULNER AND LUTHFI ASHARI

USAID/Indonesia

Sustainability Assessment of the KINERJA Public Service Delivery Program in Indonesia

Frank Feulner and Luthfi Ashari

Contents

I. BACKGROUND

For over twenty years, USAID Indonesia has been providing technical assistance to the Government of Indonesia (GOI) through various programs. The support has been provided both to central and local government. In decentralized Indonesia, USAID has been addressing the needs of local governments by improving capacities to execute greater authorities. The KINERJA Program was one of USAID's flagship local governance programs to support the decentralization in Indonesia. The program supported the democratic processes in local governance, as well as building capacity for public service delivery, particularly in basic services of health, education and business licensing.

Although some evaluations[11] have been conducted to assess the performance and impact of the program, sustainability remained an unanswered question. After years of support and working with local government partners, USAID has been keen to learn more about the project's sustainability. Apparently, this question regarding to sustainability is not only of interest to USAID, but for other donor as well. Therefore, to answer the sustainability questions, the USAID Office of Democracy, Rights and Governance (DRG) conducted an in-house assessment to look at the factors enabling and hindering sustainability.

The KINERJA Program took place over the duration of six years (2010-2016) and was implemented in seven provinces and 24 districts and cities. This in-house USAID assessment was conducted by DRG Office during period of April to September 2017. Purpose of the assessment was to identify factors that contribute to sustainability of the project. In this assessment sustainability is defined as the adoption of project innovations, project impact and internalization of project's best practices. The assessment also looked at the contributions by the GOI, both at national and local level, to ensure project sustainability.

Overall, the KINERJA Program took place in 5 provinces and 24 districts/cities throughout Indonesia. For the assessment, the team re-visited 12 districts/ cities in three provinces[12] covering initial target and replication partner districts of the KINERJA Program. In each district consultations were conducted with relevant stakeholders to collect insights, knowledge and experience with KINERJA Program. The stakeholders in this assessment included policy makers (Bupati, Sekretaris Daerah), mid-level bureaucrats (Head of Dinas, Dinas Staff), providers of frontline service delivery (Head of Puskesmas, School Principal), and CSOs. Where possible and available, in each district, the assessment team also met with former KINERJA staff.

To ensure the collection of quality data representing KINERJA Program characteristics, the assessment team applied certain criterion for selecting the districts to be visited. The criterion consists of mix of the following aspects: a) the combination of different project target areas (health, education and one stop services); b) the performance of district partners during KINERJA, and; c) geographical distribution (Java vs. non-Java).

---

[11] Several assessments and evaluations of KINERJA were conducted, including "Impact evaluation of USAID/Indonesia's Kinerja program", https://dec.usaid.gov/; and Jana C. Hertz: "Social Accountability in Cross-Sectoral Service Delivery: The Kinerja Public Service Delivery Program in Indonesia", in: Anna Wetterberg, Derick W. Brinkerhoff, Jana C. Hertz (eds.), Governance and Service Delivery, Practical Applications of Social Accountability Across Sectors, RTI Press, 2016.
[12] The districts are: Probolinggo, Lumajang, Jember, Pacitan (East Java Province), Sekadau, Bengkayang, Sambas, Kubu Raya (West Kalimantan Province), Barru, Makassar, Luwu and Luwu Utara (South Sulawesi Province).

II. ASSESSMENT

The following section provides a summary of the assessment conducted in the various districts and cities within the three provinces of East Java, West Kalimantan and South Sulawesi.

1. EAST JAVA

a) Probolinggo District

Probolinggo participated in KINERJA first with its one-stop service center for business licensing and then also with its health sector. The assessment team observed that besides official priorities in the health sector, additional "push factors" are needed to complete the legal framework, and to move forward to the next programs. The district has a large population with substantial service needs. Over time, the participatory planning process (*Musrenbang*) in Probolinggo has evolved from an initial formality to become an important link between the needs of the citizens and the local government.

Health service delivery in the district has greatly improved over the past years and Probolinggo received a national innovation award for its efforts and was also invited to share its experience at a global forum in Illinois, USA. The Health Office continues to pioneer new programs, like usage of IT, addressing mental illness, HIV Aids, Moringa Leaves (*daun kelor*) natural nutrition supplement.

Since the upgrading of the frontline service office from *kantor* to *dinas*, general service delivery and permit issuance is moving swiftly towards the one-roof service. Planning and management in the district is improving steadily.

Political commitment during the KINERJA project implementation has been very strong. The Bupati has a strong focus and mission dedicated to health services. The local government set aside a budget for supporting replication throughout the health network. The political leadership is also displaying an urge to learn more about service delivery. Members of the local government mentioned that service and development issues are also shared in an informal way outside the office. In the health sector, there exist links to other districts like Ngawi, in the permit office, there exist links to Bandung and Surabaya.

Sustainability of service delivery improvement and governance reforms in Probolinggo has been supported by a number of champions in strategic positions during KINERJA implementation. The Head of the Health Office has established a good relationship with the various heads of the health centers in the district. Health center heads commented very positively on the support they have been receiving by the Health Office. In addition, it was observed that many office head positions, like the Regional Secretary, Head of Bappeda, Head of the Health Office, Head of the Communication and Information Office were filled with highly experienced technical staff ("right person in the right position"). The Head of the Health Office spoke of a "thirst for innovation" in Probolinggo district.

The enabling legal framework for service delivery in the health and business licensing sectors has continuously evolved over the past years. Bupati decrees and regulations were passed to support the reform and innovation drive of the district. A budget has been allocated to support replication throughout the health network. According to the local government, this resulted in a steady improvement of the district in national rankings. Equally, the enforcement of national policies has been visible in the health sector, where the requirement to accredit health center to receive continues funding is providing a strong incentive to guarantee services at a high standard.

Citizen and civil society engagement in Probolinggo District is manifested by a strong CSO/NGO presence. After initial confusion about the purpose and usefulness of multi-stakeholder forums such forums have now been replicated from initially 3 to 33 Health Centers. The management model of Probolinggo's Health Centers with greatly reduced waiting times was showcased at the 2017 Regional Autonomy Fair in Sidoarjo.

b) Probolinggo District

Lumajang District in East Java participated in KINERJA as a Replication District focusing on the health sector. After the ending of the USAID funding, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) has continued to fund the activities at the Health Centers. Overall, the sustainability assessment showed that some impact of the innovations adopted can still be felt. However, internalization of practices remains low. The reasons for the slow internalization are mainly due to the rotation and promotion of civil servants. Until the closure of KINERJA, no other service areas were added to the health sector.

The assessment team had meetings at the district Health Office and the Health Center of Tempeh. It appeared that the Head of the Health Office is actively backing-up the various Health Centers in this district. The empowered Health Centers are keen to find out the needs of the citizens in order to deliver improved services to patients. As suggested by the active multi-stakeholder forum, to the initially two Health Centers funded by USAID, another two Health Centers were added under ADB support, and an additional two were funded by the local budget. KINERJA innovations like surveys and the multi-stakeholder forums are still in place.

It was assessed that the commitment by the political leadership and the vision of Lumajang did not play a very strong role for improving the service delivery and health services.

Despite the less visible political commitment in the district, there are nonetheless visible champions. Foremost the Head of the Health Office, the civil servants in the Health Office, and the Heads of the Health Centers visited by the team were championing reform. For these champions, the KINERJA project came at the right time and the successes led to a replication in another four locations. Servants in the Health Office confirmed that there has been a lot of evidence of the successful reforms conducted in the sector. The Head of the Health Office in Lumajang has extensive technical and managerial knowledge due to her experience as a former Head of a hospital.

The regulatory framework in Lumajang in the health sector is based on a Bupati regulation on safe breastfeeding, with a second Bupati regulation on exclusive breast feeding currently being drafted. The local legislature is not deliberating any local regulations (Perda) on health and the legal framework remains executive-driven. So far, the Health Centers did not develop any SoPs or service commitment statements (janji layanan). However, the pressure and enforcement of national policies, like the need for accreditation, is a decisive factor for the realization of improvements in health service delivery.

With multi-stakeholder forums still in place, continues citizen engagement is taking place in Lumajang District. The forums have regular meetings with the health centers and are also continuing to conduct patient complaint surveys. The NGO to be a known player in the health sector of the district is "Lumajang Sehat".

c) Jember District

Jember District is another example of how a continued political commitment from district leadership is a key factor to sustainability. When KINERJA commenced in Jember District in 2014, the district experienced a leadership vacuum, as the Bupati faced corruption charges. However, due to the existence of champions at Dinas/ Bappeda level, KINERJA continued to receive adequate support for its implementation ensuring smooth activities at the Puskesmas and School level. In fact some partner schools and Puskesmas improved their management and received awards from the district on various themes.

For Jember District, KINERJA provided support in the Health and Education sectors. In Health, KINERJA partnered with 3 Puskesmas to implement the following interventions: complaint survey, Minimum Service Standard-based planning and budgeting, and SOP for services. Meanwhile for education, KINERJA provided support to School Based Management in three schools. KINERJA also improved citizen engagement through MSF, both at service delivery and district levels.

Relying on support from Dinas/ Bappeda, the project run well and has made some improvement. The presence of champion at middle management has boosted the service delivery units in making

improvements. The district allocated funds to replicate the innovations to all schools and Puskesmas Sidorukun. MSF also actively participated in oversight for service improvement. With KINERJA support, one of the partner school (SDN Semboro) achieved an improved school management: transparency of school budget, improved school planning, engaged citizen in school management, and introduction of innovation at school. Meanwhile, Puskesmas also demonstrated some positive impacts including improved services and satisfied patients, and a lower mortality rate for mothers and infants.

Unfortunately, after KINERJA completed, almost all of the interventions could not be sustained. When the assessment team visited the schools and Puskesmas, most of the interventions were no longer implemented and adopted. The Puskesmas does not continue the complaint survey and the suggestion box is not functioning. Interestingly, the Puskesmas is in the process for accreditation. A similar situation was encountered at schools: the school budget is no longer published, planning and budgeting returned to its previous stage, and a lack of participation from the school committee is evident.

Interviews revealed a lack of commitment from the district leadership to adopt and replicate, erased almost all positive achievements and positive impacts at service delivery units. When KINERJA finished and Pak Aries, the main champion who was the Unit Head in Bappeda with a good relationship to the Bupati, was moved to another Dinas, he was not replaced and nobody continued to monitor the sustainability of good practices. As a result, some good practices stopped.

d) Pacitan District

Pacitan in East Java is another replication district of the KINERJA project. The district participated with education and health sectors and a number of innovations have been introduced. The political leadership of the district is committed to service delivery with a particular focus on education and health. Innovation is being seen as a driver of development and the leadership has been looking for new issues and needs than be addressed by innovative practices, like for example HIV Aids and how social stigmatization can be reduced.

In the health sector, Pacitan participated in KINERJA with three Health Centers out of 24 Health Centers district-wide. The assessment team visited the Health Center in Bubakan that for many years has received support (CARE, PACT, USAID). The team remarked the commitment by the head of the Health Centers to take on results of patient satisfaction surveys, in order to adjust the center's service commitments. Every second month, the Health Center is calling coordination meetings with the Health Office and members of the multi-stakeholder forum. After USAID funding ended, the district added another two Health Centers with funding of the innovative practices through the local budget.

In the education sector, Pacitan participated with five schools in KINERJA. The sustainability assessment team visited the primary school SD Kebonagung. Even though school heads were rotating since the closure of KINERJA, the innovations related to school-based management that were introduced under the program have continued to be implemented, including regular meetings with parents. Teachers remarked the increased performance of pupils in the past years. Since the ending of funding by USAID, another 14 schools and their management are now supported by the Asian Development Bank (ADB).

Political commitment during the KINERJA project implementation has been very strong. The Bupati and Wakil Bupati are committed to reform within the education and health sectors. Pacitan district has translated this commitment into a clear vision and development plan focusing on education and health. According to analysis conducted by the local government, improvements in these sectors also have a positive impact on other sectors, like the local economy and agriculture. Subsequently, this commitment is shared by the various local government offices, suggesting a sound translation of the district's mission and vision to the portfolios of those offices. The knowledgeable and experienced office heads were eager to discuss sustainability aspects and displaying the internalization of practices.

The Office Heads are also acting as champions within their respective sectors. There has been no fear that a change or rotation of civil servants will result in negative impacts on service delivery. Even the rotation of school heads did not impact negatively on the sustainability of the reforms in school management. This shows a high degree of internalization of practices.

The enabling legal framework for the education and health sectors is based on Bupati decrees. According to the stakeholders from local government, the development focus in these sectors has been part of a comprehensive development plan for Pacitan that has been developed by the district planning office BAPPEDA. This plan also resulted in implementing decisions (SK Bupati) on human resource management and reform in the district.

The active multi-stakeholder forums in Pacitan are testimony of the ongoing citizen and civil society engagement. There are regular meetings of these forums with the Health Centers and regular engagements of school committees with school management boards to suggest bottom-up improvements.

2. WEST KALIMANTAN

a) Sekadau District

In Sekadau District, KINERJA supported the health and education sectors during 2011 to 2014. Three Puskesmas and three schools received assistance from KINERJA. The assessment team met with champions at the Puskesmas and still saw remnants of innovations introduced under KINERJA. However, despite the existence of champions and remnants of impact, the assessment team concluded that sustainability of KINERJA is low in Sekadau District. One reason is the lack of political commitment from the District Government to continue the interventions. The assessment team identified political commitment and the presence of champions as two key factors that contribute to KINERJA to have an impact.

During the interviews and field visits conducted, both, Bappeda and Health Office staff demonstrated their ability to explain the history and interventions provided by KINERJA. According to them, one of KINERJA main contribution was that the project helped to change the mindset of staff in providing services –from doing business as usual to conscious service provision.

The discussion with CSOs and champions revealed how district stakeholders appreciated support provided by KINERJA. Stakeholders believed that KINERJA brought improvement to service delivery through improved SOPs, more engaged citizens to Puskesmas, more attention by the Dinas Kesehatan to Puskesmas. Accordingly, the three Puskesmas that had partnered with KINERJA performed much better, compared to those who did not participate in the project.

However, during the assessment it also emerged that some innovations that had been introduced by KINERJA to improve quality of services were no longer continued by the Puskesmas. Despite the fact that the Puskemas is still using the SOPs and suggestion box, complaint surveys are no longer conducted. After KINERJA ended, some interventions stopped and there is no additional support and willingness from the Bupati to continue or allocate funding. Some champions at the middle staff level still working in the sector have ended good practices at Puskesmas because of the lack of encouragement or appreciation from their leadership.

b) Sambas District

Sambas District participated in KINERJA both with its health sector and education sector. The project included six health centers in 2012. By 2015, 24 health centers throughout the district replicated the experiences supported by district funds allocated to them. Overall success of the KINERJA project in Sambas and the sustainability of results have been due to a coinciding of the project with a local government drive on bureaucratic reform. Sambas District has previously won an innovation award. Since the closure of KINERJA, Sambas elected a new District Head. The political leadership is convinced that there is always need for change and that assistance can always be helpful to achieve change.

During the assessment of sustainability in the health sector, the team encountered that there have been positive improvements at the various health centers. Patient numbers particularly at the health centers close to town have been up. In rural areas close to the forest, the patient number stagnate at a low level mainly due to the low acceptance of the western-style health system that is seen not compatible to traditional believe systems by the local Dayak population. The physical outlook of health centers has improved, reception counters and treatment facilities have been upgraded, including new ambulances, and better opening hours and management of the facilities. The patient data however, is not yet managed by IT. Another innovation in Sambas is the fact that the Health Centers that committed themselves to service delivery ("janji layanan") will be turned into region-owned enterprises (PLOD).

Political commitment during the KINERJA project implementation has been strong. The former Bupati, Regional Secretary and Office Heads worked together well and followed a clear mission dedicated to health and education services as well as to push for bureaucratic reform. The Bupati's commitment to the health sector derived also from the fact that holds a medical decree. The district's target is to allocate 25% of its budget to education and a minimum of 10% to health.

Sustainability of service delivery improvement and governance reforms in Sambas has been supported by a number of champions in strategic positions during KINERJA implementation. The Head of the Health Office has established a good relationship with the various heads of the health centers in the district. Health center heads commented very positively on the support they are receiving by the Health Office. The former Regional Secretary (Sekda) has been a strong advocate of reform and actively backed the policies of the Bupati.

The enabling legal framework for service delivery in the health and education sectors has continuously evolved over the past years. For example the Bupati Decree on Mother and Child Health (on KIA) has been transformed into a Local Regulation (on KIPLA) passed by the local legislature. Enforcement of national policies has been visible in the health sector, where the requirement to accredit health center to receive continues funding is providing a strong incentive to guarantee services at a high standard.

Citizen and civil society engagement in Sambas is manifested by a strong CSO/NGO presence in the district. A monthly tabloid (Suara Warga) reports on activities in Sambas and the access to information from the local government has been reported good. Since 2017, citizen journalists are streaming news and information via the internet. The multi-stakeholder forum in the health sector continues to be active, with the former Bupati being an active champion and chair of the forum.

c) Bengkayang District

During the assistance period, KINERJA provided various types of support to Bengkayang District, including on health governance to Puskesmas, School Based Management, Citizen Journalism, and MSF revitalization. The support provided were standard packages selected by the district government based on their priorities. The KINERJA Program partnered with three Puskesmas, three elementary schools and one junior high school.

Overall the assessment team found that Bengkayang District is lacking political commitment to adopt bureaucratic reform for public services. Champions were mainly found at working units' level where some of them are continuing to adopt best practices for service delivery reform. However, due to the lack of political commitment and support from policy makers and district office heads, innovations introduced under KINERJA remained unsustainable. The political environment does not favor citizen engagement for service delivery oversight.

The lack of political commitment has been identified previously in KINERJA Program Implementation Reports. Top leadership and middle management do not seem to have a good understanding of the supports provided by KINERJA and were less enthusiastic to support KINERJA. During the assessment visit, the Bupati and key working partners were not available to for meetings. When the assessment team met with relevant working units that used to partner with the KINERJA Program, they showed a poor understanding and recollection about support to service reform.

Box 2: Pak Yusman - A Teacher that Strengthens School Accountability

Pak Yusman, a 56 year old teacher, is the prime example of a reform champion in one of the elementary schools in Bengkayang District of West Kalimantan. He has been serving as teacher for more than three decades and has been re-assigned from one school to another. During the USAID KINERJA partnership with Bengkayang District, Pak Yusman served as Head Master of SDN Bengkayang 09. Impressed with a planning and budgeting tool for improving transparency of the use of school funds supported by KINERJA Program, he adopted the tool. He trained and mentored his staff at the school to adopt and use the tool. Using the tool, transparency of school reporting was greatly improved.

When Pak Yusman was assigned to another elementary school in the district, he continued to use the management tool. Furthermore, he shared and convinced his colleagues in the teacher association at district level to study and use the tool. Apparently, there has been great demand for the tool among his colleagues The use of the tool has contributed to improve the overall transparency of the schools.

Pak Yusman is demonstrating that passion and commitment to adopt tested tools for service reform and the willingness to share and learn from the experience of others are distinctive features of a champion.

No enabling policies were developed to enable the service reform. The stakeholders interviewed also did not reveal any policies and enforcement by the District Government to support bureaucratic reform in health and education. Bappeda, as the key agency that managed coordination among working units had difficulties in identifying any assistance provided. This demonstrates a lack

of sustainability of KINERJA Program interventions. A visit to a Puskesmas also revealed a lack of political commitment from Puskesmas staff. Staff was unable to identify any KINERJA innovation. An assessment of the service delivery processes at the Puskesmas revealed that almost no KINERJA intervention remained in place: the MSF has ceased to engage for oversight, satisfaction survey has been discontinued, and the suggestion box was not operational. Despite lacking adoption of service delivery reform, interestingly, Puskesmas staff acknowledged that KINERJA assistance had changed their mindset. However, these mindset changes did not manifest themselves in providing better services.

A potential sign of sustainability was found among citizen journalists. After KINERJA completed the program in Bengkayang District, citizen journalist that used to be trained by KINERJA reorganized themselves and established a mainstream media called Sebalau News. Through this platform, the group continues to use their skills received from the KINERJA training. Unfortunately, the journalists are no longer engaged in overseeing service delivery. A more optimistic scenario was found at working unit level. One School Master, who received training under the KINERJA Program and used to be a champion for reform at an elementary school, continues to adopt skills and management tools introduced by KINERJA. Adopting a planning and budget analysis tool provided by the KINERJA Program, he improved quality of transparency and accountability of his school planning and budgeting. When he was moved to a different school, he continued to adopt the tool for reform. Furthermore, he also shared the tool with other headmaster colleagues and provides training through teacher associations. Apparently this headmaster champion seems to be the only sign of sustainability that the assessment team encountered in Bengkayang District.

d) Kubu Raya District

Kubu Raya was one of four replication district in West Kalimantan Province. This district has been known as a progressive one in West Kalimantan due to its strong political leadership. The assessment team selected Kubu Raya District to look at the one stop services. Through Madanika, a local CSO based in Makassar, Kubu Raya District had received assistance from KINERJA for improvements in its one stop services. KINERJA provided two kinds of support to the district: first, establishing a Standard Operating and Procedure (SOP) for one stop services, and second, conducting a Survey on Customers Satisfaction.

When visited the district, the team observed that the district government still continues to adopt innovations that were introduced by KINERJA. The SOP developed with assistance from KINERJA is still being used by the One-Stop Services (OSS) Office. Based on observation, service flows follow procedures that allow transparency and efficiency. The SOP also allows customers to have a transparent service where customers are able to see on posters the relevant information required to access the services. The procedure prevents customers who seek services to pay illicit money to service providers. CCTVs were installed at certain offices, particularly those that are potentially vulnerable to fraudulent actions. In addition, an online system increases the transparency of the permit process.

The OSS Office also adopted an SOP for services reducing the number of tables for customers to get licenses. This SOP improves the efficiency of processes by reducing the length and number of tables to stop. The time for getting licenses has been reduced significantly after the Bupati issued a local regulation instructing the implementation of an integrated licensing process. Under this regulation, OSS has dedicated staff, including relevant sectoral staff that can provide technical

recommendation to any permit request. With this integrated system, the permit can be issued quickly. Usually, technical recommendations prolong permit processes.

Recently, the national government issued a new regulation that provides specific guidance for district governments on service SOPs. To respond to the guidance, Kubu Raya District has been developing a local regulation to reflect adjustment as requested by the national regulation. Such efforts are the proof for the Bupati's political commitment to continue reform of the one-stop service.

Middle level management also continues to demonstrate a genuine commitment for reform at the OSS Office. The Head of the OSS Office seems to have a good understanding of the Bupati's vision and is translating it into practice. He explained that his office has taken the necessary steps for a simplified permit process. This includes eliminating unnecessary licenses, shortening processes for getting permits, and integrating permit processes. The assessment team found that staff at the OSS Office share the vision of their office head. This is evidence that the Bupati's vision is transferred well to the middle management and staff.

Overall, Kubu Raya District continues to adopt best practices introduced by KINERJA and is also adjusting practices to reflect the national policy on OSS. Political commitment at policy and middle management level continues to be strong after the KINERJA was completed. Reforms for more transparent and accountable services are continued.

3. SOUTH SULAWESI

a) Barru District

Barru District has been known as one of the champions among KINERJA local government partners. When the program was still active, the district has shown a very strong political commitment and it performed very well. This commitment has been reflected by the district government's budget allocation, the development of supporting local regulations, and the presence of champions at *Dinas* level. The district has shown excellence in all sectors supported by KINERJA (OSS and Education). In particular, the performance in One Stop Service delivery has been among the best in South Sulawesi.

During the assessment, the team concluded that Barru District has been able to maintain and sustain their service delivery improvement. The district leadership shows a good understanding of the innovations introduced by KINERJA and explained the government's commitment to maintain the best practices by continue the budget allocation. In addition, the district leadership affirmed its political commitment towards key sectors supported by KINERJA by incorporating them into the district mid-term vision. This provides a legal justification for budget allocations to those sectors.

The district also continues to have champion at Dinas level. These champions play a very significant role in advocating for positive change i.e. at Puskesmas and schools, and keeping the district leadership informed about key priorities. In Barru district, the champions also link the feedback from front line service units with district priorities.

Pak Abustan, the Head of the District Education Office (DEO), for example, is the champion who supports KINERJA sustainability in the education sector. He continues to advocate for service delivery reform in the education sector by focusing on schools and policy reform for teacher distribution. To improve governance at school, he continues to adopt School Based Management (SBM) and relevant interventions provided by KINERJA. In doing so, he ensures that the district mid-

term plan (RPJMD) provides the cover for the reform as the legal basis for budget allocation. He convinces the Bupati and Bappeda Office to allocate funds for SBM-relevant activities. For example, for fiscal year 2017, the district allocated about Rp. 500 million to cover relevant programs. The budget allocation covers activities, such as trainings, oversight, evaluation and awards. Through his championship, he continues the redistribution of teachers in the district for better coverage of teachers.

In addition to budget allocation, the DEO carries on to implement and replicate SBM in all schools within the district. As part of this adoption, the district recruits SBM trainers independently using district funds to improve the capacity of teachers to implement SBM. Moreover, to encourage good performance in the adoption of SBM, the DEO provides awards for the best performing schools. Award winners receive the opportunity to go on a study tour to other districts in order to learn more about SBM. This in turn encourages better adoption.

Box 3: Pak Abustan - A Champion at Middle Level Management

Pak Abustan is a prime example of a champion for service delivery reform at district level. When USAID KINERJA first partnered with Barru District, he was the Head of Bappeda. Using his position as the lead district point of contact for the USAID KINERJA project, he facilitated the partnership with full support. He assigned staff and set aside local funding to handle the project. He also trained staff and developed the necessary technical guidance to facilitate effective project implementation. Pak Abustan also used his strategic position to advocate the district leadership to support the project, including for funding and political support. Due to his support, the KINERJA project did run smoothly.

During the second year of partnership, Pak Abustan was assigned to be the Head of the Education Office. In his new position, again, he showed his qualities as a champion. He ensured that the project ran well. He coordinated his team, allocated funding, provided necessary direction, and executed routine project monitoring and evaluation tasks.

To continue the reform, Pak Abustan incentivized staff and launched an award initiative for the best performing units/schools. The award became known as the School Based Management (SBM) Award. The award provides additional incentive funding for schools that perform well in adopting a SBM approach as supported by the KINERJA Program. In addition, it also rewards the winners by sending them to other districts to learn best practices in education. This reward has motivated the staff to perform better.

Aside from those initiatives, Pak Abustan personally commits himself to understand better any aspect of project interventions and project implementation challenges.

Meanwhile at the district OSS Office, the assessment team also found signs of sustainability. Pak Syamsir, who has been the reform champion since inception of the KINERJA Program in Barru District, continues his championship to date. He keeps advocating for budget allocations to continue the reforms in the OSS office. In fact, this reform drive has earned the OSS Office some awards.

After the KINERJA Program was completed, CSOs also continue to monitor and provide constructive feedback to the OSS. When KINERJA was still active, their involvement with the OSS was formally acknowledged by the District Government and CSOs played an active role to monitor the service quality. It has become an accepted fact that CSOs are engaged in oversight and the district government is providing basic funding of this practice. Interestingly, after KINERJA ended and the CSO engagement was no longer formalized, CSOs are still active. Apparently, a key factor that keeps the CSO work active is a good personal relationship with the OSS staff.

Based on interviews and a FGD, signs of sustainability were also found in the OSS Office. The Office continues to adopt SOPs provided by KINERJA. Using the SOPs, licensing processes and office lay out follow certain standards that ensure transparent and efficient work flows and service processes. Reform also can be seen from staff behavior in providing services through hospitality, smiles and efficiency. These are signs of internalization of the impact in providing better services. The OSS also continues to make adjustments to any changes of regulations and directions from the central government. Recently, the office also issued a district decree allowing adjustment of SOPs to reflect recent national policies.

b) Makassar City

The City of Makassar participated in KINERJA by focusing on the health sector and the business-enabling environment. Overall, assessment findings showed that Makassar has adopted the innovations introduced under KINERJA and their impact can be felt until today. However, internalization of innovations and practices has been patchy and hobbled by the rotation and promotion of previous staff away from key positions that they previously held. Until the closure of KINERJA, only the minimum number of three health centers in Makassar participated and no replication took place at other centers. Overall, reforms in the health sector have been more sustainable than the ones in the one-stop service office for business licensing.

During the assessment of sustainability in the health sector, the team had meetings at the Health Office and at a Health Centre. The team met with the Head of the Health Office directly on location at the Pattingalloang Health Centre where focus has been on the immediate and exclusive breast feeding and safe delivery. In Makassar, a local regulation (Perda) on breast feeding has been passed and the health office is currently focusing on new programs, like Breast Feeding Ambassadors (Duta ASI) and "Healthy Mother and Child". As the level of the front-line service Health Centers, vision and mission statements, service pledges and standard operating procedures remain prominently displayed and followed by staff. The assessment team learned that due to these innovations and the resulting better management it had been not difficult for the Health Centre to obtain its government accreditation.

At the one-stop service office for business licensing in Makassar the head has changed since the KINERJA project, but service delivery has remained a priority. During recent years, the office has changed a lot, and now previously external technical staff required for approval of license applications, are sitting within the office. They have become PTSP staff and are directly reporting to the office head. The office is planning to move to a new more central location within Makassar and also to make all license applications available online. Since KINERJA, the Licensing Office is still continuing with annual surveys as indicated by its office SOP.

Office heads in Makassar displayed political commitment to improve service delivery and management of services. They also stressed that the timing of the KINERJA project was good, coinciding with the local government's policy agenda to improve services. The Health Office in Makassar has good relations with the Mayor's Office and commitment to improvements in service delivery is strong. The Head of the local Planning Office (BAPPEDA) himself is a medical doctor.

The Head of the Health Office and her staff are visible champions for good service. They follow the understanding that excellence cannot be achieved alone and needs a concerted effort. For these champions, the KINERJA project has not ended yet and should be replicated throughout the city and in all service areas. They are convinced that what is needed are continued innovations, not routine.

Box 4: Our Community Cares about Breastfeeding

The pro-breastfeeding movement in the City of Makassar began in 2012 with a new city head regulation on exclusive breastfeeding. This provided the legal framework for promotional activities on breastfeeding. Kinerja supported the city to establish multi-stakeholder forums (MSFs) on health service delivery in its sub-districts. The community took this idea one step further after realizing that there was a lack of men involved in maternal and child health issues, and established a series of "Fathers who Care about Breastfeeding" groups. The MSFs and the Fathers groups then worked together as champions to develop the peer learning module for breastfeeding supporters.

The campaign in Makassar aims to encourage men to become advocates for and supporters of breastfeeding. It began by attempting to change the idea that breastfeeding is only something women should care about. The members of the "Fathers Who Care about Breastfeeding" groups are made up of professors, public servants, religious leaders, community leaders, neighborhood heads, and other community members. The groups aim to increase the rates of immediate and exclusive breastfeeding through making men aware that their children's health is not just their wife's responsibility but theirs as well. The groups run education activities at the sub-district and neighborhood levels. They provide advice to new mothers and fathers on exclusive breastfeeding, and promote its nutritional benefits over formula milk. The groups' members are also now often involved in discussions, workshops and trainings on breastfeeding as facilitators and presenters.

In 2014, the groups worked with the city's Multi-Stakeholder Forums established by the Kinerja program to develop a peer learning module for breastfeeding supporters. The module was designed to increase the knowledge and understanding of supporters on immediate and exclusive breastfeeding, and to improve their capacity to provide support and advice to families encountering breastfeeding problems. As a result of the hard-working champions in Makassar, exclusive breastfeeding rates in the city have increased significantly between 2012 and 2014. At Kinerja's three partner Puskesmas in the city, rates increased by more than 20 percentage points on average. The overall average breastfeeding rate in Makassar also increased, reaching 67.8% in 2013, up from 61.35% in 2012. The change in attitudes of mothers and fathers to breastfeeding has also been positive. Women are no longer embarrassed that they breastfeed their child; in fact, now they are proud. Their husbands and families are also much more supportive of their choice to breastfeed than previously.

Since a special local government regulation (Perda) on breast feeding has been passed, the legal framework in Makassar can be considered strong. A positive effect since the deliberation and passage of the regulation has been the commitment of the local legislature. Local councilors are visiting the health centers and are linking the service delivery at the centers to their political promises to voters. The realization and enforcement of national policies also contributed to the sustainability of innovations in the health sector. The reduction of child mortality, the management of hospitals and health centers and their accreditation all are part of the national policy agenda.

The assessment team learned that for office heads in Makassar at the beginning of KINERJA it was new to consult citizens. However, quickly the engagement of civil society became seen as useful for the planning processes. The multi-stakeholder forums formed subsequently are still very active in Makassar and its "cadres" are visiting the health centers on a regular basis to push for further innovation projects.

Heath center managers together with committed citizens have started to collect citizen input via SMS and are regularly discussing the issues raised by citizens and how these can be addressed. The health center heads have full confidence in the capabilities of the citizen "cadres" and fully support the networking with the surrounding communities.

c) Luwu District

The assessment findings from Luwu District are quite similar to the ones from Jember District where interventions and program impact faded away after the end of the KINERJA program. Among KINERJA partners, Luwu District has been considered to be a low-performing district; mainly due to lack of political commitment. Actually, when the project was still active, the presence of champions at Dinas, Sekda and DPRD were helpful to the program implementation. Their presence boosted effective program implementation, including the development of enabling local regulations and some interventions at Puskesmas level.

With KINERJA support, Luwu District developed a Bupati Decree (Peraturan Bupati) on MNH. This decree provided the legal basis for implementation of the following interventions: SOP, complaint survey, partnership between midwives and *dukun* (traditional healer), and Duta ASI (Ambassador for Breast Feeding). In addition, the district MSF was still very active to provide feedback and oversight. Due to the existence of champions at the DPRD, the decree has been transformed into a local government regulation (Peraturan Daerah). Meanwhile, innovations in the education sector focused on proportional teacher distribution with several analysis and trainings.

However, after KINERJA ended, most of the adopted innovations were stopped. The Puskemas stopped to adopt interventions for service delivery provision: complaint surveys were no longer conducted and the MSF is no longer involved in oversight. In addition, teacher distribution also ended.

Based on discussion with former champions and a visit to a Puskesmas, the assessment team discovered that innovations were stopped after champions had been moved to new unrelated District Offices (Dinas). The rotation of civil servants meant that no champion remained at the Puskesmas to encourage staff to perform better. Similarly, the teacher distribution program was also stopped when the champion at the District Education Office (Dinas Pendidikan) was rotated away to another position.

Despite the pessimistic assessment findings, interviews revealed that staff really appreciated KINERJA technical assistance since it helped to pave the way for accreditation of health centers. After the central government enforced its new accreditation policy with sanction and rewards, it also pushed the Puskesmas to ensure civic participation in service delivery provision.

d) Luwu Utara District

During the time when Luwu Utara participated in the KINERJA Project (2011-2016), activities were implemented in the health sector, the education sector, and the provision of licensing services. Unlike other districts participating in KINERJA, Luwu Utara used the full KINERJA menu of support. During the USAID sustainability assessment it became evident that a large number of practices and innovations that were introduced in the three sectors have been sustainable. The district government has received a number of awards for excellence in service delivery and human resource development (South Korea) Whereas other districts are looking at Luwu Utara, the district itself is also looking for new innovation opportunities.

During the assessment related to the Health Sector, the team met with the Head of the Health Office and learned that a Bupati Decree on Breastfeeding (ASI Eksklusif) is regulating the issue and that the rate of breastfeeding women has been increasing steadily from previously 70% to nearly 90%

in 2017. For mothers who decide to give birth in state health centers or hospitals will receive incentives in the form of expedited child ID cards, birth certificates and family cards.

In the Education Sector the team learned from the Head of the Education Office that the distribution of teachers in Luwu Utara is regulated by a number of Bupati Decrees. Since the national moratorium for the recruitment of teachers is still in place and teacher numbers have been declining due to retirement, in order to minimize the pressure, the Education Office trained and contracted former village teachers.

The assessment team visited the front line PTSP Office responsible for Licensing Services. Here, applications for permits can be made online, via phone or in person, and payments are made via bank transfer. Although the office is still operating out of an old building, dedication to service delivery is extremely high. The PTSP Office is focusing in particular on developing its online presence and staff training on service excellence.

Overall political commitment is playing a significant role in Luwu Utara. This commitment is displayed by the Bupati, all Office Heads and the Heads of the various service units. In the view of the Bupati, sustainability of achievements is the result of a shared understanding among government officials, based on joint-planning, joint-implementation, and joint-evaluation of government activities and programs. Officials have been empowered to recognize needs and to act upon. In the district, the Bupati Decrees and guidelines/SoPs generally have been internalized by the Office Heads

Sustainability is further enhanced by champions in all service areas. For example, concerns for education and health are of concern to every Office Head. Subsequently, former teachers staff the Education Office and former health center staff or doctors staff the Health Office. The sectoral in-depth knowledge of these civil servants is reflected by the accepted leadership they provide, making them champions in their portfolio. The local Planning Office (BAPPEDA) underlines the importance for human resource management of placing the right person in the right position. Equally important for transparency is the internal communication and sharing of information, an issue taken seriously by champions.

In Luwu Utara the legal framework governing the health and education sectors is based on Bupati Decrees, not Local Regulations (Perda). However, it seems that a change of mindset has taken place among government stakeholders, leading to a continued implementation of guidelines and procedures. Office Heads confirmed that the efficiency and performance of their offices has been increasing and that the transparency and accountability have greatly improved. No additional fees or "*surat sakti*" have been reported.

Box 5: Ibu Indah Putri Indriani - Champion Bupati for Service Delivery Reform from Luwu Utara

Ibu Indah, the Bupati of Luwu Utara District, is an example of local leader champion who can transform and moves bureaucracy for reform. As the first female Bupati in South Sulawesi, she has broken a tradition of male leadership and an example that reform can be implemented. Partnering with the USAID KINERJA Program, she started the reform by formulating a vision for better public service and sharing it this vision with her staff. To her, reform starts with changing a mindset.

In the next stage, Ibu Indah created the enabling environment for reform to happen. Working closely with the USAID KINERJA team, she identified and formulated several necessary regulations to provide the legal basis for reform. These regulations also provided technical guidance for relevant technical units to improve their way of doing business and provide quality services. For example, she issued a Bupati Decree allowing the Education Office to adopt Proportional Teacher Distribution (PTD). With the decree in place, working level staff has the basis and confidence to implement the reform. The mentioned Bupati Decree serves not only as the legal basis and technical guidance but also allocates funding to implement the reform initiatives. Similarly, she also issued a number or decrees to initialize reform in the health sector and for one stop service.

To ensure that the reform policy is implemented effectively, Ibu Indah established a pool of champions at the working level units. These champions worked closely with KINERJA, for example in the Education Office, Health Office and One Stop Service Office. These champions have proven to be fundamental to ensure a successful implementation of the proposed reform initiatives. Champions refer to both reform minded persons that are leading the reform processes at mid-level management and technical staff. The champions interpret the vision of the Bupati and materialize it. To ensure that the reform efforts are having the desired impact, Ibu Indah regularly conducts monitoring and evaluations.

Ibu Indah understands the importance of project sustainability. For her, sustainability should be a fundamental element of project design. Using monitoring and evaluation results, sustainability plans are being developed. For example, findings from the analysis of teacher distribution disparity have been used to develop an initiative called *Sarjana Mengajar*. *Sarjana Mengajar* is an initiative to recruit more teachers using the district budget and deploy them to remotest areas in the district. The initiative helps to close the teacher disparity gap within in the district. A similar approach is applied to address the doctor disparity gap in the health sector.

The combination of strong political commitment and a clear vision, an enhanced enabling environment in the form of local regulations, and having champions are key elements for service delivery reform in Luwu Utara under the leadership of Bupati Indah Putri.

In addition, the local government offices enjoy government contacts and networks with the national and provincial levels, for example via a WhatsApp group. These networks are seen as providing access to technical information and additional motivation. Opening official and unofficial channels is helping civil servants to cut red-tape and time.

Civil society engagement in Luwu Utara continues to be strong since the formation of a multi-stakeholder forum under KINERJA continues to be active. Previously mainly focusing on teacher training and human resource development, the forum continues to meet regularly at a local coffee shop (*Warung Reformasi*) and is providing input to the local government on a variety of development issues, including to BAPPEDA, government offices, and DRPD committees.

III. FINDINGS

After completion of the field trips to 12 former KINERJA sites in three provinces, the assessment team reviewed their findings. It became apparent that the feedback obtained from qualitative interviews with former project stakeholders shows that sustainability of innovations introduced by the KINERJA Program is greatly influenced by the existence or absence of a number or key factors. These sustainability factors can be grouped into five main clusters, namely Political Commitment, Presence of Champions, Enabling Legal Framework, Enforcement of National Policies, and Continuous Citizen Engagement. Each of the five key factors comprises of three indicators showing the intensity of the factor:

Factor	Indicator
I. Political Commitment	1. Committed and reform-minded Bupati/Walikota
	2. Commitment translated into a sound vision/mission priority & budget allocation
	3. Commitment shared by senior government officials
II. Presence of Champions	1. Office Heads championing reform and innovation
	2. Heads of service units championing reform and innovation
	3. Citizens/CSOs championing reform and innovation
III. Enabling Legal Framework	1. SK Bupati, Perbup, Perda passed
	2. Legal framework communicated and enforced
	3. Legal framework regularly reviewed and modified
IV. Enforcement of National Policies	1. National policies complemented by local policies
	2. National priorities communicated to stakeholders at the local level
	3. Communication network on innovations with the national level exists
V. Continuous Citizen Engagement	1. Existence of CSOs working on governance/policy issues
	2. Active Participation of citizens/CSOs in local government activities
	3. Established cooperation between local government and citizens/CSOs

The team reviewed its assessment findings from each former KINERJA site according to the factors and indicators and prepared a sustainability matrix. The matrix shows each sustainability factor per former project site (district/city) and the existence or absence of each sustainability indicator per factor. This way, the matrix is combining the findings across all project sites. A total score has been assigned for each former project site, allowing for the ranking of the sustainability per district/city.

DISTRICTS / FACTORS	Probolinggo	Lumajang	Jember	Pacitan	Sekadau	Sambas	Bengkayang	Kubu Raya	Barru	Makassar	Luwu	Luwu Utara
I. Political Commitment												
4. Committed and reform-minded Bupati/Walikota	X	X	X	X	O	O	O	X	X	X	O	X
5. Commitment translated into a sound vision/mission priority & budget allocation	X	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	X
6. Commitment shared by senior government officials	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	X	X	O	O	X
II. Presence of Champion												
4. Office Heads championing reform and innovation	X	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	X
5. Heads of service units championing reform and innovation	X	O	X	X	X	O	O	X	X	X	O	X
6. Citizens/CSOs championing reform and innovation	X	O	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	O	X
III. Enabling Legal Framework												
4. SK Bupati, Perbup, Perda passed	X	X	X	X	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X
5. Legal framework communicated and enforced	X	O	O	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	X
6. Legal framework regularly reviewed and modified	O	O	O	O	O	X	O	O	X	O	O	X
IV. Enforcement of National Policy												
4. National policies complemented by local policies	X	X	O	X	O	X	O	X	X	X	X	X
5. National priorities communicated to stakeholders at the local level	O	O	O	X	O	X	O	X	X	O	O	X
6. Communication network on innovations with the national level exists	X	X	O	X	O	O	O	X	X	O	O	X
V. Continuous Citizen Engagement												

4. Existence of CSOs working on governance/policy issues	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	X	O	X
5. Active Participation of citizens/CSOs in local government activities	X	O	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	X	O	X
6. Established cooperation between local government and citizens/CSOs	X	O	O	O	X	X	O	O	X	X	O	X
Total Score	13	6	7	13	7	12	3	11	15	11	2	15
Ranking	4	10	8	3	9	5	11	6	2	7	12	1

Since 1999, when decentralization has been implemented, Indonesian local governments have the authority to manage their own human resources. To address their responsibilities related to local development, service provision and competitiveness, local governments need competent civil servants. This requires staff career development and human resource management. However, effective and efficient systems of recruitment, promotion and mutation (rotation) are still evolving. Both at the central level and local level, staff development is not primarily based on a performance appraisal system, but also on the length of working time. Since the promotions and rotations require the recommendations from superiors like office heads and the approval from districts heads or governors, this opens the doors to nepotism.

Box 6: Indonesian Civil Service – Informal Patronage Behavior

Through what many acknowledge to be a semi-formalized system, significant discretionary allowances are distributed by top management in individual agencies to their subordinates in exchange for loyalty and, frequently, collusion in malfeasance. Membership in such personal loyalty networks is reputed to be pervasive, ensuring that officials can accept bribes and kickbacks without fear of reprise, since their colleagues are likely to be engaged in the same practice. The existence of discretionary allowances locks staff into a loyalty network that enables extra-budgetary transactions to be conducted and shared under protected conditions.

This system appears to be enabled by the significant contribution of the development (non-recurrent) budget to civil service rewards. Requirements for its continued operation include a continued commitment to project financing by donors across a wide spectrum of agencies, and the current dysfunctional split between the routine and development budgets, which allows for inadequate project supervision.

Source: This box is adapted from "Pay and Patronage in the Core Civil Service in Indonesia," Mimeo, World Bank, March 2000, pp. 33-36.

Civil servants in Indonesia are regularly rotated. At the Echelon I level, the duration of service is maximum 6 years. At the Echelon II level, the duration of service can be up to 10 years. At the Echelon III or IV levels, servants may spend 5 to 7 years in the same position before being transfer to other units. The retirement age is 58 years. The frequent rotation of civil servants is often explained to avoid the potential abuse of power. However, performance appraisal systems (Daftar Penilaian Pelaksanaan Pekerjaan or DP3) are flawed by subjective judgement and intangible characteristics, resulting in promotions conducted in the spirit to support rewarding.[13]

The Law 5/2014 on the State Civil Administration (Aparatur Sipil Negara, or ASN) provides the legal framework for public servants, especially the planning, recruitment, quality development, staffing, promotion, salaries, welfare and dismissal. Article 72 regulates promotions, and article 73 regulates mutations (rotations). Since decentralization, recruitment and selection is no longer conducted by the central government, but arranged for by each local government. The process, however, must adhere to the general and technical implementation guidelines developed by the National Civil Service Agency (Lembaga Administrasi Negara or LAN).

Civil servant rotation is a routine action and serves organizational needs, performance, and capacity building of staff. Despite the overall positive intent, rotations sometimes become politicized because they are associated with the power dynamics within the bureaucracy. Political leaders may use rotations to accommodate political interests for gaining political support and therefore placing staff in certain positions without basing the decisions on the merit system. In such event, civil servant

---

[13] Effendy, Akhyar, Manajemen Pegawai Negeri Sipil yang Efektif, Lembaga Administrasi Negara, Bandung 2009.

rotations (mutations) are driven by subjective interests rather than the system or organizational needs.

Rotations have implications for donor project implementation, particularly for the political commitment of government partners. Experience from USAID projects (KINERJA, LGSP, and other projects) show that civil servant rotation impacts significantly on project effectiveness and sustainability because of the associated adjustments. To a certain extent, it results in the reorientation for staff. Depending on the local leadership context and political commitment, rotation implications can be positive or negative.

For a local government with high political commitment, both at the level of policy makers and at middle management, staff rotation does not have a severe effect on project implementation. In such an environment, changes of staff responsible for a project usually have been anticipated and planned well. With the necessary political commitment, the reorientation of new staff can be accelerated. In many instances, rotation can be beneficial because the project can negotiate and support progressive staff to be assigned to the project. In certain cases, projects can encourage retaining progressive staff or champions at the project in order to continue leading the project until completion. Thus, an environment of high political commitment is conducive for project sustainability.

Meanwhile, in an environment with low political commitment, staff rotation tends to have a negative impact for project implementation and sustainability. In such an environment, maintaining a champion at working level is challenging. Reform usually relies on champions within each working unit. More efforts are needed to maintain and nurture commitment at working level. Due to lack of political support from the leadership, staff commitment at working level tends to be more volatile and can easily drop once a dedicated staff is moved to a new position. When moved, staff will take all the knowledge along without a proper transfer to the successor. As a result, there will be no institutional memory of the project approaches and interventions. Information flows and commitment to the project will be disrupted. Subsequently, commitment needs to be renewed, which will jeopardize the project and causes a threat to sustainability. Thus, staff rotation has a negative impact to project sustainability.

What are the ways to mitigate a negative situation as a result of staff rotations? Negative effects of staff rotations can be mitigated through nurturing more champions at working unit level. Having more champions in place will open more possibilities to increase project effectiveness and sustainability. The sense of ownership from champions will lead them to advocate adopting and continuing best practices from the project. This will likely increase project sustainability. Further, the smooth transfer during staff rotation is also a good way to preserve project sustainability. This means there should be a clear plan of staff transitioning from one candidate to the next. In order to achieve this, there should be adequate time for transitioning to allow the transfer of knowledge related to the project. Finally, to mitigate any negative effect of staff rotation project knowledge must be institutionalized. Best practices should be documented well, enabling everybody in the respective working unit to access the data freely.

IV. WAYS FORWARD

During the time the KINERJA Sustainability Assessment was conducted, a number of like-minded donors became interested in learning more about the sustainability of their own donor projects focusing on local governance and decentralization. Subsequently USAID commissioned one of its projects, MESP, to conduct a larger Donor Project Sustainability Assessment. This new initiative assesses a total of eight projects from five donors active in Indonesia. The donors are DFAT, Global Affairs Canada, GIZ, UNDP and USAID. The findings of the initial KINERJA Sustainability Assessment have been integrated into the larger Donor Project Sustainability Assessment.

It is foreseen, that the findings will be discussed among donors and Government of Indonesia ministries and agencies, like the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry for Bureaucratic Reform, and BAPPENAS. It is hoped that the discussion will lead to an agreed definition for project sustainability and a widely accepted set of indicators for measuring sustainability. This could greatly benefit the design of future projects and the effectiveness of project implementation.

So far, the KINERJA Sustainability Assessment only assesses project sites under the initial project. Ideally, findings from a sustainability assessment in Papua could be added when the KINERJA Extension Program in this particular province has been closed for a minimum of 12 months. The findings from KINERJA in Papua, combined with sustainability findings from Aceh Province could further enrich the overall assessment findings.

ANNEX II: STATEMENT OF WORK

Donor Project Sustainability Assessment: Decentralization and Governance Reform Statement of Work

1. Introduction

USAID Indonesia's strategic engagement is striving to deliver sustainable results. Outputs and outcomes are regularly assessed during monitoring and evaluation exercises. In addition, lessons learned and recommendations for future activities and replication are recorded. However, to adequately assess project sustainability over time, a continuous and more long-term assessment and analysis seems advisable.

As part of its efforts to maximize the effectiveness of projects focusing on decentralization and governance reform, the USAID Indonesia DRG Office is planning an assessment of donor project sustainability in this area. Using recently completed projects with decentralization and governance reform components, such as USAID's Program Representasi (ProRep) and Local Governance Service Improvement (Kinerja), The Office will assess the sustainability of donor activities that have ended at least one year ago, within the past three years. In all, the assessment seeks to review 10 (or so) projects funded by development partners in Indonesia.

USAID has tasked the Monitoring & Evaluation Support Project (MESP) to conduct this assessment, in coordination with the DRG Office and interested donor agencies.

2. Assessments Purpose and Intended Use

The purpose of this assessment of donor projects addressing decentralization and governance reform is to inform current and future program design and implementation by donor agencies and their implementing partners and GOI counterparts. Assessment findings will also inform GOI strategies for program sustainability. More specifically, the assessment will provide information and analysis that will help USAID and other donors do the following:

- Maximize effectiveness and impact of decentralized governance projects in Indonesia.
- Incorporate sustainability lessons into program designs and portfolio strategies.
- Increase the spread of effective, sustainable development interventions.
- Inform the Sub-Working Group partners of the Development Partner Working Group on Decentralization (DPWGD).
- Capacitate GOI and local government counterparts and help USAID and other donors prepare exit strategies for their programming in this area.

To do that, the assessment will capture and analyze lessons learned from recently concluded projects addressing multiple aspects of local governance in Indonesia. The assessment will also provide recommendations for future approaches and enhanced sustainability.

Assessment Audiences

The primary audience for this evaluation is USAID/Indonesia and other development partners supporting decentralization and governance reform activities in Indonesia. These other partners include the members of the DPWGD Sub-Working Group (WG), such as Global Affairs Canada (CIDA), DFAT, GIZ, UNDP, and The World Bank. In addition, GOI agencies including Bappenas, Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA), and Ministry of State Administration and Bureaucracy Reform (KemenPAN-RB), as well as Indonesian local governments, are a critical audience for this assessment.

Assessments Questions

USAID and its donor partners have identified the following questions for the assessment under this SOW:

Assessment Questions
1. How has sustainability been defined by donors, counterparts, and implementing partners related to the decentralized governance projects being assessed?
2. What aspects of the projects being assessed show signs of sustainability, in terms of methodology, interventions, policies, cooperation, coordination, et al?
3. What factors led to the sustainability of project interventions? What factors inhibited sustainability?
4. How can USAID and other donors best use lessons from assessed projects in rolling out or encouraging sustainability aspects in their current and future portfolios?

Projects Covered by the Assessment

The following projects will be reviewed as part of this assessment SOW:

- **USAID Program Representasi and Kinerja*.** ProRep worked with the Parliament, CSOs, and policy research institutes (universities, think tanks) on advocacy, representation, and policy making. Kinerja (Local Governance Service Improvement) worked with 24 district governments in four provinces: Aceh, West Kalimantan, East Java, and South Sulawesi.

- **DFAT Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Development, Australia-Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening, and Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme.** AIPD worked in East Java, NTB, NTT, West Papua, and Papua. AIPHSS worked in East Java and NTT. ACCESS worked with 69 local CSOs in NTB, NTT, and South Sulawesi.

- **GIZ TRANSFORMASI Phase 1.** Worked with the Ministry of Administrative Reform (KemPAN-RB), focusing in North Sumatra, West Kalimantan, and East Java.

- **UNDP Provincial Governance Strengthening Programme.** PGSP worked in Bangka Belitung, NTT, and Gorontalo.

- **Canada Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi.** SIPS supported e-procurement and certification in North and South Sulawesi.

* The USAID DRG Office will undertake the assessment of the Kinerja project. USAID will provide the findings from that review to the MESP assessment team for incorporation into the overall results and report from this assessment.

The DFAT-funded Knowledge Sector Initiative (KSI) program will support this assessment by identifying relevant literature and informants. KSI may also support the dissemination of assessment results, based on future discussions with USAID and DFAT.

3. Assessment Methodology

To complete this assessment, the MESP team will use the methods outlined below. The assessmet team will develop and submit to USAID a detailed Assessment Work Plan as its first deliverable.

a. Data Collection

Introductory briefings with Working Group (WG) members and GOI counterparts.
Prior to the launch of the assessment, MESP task managers will meet with the points of contact from each involved donor WG member and with the GOI agencies with primary interest in the assessment topics: Bappenas, MOHA, and KemenPAN-RB. At these introductory briefings, MESP and USAID will summarize the assessment purpose, objectives, and plans, and will solicit inputs from these donors and GOI stakeholders. MESP will incorporate inputs and priority issues noted by these stakeholders into the Assessment Work Plan, as appropriate.

Assessment team briefings with donor agency WG members. Once on the ground in Jakarta, the assessment team will meet with the WG donors, learn about the projects being assessed, and discuss their definitions of sustainability and how they approach it in the project design and implementation – overall and related to projects addressing decentralization and governance reform. Through those discussions and subsequent communications, the Assessment team will identify the most likely sources of relevant project info, including lists and contacts of useful counterparts, partners, and beneficiaries in Jakarta and project locations in selected provinces and districts. The Assessment team will then use that information as inputs to develop a detailed Assessment Work Plan and fieldwork itinerary.

Review of project documents and secondary data. The team will review documents from the projects to be assessed, including work plans; quarterly and annual progress reports; M&E plans and indicator data; midterm, final, and impact evaluation reports; program activity reports; and other documentation related to implementation, management, and sustainability issues.
In addition, the Assessment team will conduct a general literature review pertinent to how the participating donor agencies define, plan for, and work to achieve the sustainability of their programs – in general and specific to decentralization and governance reform. This review will focus on donors' Indonesia country strategies and plans, as well as their broader agency literature. The Assessment team will also review more general literature on sustainability and development.

Work Plan submission, followed by Assessment data collection through key informant interviews and group discussions in Jakarta and selected provinces and districts. Based on the results of the briefings with WG members and review of project documents, the Assessment team will develop a Work Plan including detailed schedule and itinerary – including informant contacts – for Assessment field-based data collection at national and sub-national levels.

A key part of this assessment will be individual and group interviews with informants who have relvant firsthand information about the results and lasting impacts of the donor projects being reviewed. These informants will include officials and staff from the following entities:

- Donor agencies
- GOI and local government counterparts
- Implementing partner (IP) organizations, at national and sub-national levels
- Project-level partners and beneficiary groups, at national and sub-national levels

Interviews will be with key informants, and will be in-depth, following an established list of questions (interview instrument) to be developed by the assessment team and included in their Assessment Work Plan. Group discussions will allow for a free-flowing examination of stakeholder responses to assessment questions, and will more frequently be employed with partner and beneficiary groups in project locations.

In identifying the informants for interviews and group discussions, and creating a detailed interview and site visit schedule, the assessment team will draw on inputs from WG members and project documentation, per the process detailed above. The USAID DRG Office and Donor WG will assist the assessment team in identifying key informants at national and sub-national levels, and in filling out the details of an Assessment informant matrix to be included in the Work Plan. Based on initial

discussions among WG members, the Assessment team interview informants in Jakarta and four other provinces: East Java, South Sulawesi, Gorontalo, and East Nusa Tenggara. The table below details the projects and districts to be examined in each of these provinces. This list will be finalized during the first week of the Assessment and included in the Work Plan.

The criteria used by WG members in selecting the locations detailed below included the following:

- Long-term field presence and interventions by reviewed projects.
- Notable, measurable impacts and sustainability factors at both provincial and district levels. Include a variety of sustainability aspects and factors.
- Involvement in multiple programs included in this assessment.
- Connection with donor agency priorities, e.g., sector, geographic, target populations, et al.

It is expected that in each province visited by the team, interviews and discussions will take place first in the capital city, followed by similar information gathering sessions in selected districts (kota, kabupaten).

Matrix of Projects and Data Collection Locations for the Sustainability Assessment

Province	Districts and Cities	Projects
Jakarta and National Level	• Jakarta	• Project donor agency (WG) offices • Project GOI agencies • USAID ProRep, GIZ Transformasi, and UNDP PGSP national counterparts
Aceh	• Banda Aceh City • Aceh Singkil • Aceh Tenggara • Bener Meriah	• USAID Kinerja (assessed by USAID DRG)
West Kalimantan	• Pontianak City • Benkayang • Sambas • Sekadau	• USAID Kinerja (assessed by USAID DRG)
East Java	• Surabaya City (Province)	• GIZ Transformasi • All project province agencies
	• Malang City • Situbondo	• DFAT AIPD
	• Situbondo	• DFAT AIP Health Systems
	• Probolinggo • Jember • Lumajang • Pacitan	• USAID Kinerja (assessed by USAID DRG)
East Nusa Tenggara	• Kupang	• UNDP PGSP
	• Flores Timur • Ngada • Sumba Barat Daya	• DFAT AIPD • DFAT AIP Health Systems
South Sulawesl	• Pinrang	• Canada SIPS

Province	Districts and Cities	Projects
	• Makassar City • Barru • Luwu • Luwu Utara	• USAID Kinerja (assessed by USAID DRG)
Gorontalo	• Gorantalo City • Pohuwato	• UNDP PGSP

b. Data Analysis and Assessment Report Drafting

Following the information and data gathering phase, the assessment team will analyze the information they have obtained, in order to develop responses and recommendations per the assessment questions detailed above. Based on this analysis, the team will draft the Assessment Report, covering findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. Details of the deliverables to be produced by the Assessment team are provided below in this SOW.

4. Logistics

MESP will provide all logistic and administration support to the Assessment team, including travel and accommodation arrangements, meeting spaces, interpreters as needed, et al. USAID and DPWGD donor partners will provide introductions to key stakeholders as well as provide documentation and background regarding the projects being assessed,

5. Assessment Schedule and Timeline

The Assessment will commence in June 2017 and will be completed by September 2017. An illustrative timeline is presented in the Gantt chart below. A final schedule, including specific delivery dates, will be proposed in the Assessment Work Plan.

Illustrative Assessment Timeline

Task/ Deliverable	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
SOW finalization; introductory briefings with WG members and GOI counterparts: Bappenas, MOHA, KemenPAN-RB.	■			
Planning discussions and general data collection with WG members in Jakarta; document review; Work Plan		■		
Data collection in Jakarta, provinces, and districts, per detailed Work Plan		■	■	
Analysis and Assessment Report drafting			■	■
Submission of draft assessment report to USAID				■
Submission of final Assessment Report to USAID				■
Presentation of Assessment findings and analysis to USAID/DPWG, as requested and scheduled by USAID				■

Drawing on the informants identified by WG and Assessment team members, and in collaboration with USAID, the Assessment team will create a detailed interview and travel schedule. An initial, illustrative draft of this schedule is presented in Annex A.

6. Deliverables

A final list of deliverables, including due dates, will be included in the Assessment Work Plan. Expected deliverables and their estimated completion dates are presented in the table below.

Deliverable	Estimated Completion Date
1. Assessment Work Plan draft, including research methodologies	Week 1
2. Final Assessment Work Plan, incorporating USAID comments	Week 2
3. Draft Assessment Report, based on USAID's approved report outline.	Week 11
4. Final Assessment Report, incorporating USAID comments	Week 12
5. Oral presentation(s) of key findings, conclusions and recommendations from Assessment Report for USAID and DPWGD partners.	As scheduled w/ USAID

Donor Program Sustainability Assessment Report. The Assessment team will submit to USAID an Assessment Report of 40-50 pages, not including annexes and including an Executive Summary. The Assessment Report will compile findings from the document review, key informant interviews and focus group discussions in Jakarta and the provinces – including discussions with USAID, WG members, and IPs.

A draft of the report and any related PowerPoint presentation slides will be submitted to USAID/Indonesia for internal reviews, per the final implementation timeline in the Work Plan. The DRG Office will review the draft and provide comments to the team, which will then finalize the report and briefing materials per the Work Plan schedule.

To be deemed acceptable, the draft and final reports must include all the elements listed below. In addition, the Assessment team must adequately address all significant comments raised by USAID/Indonesia during review of the draft Assessment Report. The final approved Assessment Report will be a public document to be submitted to the Development Experience Clearinghouse (www.dec.org) (DEC) following the required format provided by USAID.

The Donor Program Sustainability Assessment Report will include the following sections:

- Executive Summary (5pp).
- Background of WG portfolios and programs in decentralized governance, focusing on assessment targets.
- Assessment purpose, objectives, and methodology. (Assessment SOW in annex.)
- Context summary: sustainability definitions, enabling and inhibiting factors in assessment areas, etc.
- Findings and analysis. Include a matrix of reviewed programs and their sustainability aspects and factors (enabling, inhibiting).
- Annexes: Assessment SOW; documents and information sources reviewed; informants interviewed, including site visit schedule.

The Assessment Report and all deliverables will be drafted and submitted in English. All deliverables will be provided electronically to USAID no later than the dates indicated in the approved Work Plan. Any debriefs will include a formal presentation with slides delivered both electronically and in hard copy for all attendees.

7. Assessment Team Composition

The Assessment Work Plan will include team member roles and summary biographical data. It is estimated that the assessment team will comprise the following positions:

- Team Leader, international
- Governance and Decentralization Assessment Specialists (2-3), Indonesian
- Research Assistants (2)

MESP team personnel may join the assessment team as needed throughout the assignment to perform quality control, management, or logistic support tasks.

8. USAID and Donor Partner Participation

The USAID DRG Office and Sub-WG on Decentralization will act as a kind of steering committee in providing input for identifying informants and site visit selection, and in reviewing the draft Assessment Report. As such, the Assessment team will work closely with USAID and DPWGD partners to plan, implement, and coordinate assessment activities, including obtaining documents and data regarding the projects being assessed, and for interviewing donor personnel regarding the assessment questions. USAID personnel will interact with the assessment team and MESP as needed.

9. Budget

A summary estimated budget is attached to this assessment SOW.

ANNEX III: ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK: MSI'S GETTING TO ANSWERS MATRIX FOR KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Variable	Respondent Group /Data Source	Data Collection Method	Data Analysis Plan Method
AQ#1: How has sustainability been defined by donors, counterparts, and implementing partners related to the decentralized governance projects being assessed?			
Concept of Sustainability: definition, measurement, indicator, time of sustainability definition adoption, way to translate sustainability into real activities	GOI: General Directorate of Regional Autonomy MOHA, Directorate of Regional Autonomy BAPPENAS, Deputy of Public Service MOSABR Donor: National and Sub-National Levels (ProRep-USAID, AIPD-DFAT, AIPHSS-DFAT, ACCESS-DFAT, TRANSFORMASI I-GIZ, SIPS-CIDA, PGSP-UNDP, KINERJA-USAID) Counterparts: CSOs, Contractors	• Desk study, project document review, literature review • Key Informan Interviews	Comparative analysis:
EQ#2: What factors led to the sustainability of project interventions? What factors inhibited sustainability?			
Leadership, championship, commitment Institutional fitness and political environment Funding, infrastructure, and logistics Stakeholder supports and contractor performance	GOI: General Directorate of Regional Autonomy MOHA, Directorate of Regional Autonomy BAPPENAS, Deputy of Public Service MOSABR Donor: National and Sub-National Levels (ProRep-USAID, AIPD-DFAT, AIPHSS-DFAT, ACCESS-DFAT, TRANSFORMASI I-GIZ, SIPS-CIDA, PGSP-UNDP, KINERJA-USAID) Counterparts: CSOs, Contractors	• Desk study, project document review, literature review • Key Informan Interviews	Determinant analysis: Search for significance of factor
EQ#3: What aspects of the projects being assessed show signs of sustainability, in terms of methodology, interventions, policies, cooperation, coordination, et al?			
	GOI: General Directorate of Regional Autonomy MOHA, Directorate of Regional Autonomy BAPPENAS, Deputy of Public Service MOSABR Donor: National and Sub-National Levels (ProRep-USAID, AIPD-DFAT, AIPHSS-DFAT, ACCESS-DFAT, TRANSFORMASI I-GIZ, SIPS-CIDA, PGSP-UNDP, KINERJA-USAID) Counterparts: CSOs, Contractors	• Desk study, project document review, literature review • Key Informan Interviews	Impact analysis: Search for significance of factor

Variable	Respondent Group /Data Source	Data Collection Method	Data Analysis Plan Method
EQ#4: Co-funding mechanism. Has the co-funding initiative under PRESTASI 3 resulted in the desired outcomes? Specifically: What have been the positive and negative experiences with co-funding? b. How could the co-funding mechanism be more effective?			
A. Review of financing contribution and source B. Review of management process with sponsor institutions and IIE/F recruitment process (Employer response on advantages/disadvantages of Co-funding requirements) C. Scholar/applicant process	A. IE/F records of Co-funding report and notes (monitoring data/documents) from implementing partner B. Sponsor organization, and organizations targeted but not yet participating in co-financing program C. Scholars: LTT Participant PRESTASI 3 (all population/ N)	A. Desk study B. Process documentation and online survey C. Online Survey, with phone interview as required	- Descriptive statistics - Comparative analysis of descriptive statistics - Content analysis - Explanation building
EQ#5: **Support to local institutions**. Based on initial approaches implemented to date, what is the potential value of PRESTASI 3's technical assistance and partnering with Indonesian scholarship providers?			
Response on initiative of technical assistance to provider and exploration on what, why and how value of the initiative **Note:** assistance provided to only one institution to date (Governor's scholarship fund/Aceh). Other assistance is planned, e.g., Papua	Indonesian training providers Technical assistance reports/notes and data (monitoring documents/data) from implementing partner	A. Online survey B. Phone interview	- Descriptive statistics - Content analysis and - Explanation building
EQ#6: **Demand for Ph.D.'s in targeted sectors**. What is the relevant supply and demand for Ph.D.'s across targeted sectors in Indonesia, per issue-specific USAID funding earmarks?			
A. Exploration of future priority plan/needs on human resource qualification (PhD) in govt/univ/private B. Exploration on current program and support provided for PhD supply/demand, challenge and support type needs	Ministry and University respondents Secondary data from ministry of higher education Secondary data and reports from IIE	A. Key informant interview B. Document review and secondary data analysis	- Descriptive statistics - Comparative analysis of descriptive statistic - Stakeholder analysis - Content analysis
EQ#7: Effectivenes of short-term training processes and programs. How effective have the programs and processes for short-term participant training been under PRESTASI 2 and PRESTASI 3 in terms of participants' learning and improved competencies in the workplace?			
A. Applicant satisfaction response of program process during training (effective and relevance, how and why) B. New knowledge and skills gained by returned scholars and employer assessment on new knowledge and skills gained by participant/improved work competencies C. Relevance of STT program with work place needs and roles (STT program relevance with work place needs and participant roles/career plan) D. Application of new knowledge and skills in professional work (Type of applied skill, products and services produced, frequency of application) and Employer assessment on applied new knowledge and skills of returned STT participants	Eligible Short Term Training Program participants PRESTASI 2 and PRESTASI 3 Employer of Short Term Training Program participants PRESTASI 2 and PRESTASI 3 Document/reports (monitoring documents/data) from implementing partner)	A. Online survey B. Phone interview	- Descriptive statistics- - Content analysis/ Explanation building - Triangulation
EQ#8: Comparison of PRESTASI design with other participant training programs. What are the similarities and differences with PRESTASI among other long-term training programs implemented in Indonesia, including the Fulbright Program, LPDP Training Program managed by the Ministry of Finance, and Australia Awards Training Program?			
Training program process implemented	Key personnel of selected	Key Informant Interviews	- Content Analysis - Comparative

Variable	Respondent Group /Data Source	Data Collection Method	Data Analysis Plan Method
by selected training providers (Fulbright, LPDP by Finance Minsitry, and Australia Award)	training program providers (Fulbright, LPDP by Finance Minsitry, and Australia Award) Program documentation and reports	Program Document Reviews	Descriptive

ANNEX IV: INSTRUMENTS

The instruments used to collect information from the key informants and stakeholder groups, along with the format used to record information durng the review of relevant project documents is given below. The questions used will be compared to the questions used by the USAID DRG to assess sustainabililty in the KInerja project since it is necessary to use a common set of questions to enable comparison of all projects, including Kinerja, in the DPSA analysis.

Background information and detailed questions reflect the four main areas of inquiry for the DPSA.

Questionnaire

Date	
Project Name	
Source of Information	
• Resource Person	Position:
• Document	

Variable 1. Concept of Sustainability

How has sustainability been defined by donors, counterparts, and implementing partners related to the decentralized governance projects being assessed?

- How did the project define sustainability?

- How did the project measure sustainability?

- What was the indicator of the measure?

- When was sustainability introduced?

- Did you have an exit strategy? (Definition, Indicator, and Measurement)

- When did you decide to have an exit strategy?

- Was exit strategy prepared?

- When was the exit strategy prepared?

Variable 2: Underlying factors of sustainability

The following factors could be seen to lead to sustainability or inhibit sustainability – depending on the characteristics of the factor in question. Please ask how each of the following factors effected

the sustainability of the project interventions? Which had positive impact; which had negative impact?

- Leadership/Champion/Commitment

- Institutional fitness and political environment

- Funding/Co-share, in-kind contribution

- Other stakeholder support

- Was it possible to minimize or eliminate these negative factors during program implementation? If not, how can these negative factors be minimized or eliminated in the future?

- How did the project contribute to (pre-defined) outcomes?

- Was the way the project was organized a reason for its success at sustainability?

- Was there a "Champion" that promoted the project or project goals so as to make the project a success and sustainable? If so, how was the Champion related to the project?

- To what extent was the ability of the contractor responsible for the success and sustainability of the project?

Variable 3: Signs of Sustainability

What aspects of the projects being assessed show signs of sustainability?

- What interventions components/approaches/activities have been adopted and how it has been adopted? Please describe example. If no adoption, explain why the reason/challenges and how it could be improved?

- What were the positive impacts on policy and regulations, institutions including capacity, and skill/knowledge? Please describe each significant impact in detail.

- What level of adoption or impact can you identify: continuation, modification, and new initiative creation? Please describe

- Were there any unintended impacts of the project? In what why did the unintended impact occur? Please describe the detail.

Variable 4: Lessons Learned

What lesson can be drawn from the three variables above –input (definition), process (underlying factors), and outcome (impact)?

Input Level. What lesson can be taken from the concept of sustainability?

Process Level. What lesson can be drawn from the underlying factors of sustainability?

Outcome Level. What lesson can be taken from the signs of sustainability?

How lesson learned is utilized for donor and key counterparts?

ANNEX V: DONOR PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

Project' Name	Program Description	Period of the Project
Kinerja - USAID	A governance project to improve public service delivery in education, health and business climate with the intent to deliver locally owned, long term and broad based solutions for Indonesia. • Emphasizes on adopting proven initiatives and supplements them with governance interactions • Implements the program through regional and local organizations • Conducts rigorous impact assessment • Works with both government (supply) and civil society (demand side) to improve public service delivery. Kinerja' approach; (a) Increase the capacity of service providers for managing service provision based on innovation and good practices. (b) Increase public interest and engagement in local government service provision. (c) document and build structure to promote replication of good practices Source : Kinerja website	2010 – 2016
ProRep – USAID	Program Representasi, or ProRep, was one means of addressing the need for better representation. The Program supported a number of civil society organizations, think tanks, and the DPR (House of Representatives) to better research and understand, articulate, and respond to citizen needs and improve public policies. The ProRep project strengthened representation in three important areas: First, it will build the capacity of member- and constituency-based based civil society organizations (CSOs) so that they can better represent the interests of their members and constituents at the national and/or local level. Second, it will support independent analysis and public consideration of legislation and policies having a major impact on democratic governance. Third, it will work with Indonesia's key representative bodies – primarily the House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat or DPR), but possibly also the Regional Representative Council (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah or DPD) -- to help them become more effective, responsive and transparent. ProRep also initiated a new "policy community" phase, supporting civil society, research, and government institutions' efforts to join forces to improve, and better implement education, health, environment, and anti-corruption policies. *Source : AID-497-C-11-00002 / Program Representasi (ProRep) Description*	2011 – 2015
ACCESS - DFAT	ACCESS is a civil society strengthening program encourages positive and effective engagement between citizens, civil society and local government at different levels (village, sub-district and district level), to ensure that local governments have access to methodologies and practices that strengthen the processes and	2010 - 2013

	systems they use to meet citizen needs. ACCESS works with its civil society partners to strengthen their capacity to participate effectively in democratic processes. By doing so, ACCESS supports the building of a responsible constituency that is engaged and interacts constructively with government to enhance development efforts. This opens the possibility for government and citizens to engage in the collaborative management of the affairs of the state at the local level. *Source: Independent Evaluation ACCESS Replication Program Program in 4 Districts, Final Report, November 2013 - January 2014. Donna Leigh Holden and Wahyu W. Basjir*	
AIPHSS - DFAT	The Australia–Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening (AIPHSS) supported the Government of Indonesia's plan to strengthen health systems and achieve the health Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), in particular the maternal mortality MDG, which is seriously off track. The program aligns with the Ministry of Health Strategic Plan and the Government of Indonesia's Roadmap to Accelerate Achievement of the MDGs in Indonesia, which includes an explicit commitment to achieve the maternal mortality MDG. The program's impact (goal) is to improve the health status of poor people. The outcome (purpose) will be the improved use of quality primary health care and referral to the right type of care at the right time to best protect the life of mothers and children. The program intends to strengthen health financing and human resources for health, and thereby contribute, in support of other Government of Indonesia plans, to improving maternal and child health outcomes. The program aims specifically to increase the use of primary health care by the poor and near-poor. Source: *Australia–Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening 2011–2016 Program design document November 2011*	2011 - 2016
AIPD-DFAT	The Australian Indonesian Partnership for Decentralization (AIPD), was implemented from December 2010 to June 2015. The program focused on support for the Government of Indonesia (GoI) decentralization program. The program worked with three central GoI ministries, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHa), Ministry of Finance (MoF) and Bappenas. It operated in five provinces (East Java, Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB), Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT), Papua, and West Papua), across 20 districts and with a selection of service units, civil society organizations (CSO), universities and communities. It is a complex program with different activities and focus in its various locations. The program aimed to support the Government of Indonesia in its decentralization policies through capacity building of public servants at provincial and district level and through improvements to the system of public financial management. In	2010-2015

	practice the program faced considerable challenges due to internal and external changes. This led to a major restructure of the program in 2013 resulting in a change of focus towards achieving service delivery outcomes.	
PGSP-UNDP	Provincial Governance Strengthening Program is governance program of UNDP to respond decentralization that in the early stage of its implementation was heavily directed to district level government, thus neglected the role of provincial government. PGSP developed three strategies to achieve that end: (1) Enhanced policy and regulatory frameworks that further clarifies and strengthens roles and functions of provincial government; (2) Strengthened provincial government capacity in economic development planning and budgeting; and (3) Enhanced public service delivery through governance innovations, implementation of minimum service standards, and public complaint mechanisms. The program worked with the Directorate of Regional Autonomy, Bappenas; Directorate of Regional Autonomy of MOHA, and three provincial governments (Bangka Belitung, Gorontalo, and NTT).	Phase 1: 2010-2011 Phase 2: 2011-2013
Tranformasi – GIZ	A strategic initiative of the GIZ TRANSFORMASI programme is to support the establishment of sub-national knowledge hubs on innovation in the public sector. The objective of this initiative is to assist in identifying and sharing innovation, and to support systematic knowledge exchange between local governments to increase the spread of good practices. TRANSFORMASI strengthens the planning and monitoring competence of the partner institutions and selected local governments with a view to improving the overall coherence of administrative reform and to accelerating implementation. One important issue is the division of competences in the field of steering and monitoring between the institutions. TRANSFORMASI supports the Ministry of Administrative Reform as the main political decision-maker in assuming a leading role, particularly in the field of integrity management.	2014 to 2016
SIPS	SIPS, or the Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi project, was a Government of Canada's (Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development (DFATD)), project. The project worked with Indonesian Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). This project had two broad objectives. The first is to identify, implement and demonstrate improved corruption prevention practices related to improving transparency and accountability. The second is to strengthen KPK's role as a catalyst and mentor for corruption prevention initiatives in 10 sub-national governments (eight districts/cities and two provincial). SIPS aimed at having three main direct results: (1) more transparent, accountable front-	2011-2015

| | office service delivery practices and procurement systems in selected sub-national governments; (2) strengthened KPK capacity to influence change in sub-national governments, and (3) a stronger enabling environment for reduced corruption through increased awareness of corruption prevention strategies and practices. Seventy-five percent of the project effort was focused on improving the capacity of sub-national governments. The remaining 25% was divided between building the capacity of KPK (15%) and documenting and disseminating the best practices and lessons learned from all project activities (10%) | |

ANNEX VI: DETAILED FIELD DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE

National Level

Date	Day	Time	Location	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
14-Jul	Fri	09.30 – 12.00	Bappenas Office	All	Aryawan Soetiarso Poetro (Director of Regional Autonomy) + Alen Ermanita (Development Planner)
24-Jul	Mon	15.00 – 17.00	Kemen PAN RB Office	Transformasi	Diah Natalisa (Deputy Minister, Public Services) Imanuddin, and Damayani (Assistant Deputy) Yoga (Secretary Deputy)
31-Jul	Mon	10.00 – 12.00	Australian Embassy	AIPD AIP HSS ACCESS	Astrid Kartika (Unit Manager - Development Cooperation) DFAT Eko Setiono (Human Development Unit Manager & Senior Program Manager)
1-Aug	Tue	10.00 – 12.00	GIZ office in KemenPAN RB	Transformasi	Elke Rapp (Team Leader for the GIZ funded Transformasi Project on Bureaucratic Peform and Public Service Delivery) + Staff
		13.00 – 14.30	Canadian Embassy	SIPS	Jeffrey Ong (Senior Development Officer, Embassy of Canada for Indonesia)
		16.00 – 18.00	UNDP Office	PGSP	Siprianus Bate Soro, DGPRU Team Leader UNDP + Staff
2-Aug	Wed	09.00 – 11.00	USAID MESP Office	Data Collecting Plan	Frank Feulner (Senior Democracy and Governance Specialist) USAID Jonathan Simon (Chief of Party USAID MESP) Luthfi Ashari (Team Leader Democracy, Rights, And Governance Development + 2 Staff) USAID
3-Aug	Thu	10.00 – 12.00	Bappenas Office	All	Aryawan Soetiarso Poetro (Director of Regional Autonomy) + Alen Ermanita (Development Planner)
		13.00 – 15.00	MoHA Office	All	Safrizal ZA (Director of Regional Management, Special Autonomy, and Board consideration of regional autonomy) Gunawan (Director of Performance Evaluation and Regional Development)
4-Aug	Fri	10.00 – 12.00	Double Tree Hotel	ACCESS	Irene Insandjaja (Senior Program Manager Justice and Democratic Governance Unit) DFAT
		14.00 – 16.00	Bappenas Office	All	Wariki Sutikno (Director of Politics and Communication) Bappenas
		19.00 – 20.00	Skype Meeting	AIP HSS	Ria Arif (Senior Program Manager Knowledge Sector Program

Date	Day	Time	Location	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
					Indonesia/KSI) DFAT / Former AIP HSS National Coordinator
23-Aug	Wed	10.00 – 12.00	Coffee Shop Ratu Plaza	ProRep	Farini Pane (Ex Deputy CoP Prorep) USAID
25-Aug	Fri	14.00 – 15.30	USAID MESP Office	ProRep	Maria Ining Nuraini (Project Development Specialist Office of Democratcy, Rights and Governance) USAID
28-Aug	Mon	10.00 – 12.00	Skype Meeting	ProRep	Noelle Veltze (Ex Chief of Party Kinerja) USAID
		14.00 – 16.00	LPEM FEB UI Salemba	ProRep	Riatu Mariatul Qibthiyya (Head of LPEM FEB UI)
30-Aug	Wed	14.00 – 16.00	KPK Office	SIPS	Luthfi (Research and Development Division Fungsional) KPK + Staff
31-Aug	Thu	10.00 – 12.00	Paramadina University	ProRep	Muhamad Ikhsan (PRN Executive Secretary, at Paramadina Public Policy Institute)
5-Sept	Tue	10.00 – 12.00	Best Western Premier the Hive Hotel	ProRep	Alvin Lie (Former Member of Parliament, former ProRep parliamentary specialist and advisor, currently Ombudsman Commissioner)

East Nusa Tenggara

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Location	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
6-Aug	Sun		Jakarta	to Kupang	Flight		
7-Aug	Mon	09.30 – 10.30	Kupang	Kupang	RSUD	HSS	dr.Domi Mere, Dirut RSUD Yohanez NTT Dr. Franki, Advisor RSUD Yohanez NTT
		13.00 – 16.00			FGD Bappeda NTT	PGSP, AIPD, HSS, ACCESS	Wayan, Kepala Bappeda, Prov NTT Agus Fahik, Sekretariat Bappeda Prov NTT. Staf Dinas BPPKAD Ferdi Kaptian (Kepala Biro Organisasi) dan 9 Staff Biro Kerja Sama dan Staff
		16.00 – 17.00			Bappeda NTT	PGSP, AIPD, HSS, ACCESS	Pak Wayan, Kepala Bappeda NTT.
		19.00 – 20.30			CSO	ACCESS	Vinsen Bureni, Direktur Eksekutif Perkumpulan Bengkel APPeK.
8-Aug	Tue	08.30 – 10.00			Aston Hotel	HSS	Winston Neil Rondo, Komisi V DPRD NTT
		10.30 – 10.00			Swis Belinn Kristal	HSS	Ir. Erlina Rosita Salmun, Kasubbag PDE Dinkes Prov NTT
		13.30 – 15.00			Kampus Poltekkes	HSS	dr. Sabina Bero, S.Kp, M.Sc, Dosen Poltekkes Kemenkes Kupang/Consultant for HSS
		15.15 – 16.30			Sekdinkes	HSS	Klemen, Sekretaris Dinas Kesehatan/Ex Project Manager HSS.
		17.00 – 18.30			Dewan Penasehat RSUD	HSS	dr. Franki, Ketua Dewan Penasehat RSUD NTT
		19.30 – 21.00			Aston Hotel	HSS	Melky J Sudila, S.Pt Ois, Ex HSS Coord Prov NTT (Monitoring & Evaluation FAO UN Kupang)
9-Aug	Wed	08.40 – 09.40	Kupang	to Ngada	Flight		
		13.00 – 16.00	Ngada		Dinkes	HSS	drg. Emerentiana Reni Wahjuningsih, MHlth&IntDev, Fungsional/Dokter Gigi Madya – Puskesmas Mangulewa

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Location	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
							Agung Artanaya, Head of Preventive Health, Health Office Suwarno, Head of Program Planning, Health Office Siti Maryati, staff of Basic Service Health Office
10-Aug	Thu	09.00 – 11.00			Bappeda	AIPD/HSS	Sutanto, Kepala BP Litbang Kab. Ngada
		13.30 – 15.00					Wilibrodus Ngiso, SE, MAP, Sekretaris BP Litbang
11-Aug	Fri	09.00 – 16.00			BKD	AIPD	Sili Wale, Sekretaris BKD and 2 Staff
					Puskesmas SOA		Ety Kromen, Kepala Puskesmas Waepana SOA
12-Aug	Sat	09.00 – 12.00			Edelweis Hotel	AIPD	Gregorius Patty Pello (Gius)- Ex AIPD District Facilitator
		13.30 – 17.00				AIPD	Arina Rupa Rada, Ex AIPD District Facilitator
		19.00 – 21.00				ALL	Team Review, Transcript, Data Review
13-Aug	Sun	08.40 – 16.00	Ngada	Kupang-Sumba	Flight		
		19.30 – 21.00			Sinar Tambolaka Hotel	ALL	Completing all interview and group discussion note data results
14-Aug	Mon	08.30 – 10.00	Sumba Barat Daya	Sumbar Barat Daya	Bappeda	AIPD/HSS	Daniel (Dance) Kette, Sekretaris Bappeda Trifonia (Foni) Patty, Staff Bidang Sosial dan Budaya Pankratius Apin S.Kom, Staf Perencana Program Anggi, Kepala Litbang Bappeda
		10.30 – 12.00			Dinkes	HSS	Kepala Dinas Kesehatan dr. Elfirda Marpaung, Kepala Bidang Pelayanan Kesehatan) Adi Bolo, Kasubag Perencanaan Dinkes

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Location	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
		14.00 – 17.00			Puskesmas	HSS	Daud Dubu Dengi, SKM, Kepala Puskesmas Walandimu
		19.00 – 22.30			Sinar Tambolaka Restaurant	ACCESS	Martha Hebi, ST, Ex Program Officer for Access
15-Aug	Tue	08.30 – 10.00			Puskesmas	HSS	Ibu Adel Santje Legifani (Kepala Puskesmas Radamata)
		10.30 – 12.00			BPKAD	AIPD	Ethmundus Nau, Kepala BPKAD Lius, Staf Akuntansi
		13.30 – 15.00			Yayasan Donders	ACCESS	Mike Keraf (Executive Director) Imelda Setiawati Seda, S.Sos (Ex Facilitator for Access) Stefanus (Ex Facilitator for Access)
		15.30 – 17.00			Pendopo Desa (Uma Pege)	ACCESS	Kepala Desa, Kepala Badan Permusyawaratan Masyarakat Desa, Ketua dan anggota kelompok perempuan, Pengurus Bumdes (Desa Kalena Rongo, Kecamatan Kodi Utara penerima manfaat ACCESS)
16-Aug	Wed	08.30 – 10.00			DPMPD	ACCESS	Lodowaik L Raya, SIP (Sekretaris Dinas Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Desa) Yuliana Padi Lero, Sandro (Staf DPMD)
		10.30 – 12.00			Sekolah	AIPD	Stefanus Bili Bora (Kepala Sekolah Manda Elu, penerima manfaat AIPD) + 2 Staff
		14.00 – 17.00					Completing all interview and group discussion note data results
17-Aug	Thu	14.00 – 16.00	Sumba Barat Daya	Kupang	Flight		
		16.55 – 19.00	Kupang	Jakarta			

South Sulawesi and Gorontalo

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Office	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
6-Aug	Sun		Jakarta	Makassar	Flight		
7-Aug	Mon	08.30-12.30	Makassar		Prov. Office	SIPS	Irawan Bintang, Bappeda prov Sulsel Said, Kepala UPT PTSP South Sulawesi (OSS) Budi, staff LPSE
			Pare-pare	To pare-pare	Trip		By car
8 Aug	Tue		Pare-pare	To Pinrang	Trip		By car
		10.00 – 12.00		Pinrang	Prov Office	SIPS	Aslam, Bupati Pinrang Nurhayati Tamma, Kepala Badan Perijinan dan Penanaman Modal Syarifudin, Sekda Pinrang Andi Merani, Kepala Biro Organisasi & tata Laksana Untung Pawwitoi, Kepala Bappeda Pinrang Suyuti, LPSE Pinrang A.Pabiseangi, Disdukcapil
		13.00- 13.30			LSM	SIPS	Khahirudin, LSM
9 Aug	Wed		Pare-pare	to Makassar	Trip		By car
10-Aug	Thu		Makassar	To Gorontalo	Flight		
		14.00-16.00	Gorontalo	Gorontalo	Prov. Office	PGSP	Ir. Winarni Dien Monoarfa, Sekda Prov Gorontalo Aryanto Husain, Kepala UPT Kerjasama Pembangunan Bappeda Prov. Gorontalo
11 Aug	Fri	10.00- 14.00	Gorontalo		Prov Office	PGSP	Budi Sidiki, Kepala Bappeda prov Gorontalo Aryanto Husain, Kepala UPT Kerjasama

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Office	Project	Key Contact/ Informant
							Pembangunan Bappeda Prov. Gorontalo Wahab, Sekretaris Bappeda Prov Gorontalo Gema , Kasie Kerjasama Internasional
12-Aug	Sat	19.00-20.30	Gorontalo			PGSP	Ex Program Officer PGSP, Sjamsir Djafar 082347194599
13 Aug	Sun	19.00-20.30	Gorontalo			PGSP	LSM-LP2G: Harun Daluku, Pimpinan LSM LP2G Nur, Pengurus Salhudin Idris, Pengurus
14 Aug	Mon	10.30-12.30	Gorontalo	Pohuwato	Prov Office	PGSP	Irfan Saleh, Kepala Bappeda Kab. Pohuwato Rustam, Sekretaris bappeda Pohuwatu Fidi Mustafa, Sekretaris Dinkes Budiman Sujono, Inspektorat Abdullah Mile
		13.00- 13.30			Puskesmas Marisa	PGSP	Head of Puskesmas Marisa
15 Aug	Tue	10.00-12.00	Gorontalo		Univ. Muhamadiyah	PGSP	Sjamsir Djafar, ex Program Officer PGSP
			Gorontalo	To Jakarta	Flight		

East Java

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Location	Project	Key Contact/Informant
6-Aug	Sun		Surabaya	To Surabaya City	Flight		
7-Aug	Mon	08.30 – 12.00	Surabaya		BPKAD	AIPD	Heri Indrawanto ex-Kasie Perencanaan dan Program, BPKAD Jatim Sony Hermawan, Kasie Perencanaan dan Program, Kasie Pengembangan SDM, BPKAD Jatim
		12.00 – 15.00			Bappeda	AIPD	Siti Kharimah (Kasie Industri, Bappeda) Yudi Aristiawan Staf Pusat Data, Bappeda, Jatim
		19.00 – 20.00			By phone	AIPD	Purwida L Haryati (Ex. Provincial Coordinator for East Java Province)
8-Aug	Tue	08.30 – 12.00	Surabaya		Biro Organisasi Office	Transformasi	Ketut Arya Winangun, Kabag Organisasi Prov. of Jatim Budi Supriyanto, Kabiro Organisasi dan Tata Laksana Prov. of Jatim, Rachmad Wahyu (Kasubbag Tata Laksana Pemerintahan Prov. of Jatim)
		13.00 – 16.00			Disdukcapil Gresik District	Transformasi	Hermanto Sianturi, Head of Dinas Dukcapil, Gresik
9 Aug	Wed	09.00 – 12.00	Kota. Malang		Puskesmas Kepanjen Kab. Malang	HSS	dr. Didik Sulisyanto (Kepala Puskesmas Kepanjen) Sri Lesmono Hadi (Staff Puskesmas Kepanjen)
		13.00 – 15.00			Puskesmas Turen	Transformasi	Staff IT of Puskesmas Turen
		17.00 – 20.00			Univ. Brawijaya	Transformasi Kinerja	Wawan Sobandi, Ketua Program Studi Magister Ilmu Sosial, Univ Brawijaya.

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Location	Project	Key Contact/Informant
				Situbondo	Trip		By Car
10-Aug	Thur	09.00 – 11.00	Situbondo		Dinkes Situbondo	HSS	Abu Bakar (Kepala Dinas Kesehatan)
		11.30 – 12.30			Rumah Pemulihan Gizi	HSS	Rina Widharnarini, Kabid Kesmas
		13.00 – 15.00			Puskesmas	HSS	dr. Sudarmono (Momon), Puskesmas Panarukan – Kepala Puskesmas
		16.00 – 17.30			Puskesmas	HSS	Bp. Didik Sudiarso, Kepala Puskesmas Mangaran
		19.00 – 20.00			By Phone	HSS	Diah Pribadi (Ex Koordinator Jatim for AIPHSS)
11-Aug	Fri	09.00 – 11.00	Situbondo		Bappeda	HSS	Kepala Bappeda Situbondo – Haryadi tejo Laksono Sekretaris bappeda, Susmanto Kabid Sosbud Imam Mahbub Ansari, Secretary of DPPKAD Situbondo
		11.30 –12.00			Keminfo Situbondo	HSS	Staff of Keminfo Situbondo District
		13.30 – 15.00			Kantor Kecamatan	HSS	Marno (Camat Banyuglugur)
12-Aug	Sat	08.00 – 11.00	Situbondo		Puskesmas Asembagus	HSS	Sugiyono, Head of Puskesmas
		13.00 – 15.00			Puskesmas Mlandingan	HSS	dr. Yuni Verosita (Dokter Puskesmas) Amrozi, Head of Mlandingan Puskesmas Ponco Utomo (TU)
		19.00 – 21.00			Alun-alun Situbondo	HSS	Observation; Health Public Service from Puskesmas & DHO Situbondoin Alun-alun Situbondo
13-Aug	Sun	07.00 – 09.00	Situbondo		Alun-alun Situbondo	HSS	Observation; Health Public Service from Puskesmas & DHO Situbondoin

Date	Day	Time	Base	Travel	Location	Project	Key Contact/Informant
							Alun-alun Situbondo (Car Free Day)
		10.00 – 17.00					Completing all interview and group discussion note data results
14-Aug	Mon	09.00 – 12.00	Situbondo		DPPKAD	AIPD	Diana Hariantini, Kabid Akuntansi Abdul Qadir Jaelani, Kabid Aset Daerah Hadi Supeno, Staff Aset Daerah DPPKAD Situbondo
15-Aug	Tue		Surabaya	Return to Jakarta	Flight		

ANNEX VII: ASSESSMENT PROJECT STAKEHOLDER MAPPING

No	Donors/Projects	National	Province	Districts	Covered Areas
I	PGSP UNDP	Nat Dev Planning Agency (Bappenas) Minister of Finance Minister of Home Affair Minister of State Apparatus and Beureucratic	Prov Planning Agency (Bappeda)	District Planning Agency (Bappeda)	• National • NTT, Gorontalo (Pohwatu) • Bangka Belitung
USAID					
2	KINERJA USAID	• Nat Dev Planning Agency (Bappenas) • Minister of Home Affair • Minister Of Health • Minister of Education and Culture • National Institute of Public Administration Lembaga Adminsitrasi Negara (LAN RI) • Service Provider (Intermediary Organizations)	• Bappeda • Biro Organisasi • PTSP (Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu)	Bondowoso • Bappeda/Ibu Ida (sekretaris Bappeda) • Biro Organisasi • Dinas Kesehatan • Dinas Pendidikan • PTSP • Service Provider/Intermediary Organization • MSF	• National • Provincial (Aceh, East Java, West Kalimantan, South Sulawesi) • Districts – 25 districts
3	Program Representasi USAID	• House of Representative (DPR) – Badan Legislasi • Bappenas • MoHa • National CSO ○ Muslimat NU ○ the Institute for Economic and Social Research (LPEM FEUI), ○ Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), ○ Institute for Research and Empowerment (IRE),	• LePMIL and Sulawesi Institute - Sulawesi Institute (help the Moronene Hukaea Laea indigenous community in Bombana Regency achieve legal recognition) • Prakarsa (Surabaya) – Citizens Charter	• Malang Corruption Watch (Anti corruption movement)	• National • Provincial 25 Districts

No	Donors/Projects	National	Province	Districts	Covered Areas
		Women Research Institute (WRI), o Paramadina Public Policy Institute (PPPI), o Prakarsa founded the Policy Research Network (PRN)			
DFAT					
1	AIPD – DFAT	• MoHa (Bangda and Otda) • MoF • Bappenas	• Bappeda/Aosiasi Bappeda • BAKTI (South Sulawesi) • Service Provider (LPKIPI – East Java)	• Bappeda • BPKAD • Biro Organisasi • Biro Kerja Sama • Local CSO • District Facilitator • School	• Province Offices • Districts
2	ACCESS – DFAT	• Bappenas • MoF • MoHA	• NTT – Yayasan Sosial Dander • NTT – Yayasan Wahana Komunikasi Wanita (YWKW) • NTB – Yayasan Lembaga Kebudayaan Masyarakat Desa (YLKMP) • Sulsel - Lembaga Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Masyarakat Tanadoang (LP2MT) in Year 1 and Institute for Studies Empowerment and Transformation (ISET - Year 2)	• Bappeda • DPMD • Local CSO • Villages Government • Bumdes • BPD • Tokoh Masyarakat	• NTT (SBD, Sumba Tengah) • NTB (Lombok Utara) • South Sulawesi (Kep Selayar)
3	AIPHSS - DFAT	• Bappenas (Health Directorat) • Minister of Health (Bureau of	• Bappeda • Dinas Kesehatan	• Bappeda • Local Parliament	• Province Offices • Districts

No	Donors/Projects	National	Province	Districts	Covered Areas
		Planning and Budgeting) • The Center for Health Workforce Education and Training (Pusdiklatnakes) • Service Provider (Universities, NGOs)		(DPRD) • Dinas Kesehatan • Rumah Sakit • Puskesmas • Province and District Facilitator	
	CIDA/DFATD				

I	SIPS CIDA	• Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) – Research & Development (Litbang)
		• Bappenas
		• Kemenpan RB
		• Home Affairs
		• Kemdagri) National Procurement Agency (LKPP)
		• Ombudsman
			• Bappeda
			• PTSP/P2T & PAS (Population Administration Service)
			  o South Sulawesi
			  o East Java
			• LPSE (Lembaga Pengadaan Secara Elektronik)
				• Bappeda
				• PTSP & PAS (Pinrang)
				• Kecamatan
				• Local CSO
				• Universities
					• National
					• North Sulawesi & South Sulawesi
					• Districts

	GIZ				
	Transformation - GIZ	• KemPAN (mitra utama) • Kementerian Keuangan, • Kementerian PPN/BAPPENAS, • LAN RI • BKN • Kementerian Dalam Negeri	East Java. • JPIP • Local Universities (Unibraw and UNAIR)	• Bappeda • Biro Organisasi • BPKAD • Dinas Kominfo • Ex Province Facilitator	• Province Offices • Districts

ANNEX VIII: LIST OF RESPONDENTS

National level

Institution	Positions	Number of people
Bappenas	Dir. OTDA & Dir of Political communications	4
MoHA	Dir. OTDA, Regional Management, Dir. Regional Evaluation	4
Menpan RB	Deputy Minister, Public Services	6
GIZ	Team Leader, Adviser, & Provincial Coordinator	3
DFAT	Program Coordinator	1
	Human Development Unit Manager & Senior Program Manager	2
UNDP	DGPRU Team Leader	1
DFAT ACCESS	Senior Program Manager for Justice & Democracy	1
DFAT AIPHSS	Senior Program Manager	1
CIDA	Senior Development Officer, Embassy of Canada for Indonesia	1
USAID	Senior Democracy and Governance Specialist, Chief of Party MESP Team Leader Democracy, Rights, And Governance + 2 Staff	5
	EOR USAID + Ex DCOP ProRep + Ex COP ProRep	3
LPEM FEB UI	Head of LPEM FEB UI	1
KPK	Luthfi (Research and Development Division Fungsional) KPK + Staff	2
Paramadina University	PRN Executive Secretary, at Paramadina Public Policy Institute	1
Ombudsman Commissioner Member	Former Member of Parliament, former ProRep parliamentary specialist and advisor, currently Ombudsman Commissioner	1
Total		**37**

Local Level

Institution	Positions	Number of people
NTT:		
Bappeda	Head of Bappeda, Secretary of Bappeda, Head of Integrated Team Coordination, Kepala Bidang Social – Culture	5
Bureau of Organization	Head of Bureau of Organization + 8 Staff	9
Financial Office	Head of Budgeting Division & Head of Accounting Division	2
Development Cooperation Office	Head of Home Affair Coorporation + 1 Staff	2
RSUD Yohanez	Director of RSUD Yohanez, Advisor Committee of RSUD Yohanez	2
CSO Perkumpulan Bengkel APPeK	Executive Director	1
DPRD NTT	Member of V Commission House Representative Province NTT	1
Health Office	Secretary of Health Office, Sub Division of Data Center and Evaluation	2
Health Polytechnic	Lecture	2
HSS Officer	Ex Cord for HSS	1
Ngada District:		
Health Office	Head of Planning + 3 Staff and Head of Public Health Center	4
Bappeda	Head of Bappeda and Secretary of Bappeda	2
Financial Office	Secretary of Financial Office + 2 Staff	3
Public Health Center	Health of Waepana Public Health Center	1
AIPD Officer	Ex District Facilitator	1
Sumba Barat Daya Disctrict:		
Bappeda	Secretary of Bappeda + 3 Staff	4
Health Office	Head of Health Office + 2 Staff	3
Financial Office	Head of Financial Office + 1 Staff	2
DPMD	Secretary of DPMD + 2 Staff	3
Public Health	Head of Walandimu Public Health Center	1
Public Health	Head of Radamata Public Health Center	1
AIPD Officer	Ex District Facilitator	1
CSO Donders	Executive Director of Donders + 2 Staff	3
Village	Head of Kalena Rongo Village + Citizens	6
School	Head of Manda Elu Junior High School + 2 Staff	3
Total		**65**

Institution	Positions	Number of people
South Sulawesi:		
Bappeda	Kabid Social-culture, Kasubid education& Social-culture,2 Staff	4
LPSE (E-Procurement)	Kasubid LPSE South sulawesi	1
PTSP (OSS)	Head of PTSP South Sulawesi, staff	2
Pinrang:		
Bupati	Bupati	1
Regional Secretariat	Regional Secretary	1
Bureau of Organization	Head of Bureau of Organization	1
Bappeda	Kabid Social-culture	1
LPSE (E-Procurement)	Kasubid LPSE of Pinrang	1
PTSP (OSS)	Head of PTSP of Pinrang	1
Dinas Kependudukan Catatan Sipil	Head of Disdukcapil of Pinrang	1
Total		**14**

Institution	Positions	Number of people
Gorontalo:		
Bappeda	Head of Bappeda, Secretary of Bappeda, Head of UPK Go, Kasie Kerjasama Internasional	4
Regional Secretariat	Regional Secretary	1
PGSP	Ex Program Officer of PGSP	1
NGO	LP2G (Lembaga Pengakjian Pembangunan Gorontalo)	3
Pohuwato District:		
Bappeda	Head of Bappeda, Secretary of Bappeda	2
District of Health Organization	Secretary of DHO	1
District of Education Organization	Secretary of DEO, ex Secretary of DEO	2
Total		**14**

Institution	Positions	Number of people
East Java :		
Bappeda	Kasie Industri, Staff Pusat Data	2
Bureau of Organization	Head of Bureau of Organization of Prov.East Java, Kabag Organisasi Prov. of Jatim, Kasubbag Tata Laksana Pemerintahan Prov. of Jatim	3
Financial Office	BPKAD (Kasie Program Planning + 1 Staff, Kasie Pengembangan SDM) Ex Kasie Perencanaan dan Program	4
GIZ	GIZ Provincial Staff	1
AIPD Officer	Ex Provincial Coordinator	1
AIP HSS Officer	Ex Provincial Coordinator	1

Institution	Positions	Number of people
Malang :		
Univ. Brawijaya	Consultant, Scholar	1
Puskesmas Kepanjen	Head of Puskesmas Kepanjen, Staff	2
Gresik District:		
Dinas Dukcapil	Head of Dinas Dukcapil, Gresik	1
Situbondo District:		
Bappeda	Kasie Sosbud	1
DPPKAD	Sekretaris, Kabid Akuntansi, Kabid Aset Daerah, Staff Aset Daerah	4
Health Office of Situbondo	Head of Health Office, Kasie Promkes dan pemberdayaan masyarakat, Kabid Kesmas, Staff	4
Financial Office	Secretary of Financial Office	1
Kecamatan Bayuglugur	Camat Banyuglugur (ex Kabag Kesmas)	1
Puskesmas Panarukan	Kepala Puskesmas Panarukan	1
Puskesmas Mangaran	Kepala Puskesmas Mangaran	1
Puskesmas Asembagus	Puskesmas Asembagus	1
Puskesmas Mlandingan	Kepala Puskesmas Mlandingan Dokter Puskesmas Mlandingan Kepala TU Mlandingan	3
Total		**33**

ANNEX IX: DOCUMENT REFERENCE LIST

No	Projects	Type of Document	Topic	Contributor	Timeline
	Kinerja	Best Practice	Berbagi Praktik Baik Pelayanan Kesehatan di Papua (Buku 1)	Tim USAID Kinerja	2016
		Best Practice	Berbagi Praktik Baik Tata Kelola Kesehatan	Tim USAID Kinerja	2015
		Report	Laporan Analisis Anggaran Daerah 2008-2011 "Temuan-Temuan Hasil Studi Pengelolaan Anggaran di 20 Kabupaten/Kota Partisipan Program Kinerja"	Seknas Fitra, The Asia Fondation, USAID Kinerja	May 2012
		Report	Laporan Analisis Anggaran Daerah 2011-2014 Hasil Penelitian Di 20 Kabupaten/Kota Program Kinerja	Seknas Fitra, The Asia Fondation, USAID Kinerja	June 2015
		Report	Laporan Kinerja Pengelolaan Anggaran Daerah (Kipad) 2014 "Hasil Penelitian Di 20 Kabupaten/Kota Program Kinerja"	Seknas Fitra, The Asia Fondation, USAID Kinerja	June 2015
		Best Practice	Alih Pengalaman Praktik Cerdas "Penerapan Standar Pelayanan Minimal Bidang Kesehatan"	Direktorat Jenderal Otonomi Daerah Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia, Proyek BASICS-DFATD Kanada, dan Proyek Kinerja-USAID	2014
		Best Practice	Pengembangan Organisasi dan Kepemimpinan "Seri Hikmah Pembelajaran dari USAID-KINERJA"	Tim USAID Kinerja	2014
		Policy Paper	Rencana Aksi Daerah Percepatan Penurunan Angka Kematian Ibu (RAD PPAKI)	Kate Walton, Health Specialist, USAID-Kinerja	March 2015

No	Projects	Type of Document	Topic	Contributor	Timeline
		Policy Paper	Menuju Tata Kelola Program Perencanaan Persalinan dan Pencegahan Komplikasi (Pembelajaran dari Program USAID-KINERJA)	Tim USAID Kinerja	NA
		Best Practice	Tata Kelola Inisiasi Menyusu Dini Dan Asi Eksklusif "Seri Pembelajaran dari USAID-KINERJA"	Tim USAID Kinerja	2014
		Best Practice	Tata Kelola Penerapan Standar Pelayanan Minimal (SPM) Bidang Kesehatan untuk Kabupaten/Kota "Seri Pembelajaran dari USAID-KINERJA"	Tim USAID Kinerja	March 2014
		Best Practice	Tata Kelola Persalinan Aman "Seri Pembelajaran dari USAID-KINERJA"	Tim USAID Kinerja	2014
		Final Report	Study on Sustainable Innovations and Good Practices of District/City Governments Winning Autonomy Awards in East Java (2004-2013)	JPIP, USAID Kinerja	2013
		Best Practice	Kinerja Good Practices	Tim USAID Kinerja	April 2016
		Planning	Kinerja Papua Cost Extension Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	Tim USAID Kinerja	April 2016

No	Projects	Type of Document	Topic	Contributor	Timeline
		Planning	Kinerja Papua Program "Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (PMEP)"	Tim USAID Kinerja	November 2013
		Report	Kinerja Program Annual Report Year 4 Part A – Kinerja Quarterly Report Part B – Kinerja Papua Expansion Quarterly Report	Tim USAID Kinerja	October 2013 – September 2014
		Report	Kinerja Program Annual Report Year 5 Part A – Kinerja Annual Report Part B – Kinerja Papua Expansion Annual Report	Tim USAID Kinerja	October 2014 – September 2015
			Kinerja - Improving Public Service Delivery Final Report	Tim USAID Kinerja	October 2010 — September 2015
	ProRep	Planning	Prorep (Program Representasi) Performance Management Plan (PMP)	Tim USAID ProRep	2015
		Report	Midterm Evaluation Of The Program Representasi (ProRep) Project	Tim USAID Prorep	2013
		Report	Final Performance Evaluation Of Policy Cluster Approach Program Representasi (ProRep)	Tim USAID Prorep	2016
		Report	Indonesia Program Representasi (Final Report)	Tim USAID Prorep	2016
	AIPD	Report	Australia Indonesia Partnership for Decentralisation	Pulse Lab Jakarta	August 2014 – June 2015

No	Projects	Type of Document	Topic	Contributor	Timeline
			End Of Activity Report		
		Report	The Australia-Indonesia Partnership For Decentralisation Independent Completion Report	Linda Kelly & Diding Sakri	August 2015
		Others	Australia Indonesia Partnership for Decentralisation (AIPD) Delivery Strategy	Tim DFAT AIPD	2010 - 2015
	ACCESS	Planning	Australian Community Development and Civil Society Strengthening Scheme (ACCESS) Phase II	Tim DFAT ACCESS	2007
		Report	Independent Evaluation ACCESS Replication Program in 4 Districts	Donna Leigh Holden and Wahyu W. Basjir	November 2013 - January 2014
		Report	ACCESS Phase II Indonesia Activity Completion Report May 2008 – April 2014	IDSS	2014
		Best Practice	Revitalisasi Musrenbang Desa: Paradigma, Kebijakan Dan Praktik Pengalaman Access Di Sumba Nusa Tenggara Timur	Ferdinandus Rondong	NA
		Planning	Sustainability in Access Phase II	Greg Rooney	March 2014
	AIP HSS	Planning	Australia–Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening 2011–2016 Program design document	AIPHSS Team	November 2011
		Report	Laporan DHA Situbondo	Tim DHA Kabupaten Situbondo	2012
		Report	Health Sector Review	Kementerian PPN/Bappenas	October 2014

No	Projects	Type of Document	Topic	Contributor	Timeline
		Planning	Australia–Indonesia Partnership for Health Systems Strengthening 2011–2016 "Program design document"	AIP HSS Team	November 2011
	SIPS	Planning	Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi (SIPS) 2015 Annual Work Plan	Cowater International Inc	February 2015
		Report	Support to Indonesia's Island of Integrity Program for Sulawesi (SIPS) "Annual Progress Report January – December 2014"	Cowater International Inc	March 2015
		Report	Support to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi (SIPS) 2015 Annual Progress Report	Cowater International Inc	December 2015
		Report	ReportSupport to Indonesia's Islands of Integrity Program for Sulawesi (SIPS) Project Completion Report	Cowater International Inc	March 2016
	Transformasi	Planning	Sharing Public Sector Innovation At The Sub- National Level In East Java	FutureGov	NA
		Report	Better Public Service Delivery For Improving Bureaucracy Reform "Final Report"	GIZ – Pulse Lab Jakarta	2016
	PGSP	Planning	Provincial Governance Strengthening Programme (PGSP) "Project Document)	Tim UNDP PGSP	2009
		Planning	People-Centered Development Programme In Papua And West Papua 2011-2012 Phase 2	Tim UNDP PGSP	2011
		Report	Provincial Governance Strengthening Programme (PGSP) Final Evaluation Report	Mike Freeman, Evaluation Team Leader and Hizrah Muchtar, Evaluation Team	2014

No	Projects	Type of Document	Topic	Contributor	Timeline
				Member	