



Independent Evaluation of Building Resilience of Eastern Indonesia MANAGEMENT RESPONSE and LEARNING & DISSEMINATION PLAN

Prepared by: Widya Setiabudi

Approved by:

Date Approved:

Aid Activity Summary

The Australia Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction (AIFDR) is a partnership between the Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB, Indonesia's National Disaster Management Agency) and the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID). Oxfam's initiative in Building Resilience (BR) in Eastern Indonesia is managed through AusAID's AIFDR program. It is a \$4,085,368 activity over three years from June 2009 to June 2012.

Building Resilience in Eastern Indonesia aims:

- 1. To strengthen government, civil society, and community action for disaster risk reduction (DRR) in order to enable communities, government and CSOs to identify, plan and act for reducing the vulnerabilities of communities to disasters.**
- 2. To improve capacities of Oxfam partners in implementing DRR projects through training and ongoing coaching in order to enable partners to work with the government, civil society and communities to plan and implement DRR models to reduce the vulnerabilities of the communities, especially women.**

BR focuses on ensuring consolidation and scalability through partnerships and collaboration with communities, government, other stakeholders and programs in Community-Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM). The program targets local partners, local district disaster management agencies (BPBDs) and communities. Through local NGO Partners, Oxfam implements this program in the provinces of Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB), Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT), West Papua, Papua, Central Sulawesi and North Sulawesi.

The program has three major design elements:

1. Working with selected communities and schools to enable them to identify their own risks, to plan and to take action to reduce their vulnerabilities to disasters, especially women.
2. Enhancing local government capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) to identify risk. Local government disaster management activities are coordinated at district and provincial level by the recently formed Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah (BPBD or Regional Disaster Management Agencies).
3. Increasing the capacity of the local NGO partners to plan and implement DRR models to reduce the vulnerabilities of the communities, especially women.

Aid Activity Name	Building Resilience in Eastern Indonesia: Strengthening government, civil society, and community action for disaster risk reduction		
AidWorks initiative number	INI422		
Commencement date	15 th June 2009	Completion date	14 th May 2012
Total Australian \$	4,085,368 AUD		
Total other \$	None		
Delivery organisation(s)	Oxfam		

Aid Activity Name	Building Resilience in Eastern Indonesia: Strengthening government, civil society, and community action for disaster risk reduction
Implementing Partner(s)	PMPB, YPPS and FIRD in NTT; Koslata, Konsepsi, and LP2DER in NTB Kelola and Jambata in Sulawesi; Kompak, TALI and Perdu in Papua; IDEA and MPBI at national level
Country/Region	Indonesia
Primary Sector	DRR

Independent Evaluation Summary

A Mid Term Review (MTR) was conducted between April-June 2011, by a team consisting of one international team leader with extensive experience in evaluation and a national team member with extensive experience in DRR in Indonesia.

Evaluation Objective:

1. To measure how the Building Resilience Program (BR) has progressed against identified program outcomes and how it contributes to AusAID's goal in building community resilience in Indonesia, within AusAID's DRR policy framework.
2. To extract learning, best practices and seek feedback for improved program implementation.

Evaluation Completion Date:

27 June 2011

Evaluator Team:

Mike Freeman (Team Leader), Robert Sulisty (team member), Dian Octarina (Interpreter & Note-taker).

Methodology:

The MTR Team employed a hybrid qualitative methodology where a desk review of relevant project documents was undertaken as well as primary data collection through field visits/observation, focus-group discussions and individual interviews with OXFAM's local partners, government counterparts, OXFAM's national and field staff, and the communities where the BR program is implemented. The team spent 5 weeks in the field.

General Conclusion and Recommendations:

The MTR concludes that BR should be extended and/or expanded in the districts in which it is currently working, with a view to more solidly institutionalizing DRR in district government systems and providing more sustained capacity building support to BPBDs. This will allow scope for continued support to villages and schools already participating in BR (even if on a reduced basis), while at the same time offering opportunities to replicate the successes of the program in other villages.

Management Response to General Conclusion & Recommendation:

AIFDR agrees with the conclusion and finds that the MTR confirms the result of monitoring visits AIFDR carried out in Building Resilience Program areas and with implementing partners and targeted communities. AIFDR expresses its interest to continue the project into a phase two, ensuring it adapts and incorporates the MTR recommendations in a realistic manner.

Management Response per Recommendation

Recommendation	AIFDR Response
<p><u>Recommendation 1 - Extend BR in current districts:</u> BR support through its existing partners should be extended in current districts, particularly to take account of the capacity building needs of BPBDs (Provincial/District Agency for Disaster Management), to build village-district DRR links (including access to budgets), to complete vital EWS (Early Warning System) and evacuation work where this has not yet been finalised, to complete work in schools, and to finalise where necessary local BR documentation.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees with the MTR Team that it is important to integrate the DRR Plan into Village Development Plans. If any future grants are made available for the continuation of the BR Program, AIFDR would like to see the continuation of the current work in the same geographic areas, so that the expected outcomes occur. However, provided there is good justification, OXFAM can propose new areas for the follow-up program. The MTR only visited selected project areas, and is therefore unable to generalise the findings across all project areas.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 2 - Base future activities on existing approaches:</u> Future BR type activities should be based on the existing methodologies and approaches to NGO/local government partnership that have been tried and tested by Oxfam and its Partners.</p>	<p>AIFDR partially agrees with the result with two additional points:</p> <p>The current approach and methodology are measured with the same indicators for all targeted communities and districts. The planning should be specific enough to show changes happening in targeted government and the communities while still enabling OXFAM and partners to refine and adapt the methodology to the local context.</p> <p>The utilization of the expertise of OXFAM local partners should be maximized in order to adapt the tools and methodologies for communities whose cultures vary.</p> <p>Realizing the AIFDR program concludes in June 2013 and adaptation of the methodologies/tools will take time, AIFDR will seek possibilities to further support this program beyond June 2013 if the new proposal is approved for funding.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 3 - Prioritise sub-district links:</u> Oxfam and its partners should prioritise the building of links with sub-district administrations, recognising their key role in disaster response.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees with the recommendation, although more rigorous research is required in order to understand the role of sub-districts in DRR and within the development context, whether they are the front line of the government disaster response and whether they provide a government link between village and district.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 4: - Involve Provincial BPBDs:</u> If extension to the current BR program is granted, Oxfam and its partners should attempt to have more formal involvement of Provincial BPBD, to take into account Provincial BPBD roles in linking districts to the national government and to familiarise Provincial BPBDs with CBDRM methods and encourage their future involvement in DRR.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees with the MTR Recommendation.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 5 - Work to reduce impact of staff transfers:</u> To help mitigate problems associated with frequent transfer of staff in district governments BR should (in the time available and in future extensions) take measures such as 1) encouraging government officers who have been trained and since moved to remain active in local forums; 2) encouraging measures for knowledge management within BPBDs; 3) encouraging BPBDs to establish regular DRR training and familiarisation programs for themselves and other SKPDs; and 4) maximising involvement of <i>camats</i> (sub-district heads), who tend to stay in place longer.</p>	<p>AIFDR partially agrees with recommendation 5 to take measures 1-3. As for the recommended measure 4) maximizing involvement of <i>Camats</i>, please see AIFDR response for recommendation 3.</p>

Recommendation	AIFDR Response
<p><u>Recommendation 6 - Travel support for officials:</u> The BR program should be flexible regarding the provision of travel support for district government officials, particular in the light of BPBDs currently not having operational budgets. Furthermore these officials should be encouraged to adopt innovative approaches to engagement with communities, either in the village or in district headquarters by linking through the district and village DRR planning processes.</p>	<p>AIFDR does not fully support this recommendation. It is important that the government allocates its own budget for monitoring and evaluation Alignment, synchronization and joint monitoring between BPBD's disaster management plan and OXFAM's workplan should occur.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 7 - More emphasis on schools:</u> Oxfam and its partners should place more emphasis on the schools element of BR in the time available (and in any extension), particularly to build better linkages between villages and schools, and to ensure that students are more familiar with DRR measures that schools can adopt.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees with the MTR recommendation.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 8 - Importance of the private sector in DRR:</u> With the forum approach now gaining momentum within BR, and the growing awareness of the role that the private sector can play in DRR, it is important to ensure that the private sector and its associations become involved, bearing in mind that they can offer expertise as well as funding.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees with the recommendation. For future programming, opportunities to work with the private sector, especially in the development of contingency plans, needs to be explored. This may not be the focus during the first year establishment of the DRR Forum but may be developed later as the Forum has grasped a better understanding of their roles and responsibilities.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 9 - Modify small grants approaches:</u> In the future, if small grants are to be used within the BR approach (and they should) allocations should be larger than the current level because community expectations for practical mitigation measures are very high and needs in this area emerge from the BR analysis process. Recognising that BR funding for this will always be limited, small grants in the future should be better focused on leveraging wider government and community funding for these measures. In addition (and in the light of Recommendation 10 on climate change) Oxfam and its partners should consider the use of small grants for livelihoods activities that reduce community vulnerability to disaster.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees that the small grants are only for leveraging wider government and community funding. Communities should also be encouraged to contribute. Although their economic capacity may be limited, they do have time and human resources that they can invest if they believe that DRR is worth investing in. This will give a sense of community responsibility, ownership and priority and help build a dialog with the government.</p>
<p><u>Recommendation 10 – CCA (Climate Change Adaptation) is a key activity for the future:</u> Oxfam should utilise and further develop its international capacity in climate change adaptation for use within future BR activities at the local level, but should recognise that this will need further investigation on measures to be used at the local level. Furthermore, Oxfam should investigate the inclusion of a more comprehensive approach to livelihoods within future BR activities, beginning with its inclusion in PCVA (Participatory Capacity & Vulnerability Assessment) methodology.</p>	<p>AIFDR agrees with the recommendation. AIFDR noticed in the monitoring visits that the role of local facilitators is very important in helping the communities understand CCA issues. As admitted by some of the local facilitators, understanding the Participatory Capacity and Vulnerability Assessment (PVCA) tools was already a challenge for them. They find it more challenging to use the tools to facilitate the communities.</p> <p>For future reference, if any tools are used in combination with CCA and/or livelihoods, there needs to be sufficient time and resources focused on the capacity building of facilitators' to help them adapt the tools to specific contexts.</p>

Recommendation	AIFDR Response
Recommendation 11 - More responsive monitoring: Oxfam should adapt its current monitoring processes to be more responsive to issues and concerns that arise in the field. This should be done by making a direct linkage between the staff and Partners in the field and Oxfam's Jakarta office to better exploit specialist expertise in Jakarta and to provide a clearer understanding of overall program trends and issues.	AIFDR agrees with the recommendation and is supportive of OXFAM trying to improve its monitoring and evaluation by integrating feedback from the field office to the national office in Jakarta.
Recommendation 12 - Strengthen village participatory monitoring: Oxfam and its partners should examine the potential for strengthening participatory monitoring and learning processes within CBDRM at the village level if time is available.	AIFDR agrees with the MTR recommendation. This recommendation should inform the design of the BR in the next phase and potentially include involvement from communities and partners. Based on our observation on OXFAM's partners, they have the potential to contribute to the adaptation of tools, including the development of training and monitoring tools for communities.
Recommendation 13 - Flexibility in design: In future rounds of BR, it is recommended that more flexibility and variation be allowed within the design process and during implementation, by allowing partners a clear role in design and negotiation of outcomes for their programs. Furthermore, future BR programs would benefit from the use of more qualitative indicators, particularly at the output level.	AIFDR agrees with the recommendation. Although it is true that the outcomes and goals should not be compromised, the indicators should be set in a more realistic manner to give more time for capacity development and planning; reflecting outcomes more than outputs. In any subsequent phase of BR, if it has not been done, there should be more space allocated for the partner organizations and the communities to feedback on program planning and design. This will give a realistic indication of what will be achievable by the end of the program period.
Recommendation 14 - Formal links with other AusAID funded projects: In future rounds of BR it is recommended that more formal linkages are explored and if feasible developed with other AusAID funded initiatives at an earlier stage in program implementation. AIFDR should play an active role in this. Of particular value is the building of further links with PNPM.	AIFDR agrees with the MTR recommendation. In AusAID there is a Papua working group which aims at cooperation amongst units within AusAID to work in a more convergent manner. AIFDR has tried to raise the issues gathered during field visits with relevant units, such as AIPD and decentralization. AIFDR should develop a more systematic approach and strategy to mainstreaming DRR in other units of AusAID and establish a mechanism whereby partners, such as OXFAM, can raise issues related to other AusAID units. This will be a particular focus of the upcoming design of a future AusAID disaster management program.
Recommendation 15 - Support women's leadership in CBDRM: Oxfam is commended on its overall approach to gender in BR. Oxfam should continue to develop this approach in future rounds of BR. In particular Oxfam should examine the lessons it has learned regarding the empowerment of women as village leaders in the CBDRM process, as it is clear that women can be very effective in this role. There is significant potential for sustained support through facilitation and training in the future.	AIFDR agrees with the MTR recommendation and expects this will be enhanced in other components of any subsequent phase of BR.

Learning & Dissemination Plan:

Public Release:

- Presentation to partners and GoI (BNPB).
- Public Release of the report on the AusAID website (subject to approval).
- Translation of the final report and management response into Bahasa Indonesia.

Learning:

- The MTR recommended that the BR program would benefit from another phase. In considering this, the MTR also highlights a list of recommendations that will need to be considered in the review of any future proposal.
- The MTR has strengthened the need to continue support for community based initiatives. At the same time, the review highlights that a single model approach is not always the most appropriate and that understanding of local context is particularly important for impact.

Distribution List:

Stakeholder	Inclusion of Management Response	Distribution Method
AusAID Canberra/Units: Indonesia Desk, Humanitarian & Emergency Response	Yes	Email the full report (Through desk)
AusAID Post	Yes	Upload the full report on the intranet/shared point (as PDF file)
Implementing Partners/contractors	Yes	Email the full report (as PDF file)
Australian Public	Yes	Upload the full report at AusAID website (as PDF file)