

The Local Governance Innovations for Communities in Aceh, Phase II (LOGICA 2)

Aidworks Initiative No: INI355

INDEPENDENT PROGRESS REPORT

Final

Prepared for AusAID by:

Suhirman

Abdi Suryaningati

Dr Linda Kelly

February 2012

Aid Activity Summary

| Aid Activity Name | | | |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| AidWorks initiative number | INI355 | | |
| Commencement date | 1 January 2009 | Completion date | 30 June 2011 |
| Total Australian \$ | A\$18 million from AusAID | | |
| Total other \$ | | | |
| Delivery organisation(s) | Coffey International Development associated with Forum Bangun Aceh | | |
| Implementing Partner(s) | Ministry of Home Affairs | | |
| Country/Region | Indonesia / Aceh | | |
| Primary Sector | Governance | | |

Acknowledgments

The review team would like to acknowledge the logistical support provided by the managing contractor of LOGICA 2, in particular the LOGICA 2 district staff in the districts of Pidie Jaya and Aceh Timur. The review team would also like to thank the AusAID staff for their assistance throughout the IPR, in particular the organization and oversight provided by Ms Laila Yudiati. The team was joined by a representative from the Ministry of Home Affairs, Pak Win Untoro, who assisted with facilitating discussions and providing information throughout the field work. The IPR team appreciated and valued his inputs. Translation services were provided by Ms Suci Lestari, which were essential to discussion facilitation and data collection. The team leader would like to particularly acknowledge this assistance.

Finally, particular acknowledgment needs to be made of the time and generous contributions of ideas made by community members, government people at the village, sub-district, district and provincial levels in Aceh, as well as service providers at health and education facilities and staff and volunteers from local NGOs and CSOs. The team was particularly impressed by the clear thinking and informed views of people in Aceh and their strong commitment to development in their province. This review would not have been possible without these many useful, honest and insightful contributions.

Author's Details

The IPR was undertaken by a three-person team. The team included: Pak Suhirman, a governance specialist; Ms Abdi Suryaningati, a community development and gender specialist; and Dr Linda Kelly, a monitoring and evaluation specialist. All members of the team contributed to this report.

Acronyms

| | |
|----------|--|
| AusAID | Australian Agency for International Development |
| AIPD | Australia Indonesia Partnership for Decentralisation |
| BAPPEDA | District Government Planning Agencies |
| BPPA | Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Agency |
| BKPP | Personnel, Education and Training Board |
| CBO | Community Based Organisation |
| CID | Coffey International Development |
| CRF | Common Results framework |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| FBA | Forum Bangun Aceh |
| GIZ | Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit |
| ICSPO | Influence of Civil Society on Policy Outcomes |
| IPR | Independent Progress Review |
| LOGICA 2 | Local Governance Innovations for Communities in Aceh |
| MSS | Minimum service standards |
| NGO | Non-Government Organisation |
| NTT | Nusa Tenggara Timur |
| P2TP2A | centers for integrated services for the protection of women and children |
| PFM | Public Financial Management) |
| RPJMG | village mid-term development plan |
| SD | Service Delivery |
| SEDIA. | Support for Education Sector Development in Aceh |
| SOPS | Standard Operating Procedures |
| USAID | United States Agency for International Development |
| VG | Village Government |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Contents</i> | |
| <i>Aid Activity Summary</i> | <i>ii</i> |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | <i>ii</i> |
| <i>Author's Details</i> | <i>ii</i> |
| <i>Acronyms</i> | <i>iii</i> |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 4 |
| <i>Activity Background</i> | 4 |
| <i>Evaluation Objectives and Questions</i> | 5 |
| <i>Scope and Methods</i> | 8 |
| <i>Evaluation Team</i> | 8 |
| EVALUATION FINDINGS | 9 |
| <i>Program design</i> | 9 |
| <i>Outcomes and achievements</i> | 11 |
| <i>Component two</i> | 14 |
| <i>Crosscutting areas</i> | 18 |
| <i>Program implementation</i> | 24 |
| <i>Additional findings</i> | 25 |
| EVALUATION CRITERIA..... | 25 |
| <i>Relevance</i> | 25 |
| <i>Effectiveness</i> | 26 |
| <i>Efficiency</i> | 29 |
| <i>Impact</i> | 30 |
| <i>Sustainability</i> | 30 |
| <i>Gender Equality</i> | 31 |
| <i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i> | 32 |
| <i>Analysis and Learning</i> | 32 |
| <i>Summary of Evaluation Criteria Ratings</i> | 33 |
| CONCLUSIONS | 34 |
| <i>Summary of the strengths and weaknesses of LOGICA 2</i> | 34 |
| <i>Lessons learned</i> | 34 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 36 |
| 1. <i>Program extension</i> | 36 |
| 2. <i>Program redevelopment</i> | 37 |
| 3. <i>Additional recommendations</i> | 40 |
| ANNEX ONE: TERMS OF REFERENCE..... | 41 |
| ANNEX TWO: EVALUATION RESPONDENTS AND EVALUATION MISSION AGENDA | 47 |
| ANNEX THREE: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY..... | 78 |

Executive Summary

The local governance innovations for communities in Aceh (LOGICA 2) is an AusAID funded initiative under the Australian Indonesia Partnership. The first phase of the program was designed as a post-tsunami rehabilitation program. LOGICA 2 built upon the experience of that first phase but shifted from rehabilitation to focus on contribution to political stability, peace and social cohesion through improved governance and better service delivery outcomes. The objective of the program is:

“In response to communitywide advocacy, governments deliver services to improve living standards.”

LOGICA 2 operates in six districts (Kabupaten) in the province of Aceh. Currently LOGICA 2 operates in 432 villages (Gampong) in 36 sub-districts (Kecamatan).

LOGICA 2 was initially mobilised for 30 months with the possibility of a two-year extension, subject to review to assess ongoing need and program performance. Within this context, the objective of this IPR was to:

Assess the degree to which the activity has been successful in achieving its objective, and make recommendations as to whether it should continue for a further two years, with the possibility of using a facility modality from the second year of its extension to consolidate on smart practices developed through the current program.

Key findings

Program design

The IPR found that the original design, while a coherent and bold approach to governance, was an insufficient basis for LOGICA 2 and was overambitious. The actual program implementation, while meeting contractual requirements, has failed to include some features of the design. This has contributed to some of the issues identified for the program.

Achievement against objectives

The IPR found that there had been considerable achievements towards building active communities and more responsive district governments. As a result of these changes there is a tighter connection between services and citizens. The level of transparency around service delivery has increased in particular at school, health clinics and at the sub-district office. Citizens have increased knowledge of the procedure for service delivery including the time and the cost. Service units are seeking to become more accountable to citizens, seeking their feedback and suggestions.

In summary, it appears that a strong beginning has been made towards developing an enabling environment for service delivery.

Ongoing challenges

The IPR identified several specific areas of challenge for the program. These included concerns with sustainability, coordination within the program and between the program and other stakeholders, the complex focus of the program and the limited policy support provided by AusAID for the program implementation.

There were additional concerns identified with program implementation arrangements.

Recommendations

The IPR recommends extension of the LOGICA 2 program for the full remaining 24 month period.

It also recommends redevelopment of the program to address identified issues, with attention to several specific areas.

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

| Evaluation Criteria | Rating (1-6) | Explanation |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Relevance | 5 | LOGICA 2 is highly relevant to the needs of governments and communities in Aceh. When the program was designed it matched AusAID policy and further policy development is being undertaken at present to identify the contribution of LOGICA 2 to AusAID support for decentralization in Indonesia. |
| Effectiveness | 4 | LOGICA 2 has been very effective in creating an enabling environment for community empowerment. On the other hand, the program has been less effective in creating responsive government at district and provincial level and this puts at some risk the achievement of the overall program objective. |
| Efficiency | 4 | LOGICA 2 has achieved considerable activities and outputs within a short space of time. |
| Impact | NA | It is the opinion of the IPR team that it is too early in the life of the program to sensibly assess impact. |
| Sustainability | 3 | Sustainability of the program remains one of the most significant areas of concern. While the program has started a range of very important change processes the remaining time available for the program will not see these completed. If AusAID want to achieve sustainable outcomes from this program it needs to narrow its focus and reconsider some of the strategies. |

| Evaluation Criteria | Rating (1-6) | Explanation |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Gender Equality | 5 | The achievements of LOGICA 2 in gender equality have been comprehensive and impressive. The major concern in this area is how these achievements will be sustained beyond the life of the program. |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | 3 | Urgent attention is required to further develop and improve the monitoring system for this program. While work has commenced on this, the new system is still to be finalized and needs to be in place before the program is extended for any further time. |
| Analysis & Learning | 3 | There appears to have been insufficient attention given in this program to the opportunity for analysis and learning beyond that undertaken by the provincial advisor team. This is a missed opportunity for both AusAID and the Government of Indonesia, and attention should be directed to this process through the remaining program life. |

Rating scale: 6 = very high quality; 1 = very low quality. Below 4 is less than satisfactory.

Introduction

Activity Background

The local governance innovations for communities in Aceh (LOGICA 2) is an AusAID funded initiative under the Australian Indonesia Partnership. Following the first phase that ran from 2006 to 2009, LOGICA 2 commenced on 4 January 2010 for initial phase of 30 months with the possibility of extension by a further two years subject to assessment.

The first phase of the program was designed as a post-tsunami rehabilitation program. LOGICA 2 builds upon the experience of that first phase, but shifted from rehabilitation to focus on contribution to political stability, peace and social cohesion through improved governance and better service delivery outcomes. The objective of the program is:

“In response to communitywide advocacy, governments deliver services to improve living standards.”

The LOGICA 2 design draws from the strategy developed during the first phase of the program. This can be summarised as a two-component approach focused on achieving two intermediate outcomes:

Component 1—Active Communities:

“Citizen, particularly the marginalised, effectively advocate priority needs to government and contribute to service delivery reform to improve living standards.”

Component 2 – Responsive Government:

“Governments respond to citizen priorities, including those of the marginalised, by effectively allocating resources and delivering services to improve living standards.”

LOGICA 2 operates in six districts (Kabupaten) in the province of Aceh¹. The six target districts were selected and prioritised from nine possible districts in the first phase of mobilisation, based on assessment of poverty levels, conflict indicators, commitment of local government, civil society activity and accessibility to the district. Currently LOGICA 2 operates in 432 villages (Gampong) in 36 sub-districts (Kecamatan). According to the program information, the selection of the 432 villages across the six districts was determined by District Government Planning Agencies (BAPPEDA) based on district government planning and needs assessments.

LOGICA 2 is managed by a managing contractor, Coffey International Development (CID) who partner with a local non-government organisation, Forum Bangun Aceh (FBA) to deliver the program. Part of the delivery strategy is to work with local organisations, and up until September 2011, 19 local NGOs and CSOs have been contracted for various tasks under the program.

¹ The six districts include: Pidie Jaya, Bireuen, Aceh Timur, Aceh Tamiang, Aceh Barat Daya and Aceh Selatan

LOGICA 2 has a project coordinating committee which includes AusAID, representatives of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Government of Aceh (including BAPPEDA). The program also works with the provincial coordination team and has developed district and working groups in each of the six districts. The program consults with other donors working in the province of Aceh. It has undertaken particular collaboration with the AusAID program of Support for Education Sector Development in Aceh (SEDIA).

Box 1. Activity context

The location and context of the province of Aceh is significant for the review of the LOGICA 2 program. The province is a special autonomous region although the government structure is similar to that of other provinces in Indonesia. The administration is headed by the Governor and Deputy Governor who are accountable to an elected provincial legislature. Aceh is divided into 23 districts (Kabupaten) and cities (Kota) with fiscal and policy responsibilities devolved to the elected heads (Bupati) of each Kabupaten. Kabupaten are divided into sub districts (Kecamatan), administered by an appointed head (Camat), and responsible for provision of services to villages (Gampong). Gampong are headed by directly elected leaders and supported by village councils.

Aceh was subject to a 30 year conflict between the national government of Indonesia and the Free Aceh Movement. It was also subject to a tsunami in 2004 which brought unprecedented levels of destruction particularly for coastal communities and for vulnerable groups such as women. The political social and economic stability in the province is fragile despite major advances in post-tsunami reconstruction and cessation of hostilities since the negotiation of a peace deal in 2006. The capacity of government from village through to subdistrict and district levels is weak.

Despite considerable fiscal support from the National government as a result of the National decentralisation process, and internal revenue from taxes and local resources, Aceh's poverty rate is high compared to other provinces, at 22% (2009) compared with 14% nationally. Access to basic services is minimal and various assessments suggest that community confidence in government provision of services is low.

Most recently, internal politics within the province and at district level have been unstable and considerable attention seems to be given by local parliamentarians to positioning in preparation for local elections due in 2012.

On the other hand, there are considerable strengths in the province with a strong sense of Acehnese identity and sense of self-reliance. People's religious beliefs provide an important basis for unification and identity.

Evaluation Objectives and Questions

LOGICA 2 was initially mobilised for 30 months with the possibility of a two-year extension, subject to review to assess ongoing need and program performance. This independent progress review (IPR) was undertaken to provide that assessment. In addition, AusAID is currently in the process of consolidating its support for decentralisation in Indonesia with an intention to move most programs to a facility modality by the end of 2013.

Within this context, the objective of this IPR was to:

Assess the degree to which the activity has been successful in achieving its objective, and make recommendations as to whether it should continue for a further two years, with the possibility of using a facility modality from the second year of its extension to consolidate on smart practices developed through the current program.

In addition, the specific review objectives included:

- a. Assess progress towards meeting the overall goal and purpose of LOGICA 2, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
- b. Identify lessons learned from the LOGICA 2 monitoring and evaluation system for potential broader relevance to future AusAID initiatives in Decentralisation area.
- c. Recommend as to whether the project should continue for another year or two.
- d. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of LOGICA 2 and identify its best practices to contribute to other AusAID programs, especially the Australia Indonesia Partnership for Decentralisation (AIPD) and possible project delivery through facility modality which will be established in 2013.
- e. To assess how well the project addressed issues of gender equality, poverty and vulnerability in its design and implementation.

Recent information from AusAID also suggested that there are other areas of particular interest to be explored in the IPR. These are:

- a. The degree to which the project has built and is maintaining stakeholder ownership to ensure the project outcomes will be sustained after activity completion.
- b. The suitability of the project to scale up its education activities to more districts over the next 24 months, in line with the recommendation from the recent IPR for the Support for Education Sector Development In Aceh (SEDIA) project.
- c. Effective and efficient use of resources. LOGICA 2 utilises 116 staff and 152 community mobilisers alongside 1296 voluntary cadres across the 432 villages. The program also works with local NGOs to subcontract service delivery. AusAID would like some attention given to assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of these approaches to project implementation.
- d. The degree in which the project has built civil society organizational capacity to continue the work through local government funding as was initially proposed

Finally, in addition to a report against the objectives of the IPR, AusAID also sought a quality at completion rating for this project utilising the AusAID six point quality scale. In order to complete this scale there were questions for the team to consider which related to project design, implementation, management and systems for accountability.

The terms of reference for the IPR are attached at Annex One.

The IPR was conducted in December 2011. Field work was undertaken across an eight day period, exploring the views and experiences of a range of stakeholders.

Key respondents/stakeholders for the review included the following:

- Ministry of Home Affairs
- Aceh Provincial Agency
- The Aceh District Agencies of Pidie Jaya, Bireuen, Aceh Timur, Aceh Tamiang, Aceh Barat Daya and Aceh Selatan
- Selected sub-district agencies
- Community members from selected villages in the six districts of Aceh.
- AusAID
- LOGICA staff at province and district levels
- Other Donors including Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).
- Local NGOs and CSOs in Aceh

The full agenda for the review together with the list of respondents is attached at Annex Two.

Scope and Methods

A detailed evaluation methodology was prepared for the IPR it as attached at Annex Three.

In summary, the review methodology explored the program logic and assumptions of LOGICA 2 and reviewed the existing program information. Given the considerable existing information about program outputs, the review team sought to focus upon the two intermediate component outcomes and proposed two specific evaluation questions:

- Is there evidence that the project is making a significant contribution towards either or both of these outcomes within the six districts in which it is operating?
- In light of this evidence, are the various project assumptions correct, especially across the different contexts in which the project is operating? If not what implications does this have for the future of the project and wider decentralisation work within Aceh?

The IPR utilized a multiple data collection process, seeking to triangulate the various sets of information to verify outcomes and achievements and explore program assumptions. As outlined in the methodology, the intention was for the team members to utilize their professional expertise to analyse data individually and collectively, culminating in this report.

The IPR was subject to several limitations. The time available for field research was limited and therefore the in-field research was limited to two of the six districts where LOGICA 2 operates². Within these districts only a selection of villages, sub-districts and service unit visits were possible. The field data collected by the team was therefore limited and did not constitute a significant independent sample. The information collection served to verify and exemplify the existing data. Further to this, one of the team members did not speak Bahasa Indonesian and none of the team members were fluent in Acehnese. Fully independent exploration of issues was therefore not possible.

Finally, the team was challenged by the many objectives and questions attached to the mission. Given that none of the review team had had previous significant association with any of the LOGICA 2 work, there were limitations to the depth of understanding and analysis possible in the short time frame available for the review.

In recognition of these limitations the review team acknowledges that their conclusions and recommendations need to be modest and contained to their areas of expertise and direct knowledge.

Evaluation Team

The IPR was undertaken by a three-person team. The team included Pak Suhirman, a governance specialist; Ms Abdi Suryaningati, a community development and gender specialist; and Dr Linda Kelly, a monitoring and evaluation specialist.

² Additional information was sought and received from the managing contractor about the other four districts in order to complement the field research.

Evaluation Findings

The IPR findings cover program design and implementation; achievements and challenges within the two program components of community and government; and achievements and challenges in key crosscutting areas of gender, peace building, and civil society capacity development. This is followed by a summary of emerging issues which provides the basis for the assessment of the program against the AusAID criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, gender equality, monitoring and evaluation and analysis and learning.

Program design

The design for LOGICA 2 is an important feature of the program and has been influential in determining program implementation and outcomes.

The LOGICA design brings together, in one governance program, the two critical elements of ‘supply’ and ‘demand’. This is a bold approach, developed during the first phase of the program. There are many positives to such a model. The two focus areas could be understood to complement and balance each other. It could be expected that successful intervention in either area should see changes in the other, setting up a mutually reinforcing cycle. Lessons learned about demand side needs can immediately help to shape the supply side developments.

At the same time, the design is challenging and creates two foci for the program, one about empowering citizens and the other focused on capacity development of government personnel and systems. While this may be an ideal long term approach, in the short term this can create some confusion about the overall intention of the program. There appears to have been limited critical review of the feasibility of this model during the design process for the second phase, which in turn appears to have contributed to some of the confusion about the main intentions and focus of LOGICA 2.

In addition, the evaluation of Phase One of LOGICA³ makes it clear that the program was effective specifically within the post-Tsunami context.

Key stakeholders are almost unanimous in their view that LOGICA has been useful and effective in supporting villages and sub-district governments to re-establish themselves after the tsunami. (pg 24)

The design document for Phase Two gives limited attention to the way the changing context of Aceh (which is acknowledged in the document) might impact upon the proposed model or its application. It is important to ask if the model that worked in the post emergency phase where people are more ready for change and more likely to adapt to new ideas can be translated into a post conflict situation. Typically, as both governments and people move into peace-building, other factors emerge which can limit or affect their ability to take up new ideas and take risks. There seems to have been limited consideration of the appropriate use of the Phase One LOGICA model in the changing Aceh context.

³ Independent Completion Report for the Australian funded Local Governance and Infrastructure for Communities in Aceh (LOGICA) program, Final version – March 17, 2009.

Finally, the evaluation of LOGICA Phase one suggests that the model itself was less important than other factors in leading to effective outcomes.

Overall, LOGICA's effectiveness can be largely attributed to the quality of the management team in place as well as of the staff working in the field. Through establishing a good reputation for the quality of its engagement with communities, it also contributed significantly to the coordination of different agency initiatives at the village level. (pg 24)

Nevertheless, the design for Phase Two copied the Phase One model, and moved away from the flexible responsive process of the first phase. The second phase design outlined a strong technical or linear approach to implementation, described as a series of five stages, which would be phased over 12 districts according to a five-year timetable. While principles of flexibility were included, the emphasis was on application of a previously successful model is a relatively rigid and predetermined approach.

LOGICA 1 worked mainly in three districts over three years (with another three districts being included in the final third year). The final evaluation suggested that this time frame was too short for sustainable change. Notwithstanding this, the Phase Two design was ambitious expecting to reach up to 2219 villages across more than 12 districts within five years. Further, the while LOGICA 1 made (impressive) improvements in infrastructure, community cohesion building and rehabilitation of government service centers, the LOGICA 2 design proposed much bigger outcomes of service delivery outcomes health and education. Once again the feasibility of timelines and outcomes seems to have received insufficient attention in the Phase Two design process

In fact, the program has not been able to meet the initial ambitious targets set in the design. Effective community mobilization and empowerment alongside effective government capacity building has proven to be a more complex process than what was suggested in the design and one which requires attention to several influences and features. While the program has undertaken many activities and can report considerable achievements in several of the locations, these represent initial and beginning steps towards achievement of the component outcomes. It is clear from current experience that the initial design was unrealistic, contained several incorrect assumptions about strategy and context and was overambitious in its intentions and targets. This is significant in terms of judgment about the program to date.

The Phase Two design made some concession to the complexity and challenge of the program with a detailed approach to monitoring and evaluation, suggesting it should include contribution analysis, impact assessment, citizen surveys, stakeholder analysis and institutional analysis. Independent monitoring to assist AusAID with verification as well as capacity development for various stakeholders, including government, to develop their monitoring and evaluation skills to contribute to program learning and assessment was also included in the Phase Two design.

The current program implementation of LOGICA 2 has struggled to provide monitoring and reporting that is acceptable to AusAID, in part because its reporting has focused upon activities and outputs in line with the design strategy, rather than the detailed approach to monitoring outlined later in the design document. Further, AusAID chose not to mobilize the additional independent monitoring for

verification as recommended in the design⁴. Finally, there has been no wider capacity development of other stakeholders to ensure their participation in the monitoring process. Taken together, this lack of more sophisticated program assessment has contributed to insufficient analysis of progress and failed to provide the basis for addressing the gaps between program design and implementation reality.

Finally but significantly, the Phase Two design failed to address the interaction of AusAID policy development in decentralization and in the province of Aceh, and the implications for program implementation. As a result it failed to specify the role that AusAID should play in ongoing policy discussion and negotiation with the provincial government or, as appropriate, with district governments. The LOGICA 2 program therefore has been almost 'policy free', in that there has been limited engagement by AusAID at provincial level to explore issues of government ownership, responsibility and commitment. Notwithstanding attempts by the implementing agent to generate this sort of engagement at both province and district level, the limited role played by AusAID in the program means that it has not positioned well for ongoing informed engagement in this province⁵. As discussed below this has implications for program sustainability and for the effectiveness and long-term impact of program achievements.

Outcomes and achievements

Component one: Active Communities⁶

LOGICA 2 has been very successful in developing an enabling environment for communities in the six districts in Aceh to better advocate for their rights. There is progress in the ability of communities to identify, analyse and prioritise their needs; and represent their priorities to government. Particular tangible achievements include the following:

- Increased knowledge of the communities, particularly the village cadre, in regard to their rights to provision of basic social services and how government systems should work to provide those services. People are aware of their right to advocate directly to village head, to service units and if necessary to district level agencies about service provision. As a result of this increased knowledge people are interested in further expanding their information base and acquiring more skills to enable them to take charge of their situation.

"I feel blessed with the involvement with LOGICA 2. My involvement with LOGICA 2 has tremendously increased my knowledge in regards to my rights as communities and as a woman. Aside to that, LOGICA 2 has also taught me to be brave to speak in front of many parties, including in front of local government staff. With their support I now able to about issues related to the fulfilment of rights as women in village meetings, in front of the village head and staff. I am also becoming brave enough to

⁴ A monitoring review group (MRG) was anticipated at the time of mobilisation and included in the Scope of Services for the program, but this group has never been appointed

⁵ Recently AusAID has started to address this gap with the development of the Aceh Common result Framework (CRF) as an instrument to consolidate various outputs produced by AusAID programs in Aceh (LOGICA2, SEDIA and CPDA). While this had not been finalized with the Government of Indonesia at the time of the review it will provide the platform for policy engagement with the Government as LOGICA 2 moves forward.

⁶ Information about achievements under Component One was initially drawn from LOGICA2 reports. The details were confirmed through the field visit to 4 villages in two districts.

suggest improvements in front of schools teacher and head, to health centres managers , and when meeting with local health agency. Before joining LOGICA 2 activities, I am only a wife that mostly stays at home or managing my house and family. But now, I am also capable to become a resource person and a facilitator to give advice to other women on how to solve their issues. I still need, however, to get more advice and to learn about leadership, etc. to be able to advocate better for the advancement of women in my village. I also keen to share my experience with and learn from other women on strategies to pursue our needs as women. ” (Women Leader Meunasah Tutong Village; Bandar Baru Sub-district; Pidie Jaya)

- With the support of the LOGICA 2 community mobilizers⁷, some village cadres have started to develop their own innovations at village level. The examples observed included alternative schooling for children to complement formal teaching available in public schools; implementation of integrated health posts for the care of mothers and children (Posyandu); and the construction of village level health facilities (Polindes) to enable midwives to provide better care for women and children. This process in itself has increased the opportunity for women to be active in the village decision-making processes and increased the ability of village people to articulate their needs to government and service units.
- The development of village action plans where communities are able to identify their needs and articulate the kind of development they want to achieve their community. Due to LOGICA 2 influence, women were being included in these discussions and as a result the priorities of women and children are being reflected in these village plans. According to reports from LOGICA 2, 1290 people across the 432 villages were recruited as LOGICA 2 voluntary cadres. Of these 85% are women and 70% have maintained active involvement in a formal village planning forums (Musrenbang) and are contributing to local service delivery reforms as members of school and health committees.

“Through involvement in LOGICA 2 and attending all type of workshop of LOGICA 2, I am confident enough to speak in front of many people, including the village head and staff. I am so proud that women are now invited to attend village meetings and we indeed give significant inputs to the improvement of our village in that meeting. For example, we now have village poly-clinic/Polindes as result of our input at village meetings. And not only that, some of us, women, are also more aware of the importance of education for our children and in turn, start to give extra lessons to our children. We even start to be brave to give inputs in meetings in health centres. I begin to think that learning does not stop when we get married. We need to continuously learn and I hope that LOGICA 2 will still exist for years to come to give us advice and education to strengthen our capacity.” Cadre Matang Peulawi Village; Pereulak Kota Sub-District; Aceh Timur

- According to program reports, around 30% of the cadres are involved, with LOGICA 2 support, in advocacy to district level government and service units on issues related to health, education, infrastructure and welfare of women and children.

⁷ Activities under LOGICA 2 include the Community and Government Service Innovation Scheme (CAGSIS).the scheme provides small grants for it with communities on service units to work to improve service provision. Up till October 2011 417 grants had been made available to communities.

- There has been the establishment of 72 community self-help groups focused on savings and loans activities. By December 2010 the total amount of money revolving among these groups had reached 100 million rupiah. Some groups have already established their own home industries and were able to describe their plans to further develop small-scale businesses. It is significant that discussions with members of these groups indicated that the ability to generate their own income and their own operating procedures had created further empowerment of women members. The women were proud of the contribution they can make to family finances in village development as well as their ability to operate independently from other government and other programs.

Village government is important component of community development. The review found that Village government structures better understood their function, tasks and responsibilities (Tupoksi) as a result of LOGICA 2 intervention and could work together more effectively. Issues such as conflict between the village head and villages assembly had been resolved through this better understanding of functions and responsibilities. As a result the following outcomes were observed:

- Village administration processes have improved.
- There is increased ability to produce village level regulation (Qanun Gampong) and prioritise what kind of regulation is needed for particular communities. Program reporting identifies that district level regulations have been enacted across three districts and there is public consultation around village level regulation development across all the 432 villages were LOGICA 2 operates. In 189 villages health regulations have been enacted. It is notable however that provincial heads and secretaries reported a need for ongoing assistance from LOGICA 2 for the recording of this village legislation.
- There is increased understanding by the village government level about the importance of involving women in decision-making processes. There appears to be variable progress in this understanding with some women moving into leadership roles in a few locations, while in others they are now allowed to participate in meetings and decision-making discussions.
- There is increased ability to articulate needs of the village to district level government and to service units in meetings organized by LOGICA 2. As a result of this advocacy some of the villages reported that they now have midwives serving the village on a regular and reliable basis.

Notwithstanding these considerable achievements, the field research and review of LOGICA 2 documentation identified continuing challenges for LOGICA 2 in its community development work. These include the following:

- The overall strategic approach and underlying conceptual framework for LOGICA 2 draws together various activities around micro-finance, capacity development of village cadres, promotion of women's leadership and improving village governance, all for the purpose of promoting active citizenship. This was clearly well understood by the provincial LOGICA 2 team of specialist advisers, but the integration of these strategies remains less coherent in the field. What was observed was the creation of different identities at village level, with people focused upon development of skills in one area such as micro-finance or women's

leadership or village government and so on. There does not seem to be the opportunity for facilitation at village, or even district level of an integrated analysis and understanding of the LOGICA 2 strategy and how these different activities can be understood as reinforcing each other.

- There appears to be some tension between the need for LOGICA 2 to demonstrate outcomes in the relatively short time frame versus the need to further enhance the capacity of community members to identify analyse and prioritise their needs. It is clearly possible that if village level planning is left entirely in the hands of village people, their priorities and needs may be quite different to the LOGICA 2 focus areas of health, education and local government. It was not apparent to the review team how field staff are managing this tension without limiting the community empowerment strategy.
- The focus of LOGICA 2 at community level is sometimes unclear. On one hand it supports activities that enable communities to generate more income and become more self-reliant. It also supports strategies that enable community members to advocate to government for provision of basic social services. Community level stakeholders such as NGOs and CSOs reported that the focus or vision of LOGICA 2 was therefore difficult to understand and at times seemed to give mixed messages to community people, undermining the community empowerment process.
- Somewhat understandably, the dependency of village government and community members on LOGICA 2 is high at this point. Community and village government are keen to develop more knowledge and skills, eager to share this knowledge with people around them including with other villagers and want to contribute to their communities, particularly as agents of change. At this stage of community development they are keen for further information and assistance and are looking to LOGICA 2 to be the source of that assistance. (For example, community advocacy to government is largely still dependent upon interactions which are facilitated by LOGICA 2.) Within a typical community empowerment framework there are still a number of steps before communities can move from this stage to self-reliant development. Typically, progress in this direction would include the skill and opportunity to reflect upon the positive and negative impact of the new knowledge and skills being acquired as well as the outcomes being generated. This may take considerably more time than that currently available to the program.
- In line with previous point, the CAGSIS Innovation Grants has increased dependency on LOGICA 2, with communities feeling that they can turn towards the program to meet their needs in various areas. There appears to be little consideration of how to sustain funding for this ongoing innovation in communities beyond the life of the program.

Component two: Responsive Government⁸

LOGICA 2 utilises two approaches and several strategies to improve the responsiveness and capacity of government towards improved service delivery. The first approach is to encourage service units to

⁸ Information was collected for this Component through review of LOGICA 2 reports. It was then validated through visits to Aceh provincial Government, districts and sub-district governments, as outlined in the attached schedule.

comply with minimum service standards (MSS⁹), while the second is to improve the standards of competency of civil servants. In order to achieve MSS, LOGICA 2 provides training in various areas including: MSS, formulating service standards, developing citizen charters, budgeting unit costs and undertaking citizen satisfaction surveys. In order to improve civil servant competencies LOGICA 2 collaborates with the Personnel, Education and Training Board (BKPP) at Provincial level to provide training to the heads of service units including schools, health clinics and also to the head of some districts. As noted above, at the village level LOGICA 2 provides training about the functions of village head, village council and the village administrations. LOGICA 2 also promotes a one-stop administration service at the sub-district level (PATEN) to streamline service provision.

Underpinning and supporting these two approaches LOGICA 2 undertakes a range of other activities to address the particular contextual challenges of Governance reform in Aceh. To ensure that the reform is in line with local regulations, LOGICA 2 supports district governments to formulate district regulations with a particular focus on the delegation of functions from district to sub-district, the competency standards required for the heads sub-districts, health clinics in school principals and district regulations for villages. At the same time, LOGICA 2 works in line with National policy especially in relation to MSS and civil servant competency standards, drawing these into local regulation development. LOGICA 2 also engages with Parliamentary members to educate them about their functions in particular around budgeting and formation of district regulations.

Box 2. Program context

The context for LOGICA 2 work to develop more responsive government in the six districts of Aceh needs to be understood within the context of the special autonomy act for Aceh and the discontinuity between district responsibility for service provision and limited district control over budget.

These two features create particular problems in Aceh. There is a lack of regulation to define the functional assignment between provincial government and district government's, leading to misunderstanding about roles and responsibilities that translates into further confusion between district, sub-district and service unit.

There is also a lack of capacity at district level to respond to service unit requests for budget allocation. Service units must balance funds from multiple sources to enable them to operate although these funds may not match locally determine priorities. For example at one health clinic in the Trienggadeng sub-district of Pidie Jaya, the head of health clinic had developed a budget plan which enabled her to achieve the objectives of his clinic based on minimum services standards. But plan necessarily had to accommodate utilization of internal funds to finance operational costs and activities, district funds to finance office overhead costs, central government funds to finance the health insurance program for poor people and particular programs and activities and finally funds from the provincial government to finance a universal health insurance scheme. While the service unit should be able to work with the district to plan its service focus and budget, in this case the district budget provision for the unit was less than 10% of its total budget.

⁹ According to the LOGICA staff LOGICA 2 encourages district agencies and service units to adopt the MSS established by their sectoral Ministry. That is the MSS established by the Ministry of Education for schools, the MSS established by the Ministry of Health for health facilities and MOHA standards for Kecamatan.

Achievements noted to date include the following:

- The level of transparency around service provision has increased, in particular at schools, health clinics and sub-district offices. Citizens are more aware of the procedures around service delivery including the time and costs. This has contributed to reduction in transaction costs and reduced opportunity for small-scale corruption.
- Service units are now more responsive to community demand and there is active engagement in some of the units by community members through school committees, health committees and other forums.
- Social accountability of service units has improved and there are feedback mechanisms in place for citizens. Citizen satisfaction surveys and customer feedback surveys have been undertaken in various service units.
- There have been initial actions to fulfill minimum service standards in service units. For example, in some schools sanctions are given to teachers and students who do not arrive at school on time. Further, the CAGSIS grants are being utilized at service unit level to meet priority needs as determined by community members. Examples include projects to improve the libraries in schools and equipping schools with drinking water for children.
- There is strong evidence that district heads and district councils are now able to formulate, and have in fact established, district regulations to support reform at the service unit level in line with district policy. Evidence was found of district regulations for delegation of functions from district to sub-districts; district level regulation for competency standards for Heads of sub-districts and health clinics and for school principals; and district regulations for villages.
- District council members are reporting that they now have a better understanding their function, in particular their role in budgeting and the formulation of district regulations.
- There is increased commitment by the head of districts and ahead of service units to implement and work with LOGICA 2 to improve the quality of service units.
- There is national take-up of the PATEN model developed in the first phase of LOGICA and replicated under LOGICA 2. The National Ministry of Home Affairs has requested LOGICA 2 assistance to develop a framework for a national roll-out of the model. LOGICA 2 is also supporting continued roll-out of the model across sub-districts in Aceh. This model is clearly contributing to more effective service provision at sub-district level.

While these achievements are considerable in the short time frame of the project to date, there are ongoing challenges. These include:

- While LOGICA 2 is engaged with district government agencies and in particular with sub-district government, it does not engage comprehensively with the provincial government of Aceh. The provincial government has responsibly to allocate much of the budget for basic services and development programs and to develop strategic plans for health and education and women's empowerment. Yet LOGICA 2 continues to provide direct financing for basic service innovation and development at the village and service unit level. It may be that

better planning and budget coordination at provincial level through LOGICA 2 engagement at that level, would alleviate the need for this additional financial support.

- While LOGICA 2 does work with local parliamentarians to help them to understand their role and functions particularly in relation to budget allocation, there has been a lack of response from these parliamentarians with minimal change in the budget allocations to reflect local needs and priorities. It appears at this stage that other factors are more influential on the decision-making actions of these local elected officials such as fiscal capacity at district level, political context and relation between Aceh province and districts.
- Similar to the challenges identified in the community development strategy, there appears to be some fragmentation between different activity areas of LOGICA 2 at the field level. For example:
 - Activities directed to improving the public services focus of the service units undertaken by the government advisors were not in line with the public expenditure analysis undertaken by the peace and conflict advisor to assess the budget response to the needs of vulnerable groups (see Box 3 below).
 - The process of developing Citizen's Charters as managed by the government advisor appears in some locations to run separately to the development of community action plans as managed by the community empowerment advisor.
 - The micro-finance activities appear to operate in isolation from the government service reform activities.

Box 3. Fragmentation between LOGICA 2 activities

In order to improve the service units, LOGICA 2 works to encourage the units to comply with minimum service standards and competency standards for staff. LOGICA 2 also encourages the service units to involve the community in formulating the service standards, developing a citizen charter and utilizing a feedback system. To monitor the achievements of the service units LOGICA 2 conducts citizen satisfaction surveys. It supports the service units to utilize a unit costing model to ensure that budgeting is able to meet the standards they are developing.

At the same time, the LOGICA 2 public expenditure analysis focused on how budgets at district level responded to the needs of vulnerable groups rather than the processes of minimum service standards, unit costing and service planning undertaken by the service units. This analysis therefore was disconnected from the service unit development being undertaken by another part of LOGICA 2 missing an opportunity to reinforce and further integrate district budgets with service unit planning.

- There appears to be varied collaboration with other projects at village and district levels including government schemes such as the government of Indonesia national project for community empowerment (PNPM Mandiri).

- District and sub-district level government staff reported some confusion around the focus and strategy of LOGICA 2. While they remained supportive and positive about the program and its achievements, there was a consistent request for more information and more opportunity to engage with the program to ensure that it matched local priorities and local planning processes.

Crosscutting areas

Gender

LOGICA 2 has a well-developed strategy on mainstreaming gender equality in program implementation. LOGICA 2 has worked directly with women, with 85% of its voluntary village cadres being women. It has also worked with village heads and religious leaders to develop their understanding of gender equality issues.

Review of gender mainstreaming strategies

Review of the gender mainstreaming strategies utilized by LOGICA identified the following approaches:

(i) Identifying barriers experienced by women and other marginalised groups in accessing resources and services.

Activities include:

- Community profiles including gender mainstreaming and social inclusion assessments of:
 - Who, from the perspective community members themselves, are the most marginalised;
 - The extent to which women are participating in local decision-making (e.g. school committees and village government);
 - Services addressing the health needs of women (e.g. reproductive health and preventive screening);
 - Supports and resources available to women who have survived violence or are the victims of conflict;
 - School uptake rates for girls;
 - Livelihoods opportunities for women;
 - The safety and security of women in village communities, including police responses to reported incidences of violence;
 - The extent of people with disability living in the village, and the services that they access;
 - Awareness of HIV prevalence within the village, particularly among health workers;
 - The impact of Sharia'ya policing on women's capacity to participate in the social, cultural and economic aspects of village life;
 - Local economic and livelihoods conditions, restraints and opportunities, particularly for former combatants;
 - Conflict dynamics and indicators of residual conflict.

- Training, mentoring and ongoing supervision for all facilitators deployed in LOGICA 2 Community Facilitation Units in gender equity principles, understanding and identifying marginalisation and its causes, and the engagement of marginalised groups in the implementation of LOGICA 2 activities.
- Supporting the participation of marginalised groups in participative community forums engaging in needs assessment and prioritisation, planning, resolution of village problems, information dissemination, and coordination of resources.
- Village-level assessments of availability and accessibility of government services (health, education, law enforcement and infrastructure) to marginalised groups.
- The establishment of Gender and Social Inclusion Reference groups in each district to collate information on gaps and barriers to service delivery for women and to advocate for policy reforms (in collaboration with SEDIA and UNIFEM)
- Gender awareness and social inclusion training for LOGICA 2 facilitators and community representatives.

These are positive strategies and all were in evidence in the field visits. The work in these areas could have been improved through comprehensive study on conflict dynamics and indicators of residual conflict and its implications for women.

(ii) Improving access by mainstreaming resource allocations and service delivery responses.

Activities include:

- The establishment of Gender and Social Inclusion Reference groups in each district comprising representatives from community and government to collate information on gaps and barriers to service delivery for women and to advocate for policy reforms (in collaboration with SEDIA and UNIFEM). The Reference groups help to share lessons, publically acknowledge innovation and replicate successful measures where possible.
- Advocacy for policy reforms was done through support for the establishment and implementation of P2TP2A at district level.
- Development of a module of user-friendly tools and indicators to enable community leaders, representatives, and local CBOs to understand village economies and to identify avenues for economic growth, particularly for marginalised groups including women and former combatants.
- Profiling of the coverage and uptake rates of existing micro-finance groups, and identification of gaps and barriers for access by marginalised groups including women and former combatants.

While the above strategies are all underway there was limited evidence of links between the marginalized groups and micro-finance groups. This may have been due to the pressure to implement all planned activities with different units assisting.

The module of “user-friendly tools and indicators for economic enhancement” was not sighted by the review team, although actions that helped to identify avenues for economic growth were evident in field visits.

There appeared to be limited assessment of or systematic planning for how the previous conflict survivors and former combatants are integrated into the program. Although the team found that women from these categories were indeed active in some LOGICA 2 supported activities at village level.

(iii) Enhancing quality of services

- Training and mentoring in social inclusion and gender for community leaders and representatives, including for men and religious leaders where appropriate, in collaboration with PNPM Mandiri facilitators.
- Collaboration with IOM and community leaders to assess the appropriateness of implementing initiatives to improve security for women, including community policing and mediation options in communities that have experienced high levels of conflict.
- Technical Assistance for micro-finance groups to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPS), including social inclusion principles.
- Small grants to establish innovative community responses to addressing the priority needs of women, the disabled and former combatants, or to address gaps in essential services for marginalised groups, or to build project management capacity.
- Support for CBOs to implement activities to improve access and address barriers to local services for women and marginalised groups, and to facilitate more inclusive village-level decision making.

The review team did not see any evidence in the field visits of initiatives to improve security for women (such as community policing and mediation options in communities that have experienced high levels of conflict.) the small grants for innovative community responses were being utilized, leading to very positive and practical outcomes.

(iv) Engaging civil society organizations

Activities include:

- Building the capacity of formal and informal women’s CBOs and networks (e.g. posyandu) as key partners in LOGICA 2 program delivery, and in the longer term to more effectively engage with governments in advocating for improved resource allocation and improved service delivery.
- Training and mentoring in social inclusion and gender mainstreaming for community leaders and representatives (in collaboration with PNPM Mandiri facilitators).

It was evident in the field visits that most cadres are chosen from women who are already involved in local women’s CBO activities (such as Posyandu cadres, PKK cadres, etc.). So LOGICA 2 is

enhancing the capacities of existing women's cadres at village level. As reported above, training and mentoring in social inclusion and gender mainstreaming for community leaders and representatives has already been conducted.

(v) Strengthening the representation of marginalised groups in decision-making

Activities include:

- Raising community awareness of gender equity and supporting women to take on formal leadership roles.
- Support for CBOs to implement activities to improve access and address barriers to local services for women and marginalised groups, and to facilitate more inclusive village-level decision making.
- Development of strategies to increase the representation of women in formal decision-making roles, including on school committees and in village government.
- Marginalised groups supported to contribute to community and sub-district forums to canvass priority community needs
- Marginalised groups supported to contribute to PNPM Mandiri and musrenbang planning.
- Review of decision-making processes within the village, the roles and responsibilities of Village Government (VG) and local CBOs/CSOs, and the RPJMG (village mid-term development plan).
- Training and mentoring of community representatives and informal leaders in awareness of marginalization, facilitation, advocacy, leadership, proposal writing and action planning.
- Leadership and training for community representatives and women in partner NGOs.

The field visits confirmed that these activities have been implemented and are directly contributing to the outcomes listed below.

Outcomes for Gender equality

As a result of these interventions, women at village level report feeling more empowered and are eager to further develop their knowledge and skills. In addition, women are keen to share their knowledge with others and are motivated to contribute to their communities. According to program reports, 65% of women leaders in one district show increased confidence in their ability to speak in public meetings and have become resource people on issues such as HIV/AIDS and domestic violence. In addition, several women leaders have begun to work to support other women.

Men are more willing to have women participate in decision-making processes at village level. This ranges from seeing value in women assisting with the work, to interest in the ideas women are able to contribute. In some cases men have been prepared to share power with women (the LOGICA 2 reports indicate that in two villages a woman has been appointed to act in a chair position or to been proposed as the village leader).

A key strategy of LOGICA 2 has been to work with the Women's Empowerment and Child Protection Agency (BPPA) to support the development of centers for integrated services for the protection of women and children (P2TP2A). This contributes to a longer-term response to domestic violence and to the promotion of women's leadership at the village level. It is noted however that development of this service, even with LOGICA 2 support has been slow.

Ongoing challenges

While the strategy of working with men and women at village level as well as with civil servants, to mainstream gender equality has provided initial successful outcomes, it is clear that the women continue to look to LOGICA 2 for further knowledge and skill development. They continue to seek the assistance of the LOGICA 2 community mobilisers to develop their capacity.

Perhaps more significantly, it is common in women's empowerment programs for resistance to develop, in particular from men, once the empowerment of women moves from practical to more strategic issues. Once women start to look for power-sharing from men there is often a backlash against the empowerment programs and often direct action taken against the women themselves. LOGICA 2 has not experienced this to date, and indeed may not in the short program life left, but given other experience the women at the community level will need ongoing support for some time as they experience these reactions. The intensive support currently provided by LOGICA 2 is unlikely to be able to be duplicated by other existing civil society organizations and there is some risk that the program is creating a possible scenario of future increased harm to women at community level.

Peace-building and conflict prevention

The LOGICA 2 design included a focus on peace building and social cohesion. LOGICA 2 implementation in this area has included training and capacity development for staff in order to ensure they are able to work effectively in a context of Aceh; sensitive to the needs of ex-combatants and to the impact of a post-conflict context on developmental and political issues.

LOGICA 2 has also worked with local religious leaders (Mukim) to develop a handbook around conflict resolution for social disputes utilizing local religious frameworks. The program has also commissioned the development of a module on context sensitive budget planning.

While these all appear to be sound and appropriate activities, the review team was unable to identify specific outcomes or impact on this work area. It is clear that staff at province and district level have a good understanding of local relationships and the influence of the conflict experience. However it was less clear how this is utilized directly within their work either at community or government level.

Capacity development of civil society

The LOGICA 2 design placed considerable emphasis on partnerships with and capacity building of local NGOs and CSOs. It proposed that there would be mutual beneficial and dynamic partnerships with local organisations alongside transparent decision-making to ensure that the partnerships increased in trust, respect and shared learning.

LOGICA 2 has engaged with local organisations and, as noted, has worked with at least 19 local, provincial and national organisations to implement various activities of the program. Considerable attention was given to exploring the experience of these local organisations during the review,

utilizing their external perspectives to validate LOGICA 2 program achievements as well as to explore their partnership experience with the program.

It was found that provincial and district level local NGOs appreciated the overall design of LOGICA 2, in particular the focus on basic service delivery. Generally, organisations were happy to validate and confirm the LOGICA 2 achievements.

Those NGOs that have worked with LOGICA 2 directly as contracted partners report an increased ability in their technical skills and capacities as a result of the funding received and the work that they have been required to do under contract with LOGICA 2.

On the other hand, local organisations including those acting as direct implementing partners, reported feeling inadequately involved in the program. Local NGOs reported that there was limited opportunity, particularly if they were not directly contracted by LOGICA 2, to participate in planning, strategy development, monitoring or analysis with the program. This meant that local organisations lost the opportunity to contribute to LOGICA 2 development and further improvement. Further, those organisations could not benefit from the opportunity for learning and development of their own work. Even contracted partner organisations reported a partial engagement with the program contained to a focus around their delivery of contracted outputs.

There was strong dissatisfaction about the limitations of this type of relationship. Local NGOs reported that they are familiar with this formal contracting arrangement, but they would prefer a partnership arrangement as experienced with some international NGOs, which respects their unique contribution and seeks to develop this alongside the delivery of service outcomes.

NGOs acting as partners with LOGICA 2 reported that the contractual expectations of their outputs were sometimes too ambitious within the available timeframe. Further, it was reported that in some cases LOGICA 2 chose not to share information with local organisations, seeming to withhold data that had been collected through research processes and which would contribute to better local analysis and understanding of need. Finally, in one location it appeared that the LOGICA 2 district team mirrored the structure and operations of a local NGO. There was a sensible question asked about why LOGICA 2 needed to create its own structure in this location rather than simply work in direct partnership with the district level NGO?

The review team also identified particular areas of dissatisfaction regarding the decision-making and management between LOGICA 2 field staff and local NGOs. Particular complaints included:

- Organisations report long delays in payments and considerable delay in information about new strategies, leading to difficulty in adjusting their own planning to be in line with program needs.
- Local NGOs reported in some cases that the knowledge and skills of the local district manager and staff are not sufficient to ensure constructive dialogue with Government staff and officials, but that there is a reluctance to support NGO leadership on issues. When LOGICA 2 withdraws the NGO is left to address issues and try to repair the relationship with the district level government.

- Local organisations reported that in some cases they would be better positioned to take forward particular activities and strategies (in particular related to areas of advocacy) suggesting that the focus on LOGICA 2 identity comes at the expense of better impact.

Overall, while LOGICA 2 is working with local NGOs, it appears that there is insufficient attention being given to the notion of partnership development with these local organisations and to their capacity development beyond technical areas, to strengthen their role as long-term civil society agents.

Program implementation

The review team was asked to look in particular at the implementation structure for LOGICA 2. The organisational structure of LOGICA 2 involves a provincial team of specialist advisers covering the areas of community engagement, local governance, gender mainstreaming and equity, peace and conflict, and monitoring and evaluation. The two advisors for community engagement and local governance have responsibility for staff operating in the field at community and government level. In addition, at each of the districts are district managers who are responsible for HR management and operational issues.

As noted above, the provincial advisor team was able to present an excellent cross sector analysis and integrated strategy for LOGICA 2. However, at the field level the same level of integration was not evident in either district-based staff presentations or in the coordination between LOGICA 2 activities.

This appeared to have a consequence of creating a certain amount of dissatisfaction at the level of the district staff. People were both dissatisfied with their ability to influence the program strategy and also believed that their analysis of local issues was not able to be utilized within the overall program planning. A further consequence was that activities are not well integrated on the ground. This was observed by the IPR team in practice and was reported in project documentation as a particular challenge. Further, it was noted that the operational role of the district manager meant that he/she was unable to create a space for better integration of service delivery at this level (although in one example observed by the IPR team the district manager had extended his role to enable this process leading to some better integration of activities).

As noted above, there was concern expressed by both government and local NGOs about the need for great integration of program strategy and better integration with local processes including those of government planning and NGO and civil society work.

Finally, there were some suggestions raised by other donors and the NGOs, that the decision-making structure in LOGICA 2, in particular the way decisions were made between the managing contractor and their partner NGO, FBA, was less than transparent. There was also a view that while LOGICA 2 takes a principled stance by not paying incentives, it is employing staff at a salary rate which is unsustainable and out of line with NGOs and other civil society levels of remuneration. These issues were not the focus of this review but emerged as a risk to the reputation of the program and therefore as a risk to the successful achievement of program outcomes.

Additional findings

AusAID Program coordination

The MTR review team also met with the AusAID funded Support for Education Development in Aceh (SEDIA) program. This program has a strong focus on work at the Provincial level and has established a coordinating committee at this level. The program works across several areas largely through the Government of Indonesia.

SEDIA and LOGICA 2 have cooperated, together with UNICEF to help establish MSS for the Ministry of Education and roll these out into the Pidie Jaya district and then beyond. This has taken LOGICA 2 outside its current boundaries but has complemented and made good use of its strong engagement at district level.

The two programs have worked together on a gender strategy. SEDIA acknowledges the strengths of LOGICA 2 in this area and has sought to complement these through technical capacity support for gender budgeting and planning.

More recently LOGICA 2 and SEDIA have cooperated together to help AusAID finalize the Common Results Framework for Aceh.

The two programs appear to have some complementary strengths, although their focus areas are different. There may be potential for ongoing cooperation between the programs.

Coordination with other donors

The MTR review team met with some other donors working in Aceh, including GIZ and USAID. The donors reported that there is ongoing sharing of information between them but limited coordination apart from this.

The assessment of the LOGICA 2 work by other donors suggested that those donors recognized the relevance of the work of LOGICA 2, especially from the perspective of the Government of Indonesia. However, the same donors also noted challenges evident in the program. In particular, they identified the concerns around the work at district and village levels being siloed, with insufficient coordination on the ground. They also suggested the relationships between LOGICA 2 and the provincial government of Aceh needed to be strengthened.

Evaluation Criteria

In line with the IPR TOR, the findings of the review were analyzed under the AusAID evaluation criteria. These are outlined below with the summary of the ratings provided at the conclusion of the section.

Relevance

LOGICA 2 appears to be highly relevant to the Government of Indonesia and to the people of Aceh. The program is in line with National Government policy, especially national policy on MSS, service standard, civil servant competence standard, and village governance (Act. 32/2004, Act. 25/2009, Government Regulation 65/2004 and MOHA Regulation 79/2007). In addition, the Indonesian Government counterpart agency for the program (Ministry of Home Affairs) responded in writing to the review, stressing its support for LOGICA.

The programs of LOGICA 2 need to be extended as it really support the programs of Dltjen PUM especially those which are related to the improvement of the public service to the community. However, it is hoped that the programs will not be conducted in Aceh only, but also in other provinces in Indonesia.

At the Provincial level, the Provincial Secretary reported to the IPR team that he supported the ongoing work and even the extension of LOGICA 2. District officials responded in a similar way.

At the level of the community, the relevance of LOGICA 2 is assessed by the program through ongoing participation of village members. The program reporting shows that 47% of those people who attended the initial LOGICA 2 discussions are continuing to participate in village meetings.

The program design was directly relevant to AusAID policy. The Australian Indonesian Partnership, Aceh Program Framework (2008-13)¹⁰ focuses on priorities identified by the Aceh Government, and includes a specific area of work on “Demand for and supply of better governance in Aceh”.

AusAID is now in the process of developing a new framework to support governance reforms and decentralization consolidation in Indonesia. Towards this end, the Decentralisation Unit has begun to develop a more coordinated approach to their various programs, and is now piloting region specific Common Result Framework (CFR) in both Nusa Tenggara Timor (NTT) and Aceh that takes into account provincial priorities but has three themes in common, namely Public Financial Management (PFM), Service Delivery (SD), and the Influence of Civil Society on Policy Outcomes (ICSPO). LOGICA 2 continues to be a highly relevant program under this approach, contributing to all three themes.

Overall therefore, LOGICA 2 is assessed as being of high-quality in its relevance (5)

Effectiveness

As noted in the discussion of findings, LOGICA 2 has been effective in creating an enabling environment for community empowerment. It has also been effective in creating the motivation and incentive for improved service delivery at the level of service units. There is evidence that it has led to better positioning for government support for service delivery through the establishment of district regulations particularly those related to functional delegation, competency standards and minimum service standards.

These areas are discussed in more detail below.

Enabling environment for community empowerment.

The program has been effective in mobilizing village people in the first stages of community development process. Examples of this mobilisation include the following:

- Since the commencement of the program there has been problem identification and prioritisation of needs by community members in all 432 LOGICA 2 supported villages. Issues that have been highlighted include issues related to health, education, infrastructure and economic development and livelihoods.

¹⁰ This Framework sits under the Australian Indonesia Country Strategy (2008-13).

- 390 out of 432 villages have been supported by the program to submit proposals to government line agencies about their priority local needs (mostly related health and education). These proposals have advocated for resources or services to be provided.
- There has been 120% increase from the previous year in community members in LOGICA 2 supported villages attending village Musrenbang meetings in 2011. Similarly, the average number of women attending the meetings in 2011 more than doubled from 2010.
- In the LOGICA 2 target districts citizens raised around 3500 issues related to health, education, security for women and livelihoods at Musrenbang meetings.
- As a consequence of program training, 70% of the village cadres initiated, organized and attended meetings with local Parliamentary members to present and discuss community priority issues. 40% of village cadres attended meetings with government service units to develop joint action plans on improving access to and quality of services in health and education
- Village people are also starting to demonstrate some elements of self-reliant development. Reports for the CAGSIS scheme show that grants have been approved for 432 proposals covering each of the LOGICA 2 supported villages. (It should be noted however that the average progress of the community grant program varies across districts with Pidie Jaya district showing the greatest progress at 85.97% while Bireuen is recorded at 17.13 %.)
- Finally in regard to economic development, the micro-finance program appears to have been very successful in some locations. As at June 2011 the total assets managed by micro-finance groups supported by the program was IDR 350 million. 21 microfinance groups are now producing marketable products, exceeding an earlier target of three groups the district. In addition, 24 micro finance groups participated in marketing their products at the Aceh fair. Finally six micro-finance groups have been supported to be certified by the Health Department enabling them to sell their product to a broader market.

Service unit improved service delivery

The program has contributed to better relationships between village members and service units. Highlights include examples of increased citizen engagement and increased attention to service standards.

- Sub-district health committees have been established in the 36 sub-districts supported by the program. These committees provide a representative body where citizens can engage in discussions to improve the quality of local health services.
- In 72 of the most remote villages covered by the program, additional support has been provided to school committees to develop action plans for improving educational outcomes at local schools.
- At the level of the service units themselves:
 - 170 service units have repaired and published their vision, mission and slogans.
 - 159 units have implemented standard operating procedures.

- 149 service units have developed and are phasing-in competency-based job descriptions.
- The baseline survey on minimum service standards conducted across 1200 schools and 50 health clinics in the six districts where the program operates is now being used by district line agencies to assess the performance of the service units and to develop performance targets and costings. Similarly the results of citizen satisfaction surveys completed in April 2011 are being used by government service units to develop citizen charters and plans action to improve local service delivery.
- 120 of the service units, 29 health clinics and 91 schools have submitted proposals to the program for funding under CAGSIS to work to improve their minimum service standard.
- Significantly, the single window service model, PATEN, which was trialed during the first phase of LOGICA, continues to be replicated. In early 2010 the National Ministry of home affairs requested programs assistance to develop a framework for the adoption a national roll-out of this model and stop in addition to this assistance program has continued to support PATEN across all districts in Aceh with a review of existing services that have been operating since early 2009 and further technical assistance sub-district officials in the four districts beginning to implement the model.

Improved positioning for government supported service delivery

There is evidence that some of the principal building blocks of government capacity to provide services for its citizens have been supported and developed through the LOGICA 2 work. Development of government regulations, which is part all developing enabling environment for better service delivery has proceeded strongly in the program, although progress has been uneven across some districts. Particular highlights include the following:

- Strong support for regulations on implementation of each government. The overall regulation has been issued by the Governor of Aceh. Three district level regulations have been enacted in the districts of Aceh Timur, Pidie Jaya and Aceh Tengah. 189 Village level regulations have been enacted.
- Competency standards for the heads of health clinics, principles, district school supervisor and sub district heads have been drafted. In one district the regulation has been signed (in Aceh Timur) and four more are expected soon. It is notable that the district of Aceh Barat Daya has declined assistance in this area.
- Directive letters have been issued by the heads of both health and education departments in four districts (Aceh Timur, Pidie Jaya, Bireuen and Aceh Tengah) and by the health department in Aceh Timur. Once again it is notable that district of Aceh Barat Daya has declined assistance in this area.

There is also evidence that civil servants are being supported to increase their capacity to deliver services. For example:

- District civil service reform teams have been established in five districts. Notably, Aceh Barat Daya has declined assistance in this area.

- Health technical teams are operating in five districts that is, Aceh Barat Daya, Pidie Jaya, Bireuen, Aceh Tamiang and Aceh Tengah. Educational technical teams have been established in four districts: Pidie Jaya, Aceh Timur, Aceh Tamiang and Aceh Tengah.

Finally, it appears that local governments are starting to use the baseline assessment of minimum service standard achievements to develop some concrete plans and budgets for the future. Changes have been made in several districts. For example, in Pidie Jaya, Bireuen and Aceh Tengah regulations have been issued in line with minimum services standards regarding pupil enrolment processes; regulation has been issued in Aceh Tamiang to ensure that schools are by the books they need; and in Pidie Jaya the government has issued a regulation requiring funding to be used more effectively in achieving minimum service standard targets.

On the other hand, the program has been less effective in creating responsive government at district and provincial level. It also has been less effective in creating the political will and support for more effective budgeting for service delivery. There are other challenges which LOGICA 2 has not addressed such as limited budget to finance the service delivery, limited infrastructure for service delivery and the ongoing political influences that impact on delivery of community services.

For example, the program reports that in the district of Bireuen there are considerable challenges because of the limited infrastructure available to provide basic services at the service units and the villages. In addition, budget allocation continues to be very influenced by political motives rather than determined primarily by community need (an issue identified across virtually all of the LOGICA 2 districts). The district of Aceh Tengah faces considerable tensions between the various post-conflict groups between bordering villages and there is reportedly a poor relationship between district government and local parliamentarians, which has negatively impacted the development of policies to support service delivery.

LOGICA 2 is very unlikely to achieve the program objective within the remaining life of the program, in large part because of these additional influences and challenges. The intermediate outcomes under the two components will likely be achieved in part. However the experience the program to date suggests that they are ambitious and unrealistic targets for program of five years within such a challenging context.

For these reasons while the program has demonstrated considerable achievements to date it is assessed as being of adequate quality only in this area of effectiveness (4).

Efficiency

It is difficult to provide clarity on judgment around the efficiency of LOGICA 2. The program has achieved considerable activities and outputs within a short space of time. While there are large numbers of staff in the program, in order to work towards the community empowerment targets outlined in the design document, this level of staffing is not unreasonable. Indeed, it was the view of the review team that the level of staffing, particularly community facilitators, has been necessary to achieve a significant degree of community mobilisation evident throughout the review. LOGICA 2 has also made efficient use of local NGOs and partners.

One specific concern about efficiency has been that the intensive training provided to service unit staffing may be ineffective because the government staff are regularly rotated on a short-term basis.

Overall however, the implementation of the program has proceeded efficiently, according to the original design albeit with a more reduced target area.

On the other hand, the IPR findings suggest that progress towards into program outcomes will be limited within the program life. For this reason it could be argued that efficiency was not well-considered in the original design and that the long-term value of the program, versus the considerable program inputs were inadequately assessed. Efficiency judged as the value of outcomes for program inputs remains a concern for this program.

Overall the program is therefore rated as being of only adequate quality for efficiency (4)

Impact

LOGICA 2 has operated for approximately 24 months and in that time some changes in attitude and approach to service delivery at service unit level are clearly observable. As noted above, in particular transparency and responsiveness to citizens has increased. In addition the accountability of service units to citizens has improved.

At the village level there are clear signs of increased empowerment of individuals including women.

At the same time, the program has not yet achieved its overall objective of government delivering services to improve living standards, nor is it likely to achieve this objective within the remaining life the program. It is the opinion of the review team that the original objective was ambitious and unrealistic. Further, that in order for there to be sustained impact from this program, attention needs to be given to the broad focus and multiple activities, moving towards a more consolidated and focused approach to implementation. Recommendations towards this end are outlined in the conclusions to this report.

On this basis the review team would suggest that it is not appropriate to make an assessment of the impact of the program at this time. It would be more appropriate to consider the redevelopment of the program in the remaining program life and better definition of realistic objectives against which the program can be judged.

Sustainability

As noted above, sustainability of the program remains one of the most significant areas of concern.

In particular, in the communities considerably more community development work is required before people will be able to independently act for their own development. There is some risk that short term community activity, particularly around women's empowerment, can cause more harm than good. Broader experience suggests that to mitigate this risk there need to be a clear strategy for long term support and engagement with communities as they move through cycles of mobilization, empowerment, learning and eventual self-reliance. This will not be achieved in a 2 to 5 year intervention.

The small grants program has successfully initiated a focus on improved service delivery but also an expectation that LOGICA 2 will continue to provide the additional resources not being provided through government budgets. Sub-district government is looking to ongoing and expanded support from LOGICA 2 to address its reform and budget needs.

These expectations are unrealistic given the current budget and program scope. They continue to grow, with some expectation that LOGICA 2 will be continued for a long time and expanded to other districts and possibly other provinces. Urgent attention is required to lessen this dependency and develop sustainability.

For these reasons the sustainability of the program is rated as less than adequate quality (3).

Gender Equality

The achievements of LOGICA 2 in gender equality have been comprehensive and impressive. As discussed above, at community and government levels changes are being observed for women through the program support and interventions. LOGICA 2 has worked directly with women, with 85% of its voluntary village cadres being women. It has also worked deliberately with men and with religious and government leaders to support the notion of women's participation and empowerment. The program has supported government officials to consider how they can improve services specifically to meet the needs of women. Particular achievements include the following:

- Women have been supported and trained to participate in their communities. As a result of this, 65% of women in the district of Pidie Jaya are reporting increased confidence to speak at public meetings and workers resource people on social issues such as HIV and AIDS and domestic violence.
- The concept of Musrena, a consultative forum for women's action was initiated by the municipality of Banda Aceh and P2TP2A with support from the program. There was an inaugural Musrena in Aceh Tengah in May 2011 involving 798 participants from 14 regional women's groups, village cadres and local CBOs. Government representatives, including the head of district, senior government officials from the planning, village empowerment, health and education departments, also attended alongside members of the district parliament. The district has committed to a second Musrena and the process is now being replicated in two other non-LOGICA districts. An inaugural Musrena is scheduled for the district of Bireuen.
- Women are being supported to take up leadership positions. As a result, a woman leader has recently been elected as chair of the farmers group in Blang Moncong Village, Sub District Ketol in Aceh Tengah. Another woman has been proposed as a village leader in Saneheun Village, Silih Nara Sub District in Aceh Tengah
- Bupati regulations on the deterrence and management of violence against women and children have been developed in the two districts of Aceh Tamiang and Aceh Timur.

Perhaps the most compelling evidence for the improved gender inequality comes from the statements of the women themselves. At the village meetings there was consistent feedback from women about their experiences of change in status and their experience of increased opportunity for participation.

Now I have more self-esteem and self-confidence. Before we could not do this. Village leaders are now more open to our ideas. They care about health for women and children and are allocating budget for these areas. (Woman cadre from Beusa Seberang Village)

The strategy utilized by LOGICA 2 has started a very important process of empowerment for women and challenges to existing power structures. As noted in the previous discussion, there are issues about how sustainable this strategy may be, given the long-term challenges that are normally associated with women's empowerment. In particular, it should not be underestimated how difficult it will be in the long-term for men to move from accepting women's participation, to acknowledging their potential to undertake leadership and other responsibilities.

However, to date the program has consistently addressed and worked well with women and is able to demonstrate results in this area. Women reported that as a result of their activity and the opportunity to present their issues in community meetings there have been changes such as:

- Midwives now residing in villages, available at all hours to assist with births.
- The construction of rehabilitation of village level clinic (Polindes).¹¹
- The re opening of integrated health posts (Posyandu).
- Alternative schooling arrangements to complement the formal teaching classes and assist children with their learning.

Overall, there seems to be considerable learning and useful experience from LOGICA 2 around how to mainstream and promote gender equality in governance that would be relevant for other AusAID programs.

Gender equality in the program is therefore rated as high quality (5).

Monitoring and Evaluation

As noted, the monitoring and evaluation undertaken by the program has until recently not been able to meet AusAID requirements for greater integration and analysis. Further, the design intention for independent monitoring that can engage a wide range of stakeholders has not been realized.

Considerable attention has been given to the need for improvements in monitoring in previous reviews. While it is understood that there is now some changes been developed in this area, a new monitoring and evaluation framework is not yet in place. If the program is to be extended urgent attention is required to further develop and improve the monitoring system to better manage the remaining program life.

For this reason the monitoring and evaluation is rated as less than adequate quality (3).

Analysis and Learning

In line with previous rating, there appears to have been insufficient attention given in this program to the opportunity for analysis and learning beyond that undertaken by the provincial advisor team.

District program staff have complained of a lack of opportunity to engage in analysis and learning for program implementation. NGOs and civil society organisations feel that they have been insufficiently

¹¹ Information from LOGICA2 Progress Report July – December 2011: 31 village health centres constructed or rehabilitated, 60 village health centres (Pustu/Polindes) and 100 Posyandus provided with furniture and equipment

engaged in this process for the program. District and sub-district governments have requested more information and knowledge about program focus and strategy. Finally AusAID have not made good use of the analysis and learning that should be available from this program due to the limited reporting arrangements.

For these reasons, while the program provides considerable opportunity for wider learning and analysis around service delivery in a decentralized context, it is currently rated as being of less than adequate quality (3).

Summary of Evaluation Criteria Ratings

Drawing from the discussions above the evaluation criteria can be summarised as follows:

| Evaluation Criteria | Rating (1-6) |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| Relevance | 5 |
| Effectiveness | 4 |
| Efficiency | 4 |
| Impact | NA |
| Sustainability | 3 |
| Gender Equality | 5 |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | 3 |
| Analysis & Learning | 3 |

Conclusions

Summary of the strengths and weaknesses of LOGICA 2.

In summary, it appears that a strong beginning has been made towards developing an enabling environment for service delivery. The LOGICA 2 approach is in line with national integration policy in particular the policy on minimum service standards, civil servant competency standards and regulations for village governance. It has engendered a strong sense of community engagement and a strong interest by communities to work for further development. It has created the beginning of better service delivery at the service unit level and, through the PATEN one-stop service arrangement, at sub-district level.

As a result of this work, there is a strong commitment from the government at district level and sub-district level as well as from communities and village governments, to work with the program. There was overwhelming support from all of those consulted for LOGICA 2 to be extended as long as possible and for it to be expanded beyond its current sub-districts and districts.

The Ministry of Home Affairs is the counterpart agency for the program. In a written submission to the review team it expressed strong support for LOGICA 2, recommending that it be extended in time and to other locations. As noted, the Ministry has established a regulation for the PATEN to be extended nationally, based upon the LOGICA experience. This is an unexpected but considerable achievement of the program.

Notwithstanding these achievements, there are challenges for the program to address. These include the current lack of sustainability and the problems with coordination within the program and with other stakeholders, in particular local NGOs and civil society. In addition, there seem to be issues around the focus of LOGICA 2 and the need for better communication around this focus. Further, as discussed, there has been insufficient policy engagement by AusAID particularly at the level of the provincial government.

Finally, there are some concerns around current program implementation arrangements.

Lessons learned

Particular lessons learned from this program include the following:

- Program design, while it should draw from previous experience, should also include careful analysis and attention to current context. Feasibility of objectives and strategies need to be carefully considered during the appraisal of new programs.
- Community empowerment and mobilisation is a powerful strategy for generating engagement and self-reliance among community members. However, it requires considerable resources and in order to be sustainable needs to be undertaken over a timeframe which is greater than five years.
- Working with women and men in the community to enable both to understand the value of shared participation has been a successful strategy in promoting gender equality in this program. The use of human rights as a mobilizing strategy has been particularly effective in

enabling both men and women to identify why existing arrangements and relationships need to change.

- Changing the differences in power between men and women in communities is however a long-term process, and attention needs to be given within the program about how support will be provided on a sustainable basis for the long-term in order to 'do no harm'.
- Mainstreaming gender into service delivery capacity development is a powerful strategy for ensuring services respond to the particular needs of women. However, it needs to be accompanied by corresponding changes in political interest in the needs and welfare of women.
- While the building blocks for government capacity building towards service delivery can be promoted through technical programs, it is important to give attention to other influences, in particular, political and power differences which may inhibit or distract from government focus on services.
- AusAID has a role to play in governance programs, in particular in building relationships with the appropriate level of government to promote their ownership and responsibility for program outcomes in the longer term.
- Strengthening the capacity of civil society includes attention to their organizational systems and structures. However, it also includes attention to their ability to monitor, analyse, and participate in strategic development of programs and activities. Building civil society organisations' capacity to maintain effort towards improved service delivery requires a deliberate and sophisticated approach to partnership with those organisations which goes beyond contracting them for service delivery.

Recommendations

1. Program extension

There are three options for the LOGICA 2 future.

- **The program can finish in June 2012.**

Given the considerable range of issues which need attention, this would provide a clean break and opportunity to focus on lessons learned and achievements to date. AusAID would be free to develop a coherent policy approach based upon wider Australian government considerations. In particular it, would limit what are growing expectations that the program will expand both within Aceh and possibly beyond.

This option is not favored by the IPR team for two reasons: program achievements are unlikely to be sustained and relationships established with communities, governments and other stakeholders would be considerably damaged by this sudden cessation of support. Both the Government of Indonesia in Aceh and communities are committed to LOGICA 2 and keen to see current activities continue and be completed. Finishing the program within a few months would not allow for this and would damage relationships and the basis for development of other programs by AusAID in Aceh.

In particular AusAID would lose the value of the investments to date.

- **The program can be extended to December 2012.**

This option would provide some more time to complete current activities and build some strategies for sustainability. It would give more time to focus on the learning that is available from key achievements.

This option is not favored by the IPR team because it would provide insufficient time to build sustainable strength in civil society, which is considered an essential element of a sustainable program. Experience elsewhere in Indonesia suggests that even where new regulations are established implementing and activating those regulations depends in part on the ongoing engagement by a capable civil society. In particular, civil society needs to work to hold government to account. LOGICA 2 has started this civil society development process at the community level but it requires considerable more attention to ensure its sustainability. Without this work the reforms developed with the government of Indonesia are unlikely to be sustained.

Further, the time is probably insufficient to implement the range of reforms which are considered necessary to reposition the program, while being too long to continue in the present program management arrangements.

- **The program can be extended to June 2014.**

This is the preferred and recommended option by the IPR team, with time available to refocus and consolidate the program in line with recommendations below.

It is noted however that expectations will continue to remain high and that any extension of the program should be accompanied by a strong communication by AusAID and the program management team about the intended completion date.

2. Program redevelopment

If AusAID chooses to accept the recommendation to extend LOGICA 2 for an additional two years there are several reforms which need to be considered to the focus, strategies, policy and program management.

It is recommended that AusAID consider a focused redevelopment of program early in 2012 in order to systematically address each of these areas and shape the program to move ahead as efficiently and effectively for the remaining program life.

Program scope

During the review it was suggested by several respondents, including MOHA, that LOGICA 2 should be expanded as well as extended. The review team has observed that the original program design for LOGICA 2 was ambitious and unrealistic. It was further observed that current activities need further consolidation in order to be sustainable. As outlined below, there is considerable scope for further work on existing area sand for consolidation of that work. Expansion of the program to new locations will potentially lead to the pressure to extend LOGICA 2 further in order to support and consolidate that extra work.

- For this reasons it is recommended that LOGICA 2 not be expanded to a wider geographic area but be confined to the current locations of work.

Community level work

- It is recommended that LOGICA 2 narrow its approach to community development and focus on empowering people to advocate for their rights to receive basic social services from the government as mandated by Indonesian law. The micro-finance work fostered by LOGICA 2 should be transferred to other programs or donors.
- The CAGSIS Innovation Grants should continue to support the community development work of LOGICA 2. However, it is recommended that stakeholders be bought together to explore the ways for the work started through these grants to be sustained through other funding sources. This might include allocation of funds from BOS (Biaya Operasional Sekolah/School Operasional Funds) at schools or BOK (Biaya Operasional Kesehatan/Health Operational Funds) at Health Centers or from other government support program for schools and health centres.

Gender equality

- In order to sustain achievements to date in gender equality, it is important that current strategies are maintained. These include:
 - The work with village heads around gender equality issues.
 - Engagement with Village government staff and other men at village level, including religious leaders, should continue with a focus on supporting culture and attitudinal change among these influential people.
 - District and Sub-district advocacy teams for women leaders.
 - Institutional and technical support for district advocacy teams from LBH Apik and Balai Syura Inong.

- Networking and policy dialogues with P2TP2A
- In addition in order to further strengthen this work area attention needs to be addressed to:
 - Ensuring that strategies are well integrated with other LOGICA 2 work, especially at district level.
 - Introducing skills in conflict analysis and conflict management with attention to power analysis between men and women, to the community mobilizers so that they in turn can begin to empower men and women to understand and address these issues.

Civil society capacity development

- LOGICA 2 needs to develop a more comprehensive capacity development and partnership strategy in its relationship with local CSOs at provincial and district level. This could begin with a frank discussion around the current state of relationships. It should explore the degree to which local NGOs and civil society organizations could be supported to take over areas of LOGICA 2 work in the medium to long term.
- LOGICA 2 also needs to explore how to develop a more transparent and open relationship with local NGOs. This includes an improvement in systems and communication. It also requires far more open information about management arrangements and decision-making structures.
- Particular attention should be given to developing the learning and analytic capacity of NGOs and CSOs. The monitoring and evaluation should direct particular attention to how to both utilize these organisations in data collection, as well as engage them in analysis and exploration of the implications of the findings.
- Local NGOs and CSOs have the potential to play important roles in ensuring sustainability beyond the program end date. Therefore, LOGICA 2 should formulate clear strategies on how it is connected with local government and how it could function as auxiliary to the government. The program should explore how NGOs and CSOs could continue working hand-in-hand with local government in improving service delivery. This may include service delivery and/or advocacy roles.

Government reform

- LOGICA 2 should engage further with provincial agencies in order to:
 - Contribute to formulate the functional assignment between province and district in the key areas of education, health and competency standards for civil servants.
 - Assist provincial government to finance basic services based on districts and service unit budgets and plans, avoiding double funding and inefficiency.
 - Support the provincial government and districts to develop a budgeting system which references and addresses community needs.
- As the medium-term development plans are re-developed in each district, LOGICA 2 should bring its activities and its focus into line with these plans. As far as possible LOGICA 2 should

reflect and be driven by the government vision and development intentions for the districts and province.

- LOGICA 2 should seek to promote more synergy between its activity areas in districts, sub-districts and villages, including synergy between reform at the unit service level and budget policy analysis.
- In order to facilitate the focus on Government reform, LOGICA 2 should improve coordination and collaboration with other programs – either AusAID funded projects such as PNPM or that of other donor's working in the same sector such as KINERJA.
- LOGICA 2 should explore with AusAID the potential learning from the Aceh experience and its implications for wider national decentralization policy. This might include exploration of:
 - District formulation of functional assignment especially in health, education and civil servant competencies.
 - Further analysis of the ongoing scaling up of the one-stop administration services at district level. In particular, analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of PATEN implementation in Aceh in order to provide advice to MOHA as it plans how to implement PATEN in all district in Indonesia.

Policy development

- The policy environment for ongoing AusAID support in Aceh needs to be clarified as soon as possible in order to provide the basis for the remaining program focus and also for policy engagement with the Government of Indonesia.
- It is further recommended that for a complex program such as this with a range of highly technical areas, AusAID staff be supported by additional technical capacity as required to support their ability to engage at policy and high-level program strategy discussion.

Sustainability

- Given the limited timeframe for program completion, the LOGICA 2 focus should shift to building strategies for the sustainability of the current achievements. While many of the current activities would be expected to continue under this approach, the focus would be on identifying strategies to sustain outcomes. These could be expected to lead to several changes including:
 - Different strategies in different locations, determined through consultation with communities, village governments and sub-district administrations about their priorities for change.
 - Decisions, where such engagement is absent or insufficient, to stop work in some sub-districts/districts and shift resources elsewhere.
 - Attention to how to support community and women's empowerment beyond the life of LOGICA 2, including attention to civil society strengthening in some locations, as discussed above.

Program management

- The overall LOGICA 2 program management structure needs to shift to support its two-component strategy. That is, more control and responsibility needs to move down to district and community level, with an expectation of diversity at this level. In turn, more attention and engagement needs to be focused upwards with province and perhaps national level government to address some of the overarching issues such as budget analysis and functional assignment, which are key areas requiring change for sustainable service delivery. The LOGICA 2 advisory team at province level needs to become the service team for these two areas.
- The monitoring and evaluation for the program should be considerably redeveloped to focus on analysis and lessons learned. This should be designed to contribute to informing AusAID future program and policy development; providing models and lessons for Indonesian national and provincial governance development; providing practical and accessible information for provincial, district and community level stakeholders in Aceh to support further self-reliant development; and for sharing with other donors.
- The current management issues identified above, in particular those which raise risks to the reputation of LOGICA 2 and AusAID need to be urgently addressed. These include the issues of conflict of interest, staff management and relationships with stakeholders

3. Additional recommendations

In addition, as requested by AusAID, attention was given to the recommendation provided in another independent progress report related to the Support for Education Sector Development in Aceh Program (SEDIA) that LOGICA 2 undertake the ongoing activities of this program. Given the many challenges which are currently facing LOGICA 2, this recommendation is not supported. The alternative recommendation is suggested:

- That LOGICA 2 and SEDIA continue their close collaboration around service delivery for education at the district level in a way that serves the intentions and strength of both programs, this might in particular include cooperation around the following:
 - Further development and implementation of the CRF.
 - Cooperation around extension of the MSS, especially in education sector.
 - Building relationships with the provincial government of Aceh
 - Development of an equity strategy for funding allocation from province to district of oil and gas funds
 - Strengthening cooperation in shared districts.
- However it is recommended that LOGICA 2 not take on any additional functions or activities on behalf of SEDIA.

ANNEX ONE: Terms of reference

1. INTRODUCTION

The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) will undertake an Independent Progress Report (IPR) to assess the performance and achievement of the Local Governance Innovations for Communities in Aceh Phase II (LOGICA2).

2. BACKGROUND

Program Context

LOGICA2 was designed as part of the Prime Minister's announcement on Australia's assistance to peace and development in Aceh over 5 years and in line with priorities articulated in the Aceh Program Framework¹². LOGICA2's initiative value is A\$18million over 30 months (1 January 2010 – 30 June 2012), with possibility of a 2 year extension dependent on the findings of a Mid Term Review and the identification on funds. LOGICA2 works within 432 villages in 6 districts out of 18 districts in the Province of Aceh (Pidie Jaya, Bireuen, Aceh Timur, Aceh Tamiang, Aceh Barat Daya and Aceh Tengah).

The goal of LOGICA 2 is to "contribute to a stable and peaceful Aceh by supporting effective governance that addresses priority village needs."

The project objective is: "In response to community-wide advocacy, governments deliver services to improve living standards."

LOGICA2 will deliver activities under this objective by applying the '*Active communities – Responsive governments*' approach through two program components:

Component 1: Active Communities, with the intermediate outcome of Citizens, particularly the marginalised, effectively advocate priority needs to government and contribute to services delivery reform to improve living standards.

Component 2: Responsive Government with the intermediate outcome of Governments responds to citizen priorities, including those of the marginalised, by effectively allocating resources and delivering services to improve living standards.

LOGICA 2 supports local governments to deliver services that improve living standards (health, education, personal safety and infrastructure), in response to community-wide advocacy. LOGICA 2 builds the capacity of citizens to identify and advocate their needs to government (village, district and provincial). LOGICA 2 works in parallel with local governments to strengthen their capacity to respond to community need through transparent planning and budget allocation, competent staffing, and service delivery based on minimum service standards.

LOGICA2 delivers governance reform and community development outcomes within the 432 villages in located in complex social and topographical conditions.

The active communities and responsive governments approach is in line with the Australia Indonesia Partnership Country Strategy for 2008-2013 mainly under pillar 3 – Democracy, justice and good governance especially the 7th objective under which is to improve planning and delivery by local

¹² The Australia Indonesia Partnership Aceh Program Framework (APF) provides direction for Australia's development assistance in Aceh from 2008-2013. The APF sits under the Australia Indonesia Partnership Country Strategy 2008-2013, which identifies Aceh as one of five priority provinces for comprehensive cross sectoral Australian Government engagement.

authorities, including through strengthened public financial management and improve capacity of communities to demand greater accountability and better access to services.

The GOI's mid term development plan for 2010-2014 has set out 11 priorities. LOGICA2 is in line with the 1st priority which is bureaucracy reform and governance, 4th priority which is poverty alleviation and the 10th priority which is development of developed, less developed, border and post conflict areas.

Decentralisation, Poverty Reduction and Rural Development Section Context

By 2013 Decentralisation Unit will only manage one program (i.e. Australia Indonesia Partnership for Decentralisation / AIPD) and 1 facility. All programs under Decentralisation Unit, except AIPD, will end by 2013 and work areas that currently covered by those programs will be covered by the Facility. The Facility will also facilitate the conception of new programs in the areas in line with Decentralisation Common Results Framework (CRF).

Reviews of the Program

AusAID assigned a Desk Review in May 2011 to assess the quality of LOGICA2 main documents and adequacy of program progress. The review found that in overall, it seems wise the program to continue, but to base all future assessments of progress on evidence gathered from monitoring, evaluation and research, including stakeholder assessments. Further, the program should prepare a document that clearly articulates the program logic and underlying assumptions.

In terms of sustainability, the program should provide evidence and analysis in future, reporting about how it has built and is maintaining stakeholder ownership to ensure that program outcomes will continue after activity completion.

The IPR team is requested to review the Desk Review report along with other key program documents.

3. OBJECTIVES OF IPR MISSION

- 3.1 The objective of the review is to assess the degree to which the activity has been successful in achieving its objective, and make recommendation as to whether it should continue for a further 2 years, with possible of using facility modality on the 2nd year of its extension.
- 3.2 Specifically, the review objectives are to:

- a. Assess progress towards meeting the overall goal and purpose of LOGICA2, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of LOGICA2;
- b. Identify lesson learnt from the LOGICA M&E system for potential broader relevance to future AusAID initiatives in Decentralisation area;
- c. Recommend as to whether the program should continue for another year or two;
- d. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of LOGICA2 and identify its best practices to contribute to AusAID other programs, especially the AIPD and possible program delivery through facility modality which will be established in 2013;
- e. To assess how well the program addressed issues of gender equality, poverty and vulnerability in its design and implementation;

4. SCOPE OF INDEPENDENT PROGRESS REPORT

The review will be undertaken in two stages. The first stage will be a desk review of key program documentation to identify key issues and develop evaluation plan for the IPR. The second stage is to conduct field visit.

The IPR will independently assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the project. The IPR should include a Quality at Completion (QAC) ratings that incorporates overall ratings of the project based on the standard AusAID six-point scale of the quality of the project.

The QAC should be compared with ratings made earlier (QAI) by AusAID at different stages of its project cycle. The final ratings are intended to primarily measure the quality of project delivery against the objective. The quality ratings are not designed to be a summary of the evaluation role of the progress report.

Definitions of Rating Scale

Satisfactory (4, 5 and 6, above the line)

6 Very high quality

5 Good quality initiative; could have improved in some areas with minor work

4 Adequate quality initiative; could have improved with some work

Key Questions for the IPR evaluation team to consider (in order to gather evidence to support the ratings):

- a. Was the program designed to the highest technical quality, based on sound analysis and learning? Was the program relevant in terms of the aid delivery mechanism, financing and management arrangements?
- b. To what degree did the program achieve its objectives, and how well did they contribute to higher level objectives in program strategy?
- c. What were the program's achievements in terms of the outputs and outcomes contained in the original design?
- d. How sustainable are the program outcomes likely to be based on technical, financial and organizational conditions?
- e. How effectively was the program managed? How did management impact (positively or negatively) on the achievement of outcomes, including management of risk, procurement, involvement of recipients/beneficiaries and relationships with partners.
- f. To what degree did the program provide good value for money? Was it cost effective?
- g. To what degree did the program incorporate gender, fragility and vulnerability into its design and implementation?
- h. How robust was the performance assessment system to measure ongoing achievement of objectives and results?
- i. Were there any unplanned impacts or outcomes (positive or negative), such as environmental impacts?

Field visits should not duplicate the function of basic gathering of performance information, which is the responsibility of Coffey International Development (CID) as the delivery organization. The visit should focus on checking the key assumptions in the evidence and analytical base of the progress reports.

Should there be limited primary data available to verify claims of achievements in this activity; the IPR Team should use their professional judgment to assess the initiative's impact and outcomes. Methodology, questions proposed for investigations and any key interview guides or document checklists should be developed prior to the field visit. The IPR Team should provide a list of documents, or information required prior to the in-country visit.

The IPR provides the first evaluation of the impact or potential impact of the complete project and is an important measure of aid effectiveness. Completion is also the time to consider what to keep or

repeat in our approach, and what to do differently next time. The progress reports from CID will be important inputs to the IPR. The IPR should not only assess the overall performance of the concluding activity but should be 'forward-looking', and highlight some of the lessons, and consider how activity outcomes might influence future policy and programs.

In finalizing the IPR, the consultant should pay attention particularly to the assessment of aspects relating to cost, timeliness and quality of program outputs and also cross-cutting themes, such as: gender equality, anti corruption and HIV.

METHOD

In undertaking the scope of the IPR, the Team will:

- a. Familiarise themselves with relevant program and activity documentation provided by AusAID
- b. Participate in AusAID briefing sessions both prior to and at the conclusion of field visit
- c. Prior to the field visit, submit to AusAID a proposed evaluation plan for implementing the requirements of the IPR in-country.
- d. Undertake a field visit to Aceh Province, including field investigations (interview of beneficiaries) and consultations with LOGICA2 Project Team, AusAID staff in Jakarta, GoI officials and other agencies as set out in the evaluation plan
- e. Meet with targeted beneficiaries and LOGICA2 implementing partners
- f. Present initial findings of the IPR to AusAID Jakarta, GoI and LOGICA2 team, followed by submission of draft and final IPR.
- g. Prepare a draft and final report which includes set of recommendations and management responses.

6. TEAM COMPOSITION

The team will comprise three members, a Team Leader/Evaluation Specialist, a Local Governance Specialist and a Community Development Specialist. Dependent on need, an interpreter may be required for the team.

The Team Leader will be expected to have:

- a. Extensive monitoring and evaluation experience, including significant experience designing methods for assessing performance of development programs
- b. Understanding of AusAID policy development context
- c. Extensive experience and excellent understanding on Indonesia's decentralisation and development contexts.
- d. Extensive experience in writing reports for development agencies
- e. Indonesian language skills preferred

The Team Leader will be responsible for:

- a. Drafting the evaluation plan, designing the evaluation method, field research guide and instruments in collaboration with the technical team members.
- b. Planning, directing, coordinating and managing the assignment, including directing other team members
- c. The submission of reports to AusAID.

The Team will be supported by staff from AusAID Jakarta and Banda Aceh, as required.

The Local Governance Specialist will be expected to have:

- a. Strong understanding of the Indonesian local governance context. Understanding of the Aceh context is desirable.
- b. Extensive experience in designing, and managing sub-national governance / decentralization programs
- c. Experience in project/program evaluation.
- d. Indonesian language skills preferred.

The Local Governance Specialist will be responsible for:

- a. Providing inputs to the evaluation plan and method and field research guidance.
- b. Reviewing the program's components related to capacity building of the local government.
- c. Participating in fieldwork activities.
- d. Providing inputs to reports to AusAID.

The Community Engagement Specialist will be expected to have:

- a. Strong understanding of the Aceh social development context.
- b. Extensive experience in designing and managing civil society and community development programs.
- c. Experience in project/program evaluation.
- d. Indonesian language skills preferred.

The Community Engagement Specialist will be responsible for:

- a. Providing inputs to the evaluation plan and method and field research guidance.
- b. Review the program's community engagement, gender and social inclusion strategies.
- c. Participating in fieldwork activities.
- d. Providing inputs to reports to AusAID.

7. TIMETABLE

The IPR will take approximately 28 days and it is to be completed by 16 January 2012 at the latest.

- a. 5 days for desk review of key program documentation (**22-26 October 2011**)
- b. 2 day for consultation with mission team to discuss and draft an evaluation plan (**27-28 October 2011**)
- c. 1 day discussion on the evaluation plan with AusAID and the Managing Contractor (MC) (**31 October 2011**)
- d. 11 days for travel in/out, briefing, field visit and present initial findings (**20 November – 1 December 2011**)
- e. 1 day for possible de-brief at AusAID Canberra (**between 2-16 December 2011**)
- f. 5 days drafting the IPR within 14 days of completing field visit (**5-9 December 2011**)
- g. 3 days finalising the IPR upon receipt of comments from AusAID (**16 January 2011**)

8. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The Independent Completion Report should be based on the format provided in "Independent Completion Report Template" guidelines.

The IPR Team shall provide AusAID with the following reports:

- a. **An Evaluation Plan**, no more than 10-15 pages (excluding annexes), to submitted to AusAID by **Friday 28 October 2011**;
- b. **Presentation and discussion - on the initial findings of the IPR (Aide Memoire)** to AusAID, GoI and other stakeholders at the completion of the in-country visit on **Tuesday, 29 November 2011**;
- c. **Draft IPR** – to be submitted to AusAID at the latest by **Friday 16 December 2011** or within 14 days of completing field visit.
- d. **Final IPR** – to be submitted to AusAID at the latest by **Monday 16 January 2011** or within 3 days of receipt of AusAID's comments on the draft IPR. The IPR Team Leader is responsible for the final content of the report. The report should be a brief and clear summary of the IPR outcomes and focus on a balanced analysis of issues faced by the activity.

All documents will be delivered to AusAID Activity Manager in electronic format, compatible with Microsoft Office suite. Draft and Final IPR reports should be no more than 50 pages of text plus appendices and both should include the IPR Terms of Reference, field research guidelines, sources, list of meetings and instruments as appendices.

Hardcopy reports will be made available to AusAID on request.

9. LIST OF KEY DOCUMENTS TO BE REFERRED TO IN DESK STUDY

a. Concept and Design Documents

LOGICA2 Project Design Document

b. MOUs/Agreements between GoA and partners

c. Contract Document

LOGICA2 Contract

d. Implementation workplans and progress reports from the managing contractor

LOGICA2 Annual Work Plan 2010

LOGICA2 Annual Work Plan 2011

LOGICA2 Six-Monthly Latest Progress Report, period January-June 2011

e. Other Significant documents / reports prepared by the managing contractor

LOGICA2 Monitoring & Evaluation Framework, 9th Version, July 2011

LOGICA2 Brief Project Report, period July – September 2011

Joint LOGICA2 and SEDIA Gender Mainstreaming Strategy

f. Independent Review Reports and AusAID QAI reports

Quality at Implementation (QAI) Report on LOGICA2, January 2011

g. Relevant AusAID policy documents and operational guidelines

The Australia Indonesia Partnership Aceh Program Framework (APF)

AusAID policies (gender, anti-corruption, partnerships, performance assessment and evaluation)

AusAID Guidelines on Standard for Monitoring and Evaluations

ANNEX TWO: Evaluation respondents and Evaluation mission agenda

| Name | Occupation |
|----------------------------|--|
| Aceh Province | |
| Anrina Habibi | Kasubid PKHP BP3A Provinsi Aceh |
| Dharmakanti | Kasubid Partisipasi Politik, Sosial dan Lingkungan |
| Kamaruddin | Biro Tata Pemerintahan Provinsi Aceh |
| Ikhmanuddin | Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi Aceh |
| Warqah Helmi | Bappeda Provinsi Aceh |
| Nasrullah Muhammad | Ka. BKPP Provinsi Aceh |
| T. Armansyah | Kabid TF BKPP Provinsi Aceh |
| Abdul Fatah | Kabid P2PL/Dinkes Propinsi Aceh |
| Pidie Jaya District | |
| Nurleli | District Office Pidie Jaya |
| Armianti A. Gani | CC (Pidie Jaya) |
| Dewi Suryani | CC (Pidie Jaya) |
| Nazaruddin | CC (Pidie Jaya) |
| Denny Faqrizal | PA-CAGSIS (Pidie Jaya) |
| Fajri M. Kasem | CC (Pidie Jaya) |
| Furqon | SCC (Pidie Jaya) |
| Asri Ali | FS (Pidie Jaya) |
| Rustin | CC (Pidie Jaya) |
| Robby Ziat Pasya | District Manager Pidie Jaya |
| Ramli Daud | Sekretaris Daerah Pidie Jaya |
| Radjali Adami | Kepala Bappeda Pidie Jaya |
| Jauchari M. Riza | Sekretaris BKPP Pidie Jaya |
| Machmud Dani | Kepala DPKAD Pidie Jaya |

| Name | Occupation |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ramli | Wakil Ketua DPRD Pidie Jaya |
| Bahrum | DPRD Pidie Jaya |
| Sarbini | DPRD Pidie Jaya |
| | Kepala Daerah Pidie Jaya |
| Radjali Adami | Kepala Bappeda Pidie Jaya |
| Jamian | Sekretaris Bappeda |
| M. Nazir | Kabid Bappeda |
| Ismail Ibrah | Kasubag Pemerintahan |
| Muslim Khadri | Kasubag Otonomi Daerah |
| Sayed Umar | Sekretaris |
| Isa Ismail | Kabid |
| Dody Suhariadi | Kasubag Penyusunan Program |
| Dr. Nasriah | Kepala Puskesmas |
| M. Nazar | Tim Inovasi |
| Yanti Nanda Sari | Tim Inovasi |
| Fadhlina | Ketua K3 |
| Juliah | Pengelola BOK |
| Ridwan M. Ali | Kepala Dinas Pendidikan |
| Cut Bahraini | Kabid Dikdas |
| Aiyub | Kabid Program |
| Saiful | Bappeda |
| Junaidi | CM |
| Marhamali | Women Leader |
| Mursyidah | Bendahara KSM |
| Khalidah | Kader Gampong |
| Maryana | Kader |
| Surya Sayuti Malik | Kader |

| Name | Occupation |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Ulfah | Kader |
| Ummiati | Kader |
| Nurmalawati | Kader |
| Erna Erlina | CM |
| Rahmawati | Kader |
| Cut Rahmawati | Bidan Desa |
| Rusli | BPK Kecamatan Ulim |
| Bakhtiar | TPK Gmpong |
| M. Nasir | TPK |
| Syamsyar | BPP |
| H. Aiyub, SKM. M.Si. | |
| Marwan | Camat |
| Abdulah | Staf |
| Hasyem | Kasi Pemerintahan |
| Rapiati | Kasi Kesra |
| Lailawati | PJOK |
| Nasri | Sekcam |
| Iramarnika | Staff |
| Asiah | Kabid PP & PA Pidie Jaya |
| Roslina | P2TP2A Pidie Jaya |
| Cut Nurazizah | Ketua P2TP2A Pidie Jaya |
| Siti Rahmah | P2TP2A Pidie Jaya |
| Andriani | P2TP2A Pidie Jaya |
| Iskandar | Coordinator/LPLH (CSO in Pidie Jaya) |
| Zohra | F1/LPLH (CSO In Pidie Jaya) |
| Azhari | F1/LPLH (CSO In Pidie Jaya) |
| Sri Rahmawati | F1/LPLH (CSO In Pidie Jaya) |

| Name | Occupation |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Mustafa Kamal | F1/ LPLH (CSO In Pidie Jaya) |
| Mashadi | F1/ LPLH (CSO In Pidie Jaya) |
| Saifuddin | Director/ LPLH (CSO In Pidie Jaya) |
| Aceh Timur District | |
| Husni Thamrin | Kepala Bappeda |
| Muhammad Oriza | Kabid Ekonomi |
| | Sekretaris Daerah |
| Syawaludin | Sekretaris Disdik |
| Fahmi Rizal | Sekretaris BKPA |
| Effendi | Kasubag Tata Usaha BKPA |
| Nursyamsiah | Wakil Ketua P2TP2A |
| Wadi Fatimah | BPMPKS |
| Saifuddin | Kasie Diklat SDM Kesehatan |
| Fakhrurrazi | Kabid KA BPMPKS |
| Syahrizal | Anggota DPRD (FPD) |
| Muslim | Anggota DPRD (FPD) |
| Zulkifli M Thoeb | Anggota DPRD (PA) |
| Ahmad Emda | Ketua Banleg |
| P. Zakaria | Ketua Fraksi FD |
| Cut Lismariati | Anggota (FPD) |
| Sulaiman Ismail | Ketua Komisi B |
| Mulkan Lukman | PMGM |
| Herman Peudada | PM-PM |
| Evi Wahyuni | FS |
| Pridwansyah | Ex-DM |
| Muhammad Taufiq | CC Aceh Timur |
| Khairul Husna Ahmad | CC Aceh Timur |

| Name | Occupation |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| Zulfahmy | CC Aceh Timur |
| Muhammad Idris | CC Aceh Timur |
| Adi Wardah | PA-CAGSIS |
| Gi SR | DO |
| Mahyar | SCC Aceh Timur |
| Radiah | Women Leader |
| Nirwana | Women Leader |
| Nurhayati | KSM |
| Zauharui | KSM |
| Suhaida | KSM |
| Ani Wahyuni | Kader |
| Yusniar | Kader |
| Fadhilah | Women Leader |
| Emiliana | Kader |
| Siti Masyithah | Women Leader |
| Mariani | Women Leader |
| Mashudi | Wakil Ketua Pemuda |
| A. Salam | Kader |
| Wahyu Indra | Kader |
| Ibrahim Jafar | Kader |
| Rosniati | Tokoh Masyarakat |
| Aswita | Ketua KSM |
| Murshidah | Bendahara |
| Nurhayati | Kader |
| Putri Melati | Kader |
| H. Aiyub, SKM, M.Si. | Kadis Kesehatan |
| Salman Drajat, SP., MNA. | Kasubid Bappeda |

| Name | Occupation |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Effendi | Kasubag Tata Usaha |
| Saifuddin | Kasie Diklat SDM |
| Isham | Tim Inovasi |
| Khairul Fahmi | Tim Inovasi |
| H. Anwar | K3 Kecamatan |
| Reza Rizki | Camat |
| Hasan Basri | Dan Ramil |
| Usman, Skm | Kepala Puskesmas |
| Suheri | Staff |
| Syukri | Staff PKM |
| Zulfikar | Staff PKM |
| Yusmidar | Ka KM |
| Hasdiana Kusma | Staff PKM |
| Sariana | Staff PKM |
| Yuni | Staff PKM |
| Ratna | Kader |
| Nurfthriani | Bidan Desa |
| Wardiah | Bidan Desa |
| H. Anwar | K3 Kecamatan |
| Hanifah | Staff PKM |
| Masyitah | Kader |
| Rukaiyah | Staff PKM |
| Muhammad Nurdin | Staff PKM |
| Sopian Hamid | Director/Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |
| Iswandi | F1/ Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |
| Fauzan | F1/ Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |
| Masrizal | F1/ Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |

| Name | Occupation |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Safniar | F1/ Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |
| M. Nasir | F1/ Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |
| Sri Wahyuni | F1/ Maskot (CSO in Aceh Timur) |
| Mahyuddin | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| Razali | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| M. Nasir M. Nur | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| Abdul Wahied | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| M. Said Sufi | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| Riswandi | Ketua Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| Samsul Hadi | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| Nurdin AB | Asosiasi Keuchik Aceh Timur |
| Saiful Isky | LPPM Aceh (CSO) |
| Sudarman | Aceh CSO Forum |
| Kholilullah P. | Aceh CSO Forum |
| Arman Fauzi | Aceh CSO Forum |
| Abdullah Abdul Muthaleb | Aceh CSO Forum |
| Chairul Fahmi | Aceh Institute (CSO) |
| Saiful Mahdi | Aceh Institute (CSO) |
| Yulinda Wati | Gerak Aceh (CSO) |
| Other Programs/Donors | |
| Deny Purwo Sambodo | Governance Advisor Aceh District Response Facility GIZ |
| Sarwansa Sahabuddin | Provincial Coordinator KINERJA USAID |
| PUM-MOHA | |
| Drs. A. Siradjuddin Nonci, M.Si. | Direktur Dekonsentrasi dan Kerja Sama |
| Ir. Endah Kastanya, M.Si | Kasubdit Fasilitasi Pelayanan Umum |
| Anita D. Ratih, M.Si. | Kasi Wilayah II Subdit Fasilitasi Pelayanan Umum |

| Name | Occupation |
|-----------------------|---|
| Dra. Rumintang Sinaga | Kasi Wilayah I Subdit Fasilitas Pelayanan Umum |
| Amanah Asru, M.Si. | Staff Subdit Fasilitas Pelayanan Umum |
| Win Untoro, SE | Staff Subdit Fasilitas Pelayanan Umum |
| TM Yusuf | TUHA 4 (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Ismail Saleh | Imam Meunasah (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Nadar | Informal Leader (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Murdani | Informal Leader (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Amri | Informal Leader (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| M Radix | CM (Musa Ara Village) |
| Muhammad Jafar | Village Head (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| M. Yusuf | Kepala Dusun (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Jafaruddin | Village Government Staff (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Zulkarnaen | Village Head (Banjar Baru Sub District) |
| M. Yusuf Amin | Village Government Staff (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| H.T. Yusuf Abdullah | Village Head (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Munirwan | Informal Leader (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Fauzi | Informal Leader (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Wahyudy Asyanysyech | Informal Leader (Bandar Baru Sub District) |
| Nilawati | Women Leader Paru Keude |
| Suriani | Cadre Musa Ara |
| Misnaiyah | Midwives Musa Ara |
| Nuryahati | Women Leader Musa Ara |
| Suriana | KSM member Paru Keude |
| Cui Bardiah | Women Leader Baroh Musa |
| Mardalagna | KSM member Keude |
| Muliani | Women Leader Tutong |
| Hanifah | Women Leader Pidie Jaya |

| Name | Occupation |
|---------------|---|
| Marliza Rahmi | CM Tringgadeng |
| Nur Fittriani | CM Bandar Baru |
| Nasrullah | Guru Agama/Tim Inovasi LOGICA 2 (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Murni | Guru Kelas/Tim Inovasi LOGICA 2 (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Kasmawati | Guru Kelas (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Nurhayati | Guru Kelas (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Yanti Maisura | Guru Kelas (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Khairani | Guru Agama (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Nurbaiti | Guru Bakti (SD Negeri Teupin Jangat) |
| Marlaini | KSM member Kumba |
| Khairiah | KSM member Kumba |
| Jamaluddin Y | TPK Kumba |
| Muhammad Sabi | Sekdes Kumba |
| Halimah | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Wardhiah | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Cut Aisyah | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Cut Nurbaiti | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Fauziah | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Nurhasanah | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Nur akmal | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Soudah | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Darmawati | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Syaffruddin | Cadre (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Muslim | Tuha 4 (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Irwan Ismail | Youth Leader (Bandar Dua Sub District) |
| Sulama R | Village Head (Bandar Dua Sub District) |

| Name | Occupation |
|--------------------|--|
| Hj. Nursam, Spd | Kepala Sekolah (SD Negeri Kp Jalan) |
| Khalijah Siregar | Tim Inovasi LOGICA 2 (SD Negeri Kp Jalan) |
| Rosmawardani, Spd | Guru (SD Negeri Kp Jalan) |
| Sri Wahyuni, SPd.I | Tim Inovasi LOGICA 2 (SD Negeri Kp Jalan) |
| Alfan, SPd | Wakil wali murid/Komite Sekolah (SD Negeri Kp Jalan) |
| Hanafiah Putih | Komite Sekolah (SD Negeri Kp Jalan) |
| Agustina | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Hasnah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Nurbaini | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Nurlina | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Indri Safri Yanti | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Riska Yunanda | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Aqlina | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Yusrawati | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Raziah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Syukriah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Nur Saili | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Nurna Fajri | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Suryani | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Farida Hanum | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Anisah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Fahmah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Hamidah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Aisyah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Hanifah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Fitriani | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Srisuriandani | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |

| Name | Occupation |
|-----------------|--|
| Ainun Mardhiah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Roslindayati | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Sufyan | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Muhammad Riza | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Samsul Bahri | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Darwis Nuchari | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Sarbini | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Ainil Mastura | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Khairul Nisak | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Ardiyanti | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Fazillah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Suryati | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Irmawati | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Kamaliah | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Kota) |
| Iswandi | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Azhar AMK | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Abubakar | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| M. Nasir | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Armo ZT | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Saiful Mulki | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Said Ali Alini | Village Head (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Zainuddin Yasin | Village Head (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| M. Thaib | TPG (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Habsah | Village Government Staff (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Yulita Sulaiman | Informal Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Arani T. Ali | TPG (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| M. Ali | Youth Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |

| Name | Occupation |
|--------------------|---|
| Abdullah | TPG (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Nirwana | Women Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Wiwik | Women Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Adiah | Women Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Nuryahati | KSM Member (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Zubaidah | KSM Member (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Ani | Guru PAUD (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Yusniar | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Fadila | Women Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Emiliana | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Siti Masitah | Women Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Putri | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Nurhadina | Women Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Fatima | KSM member (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Nurati | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Mursidah | KSM member (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Asmita | KSM member (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Rosniati | Informal Leader (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Marjani | Cadre (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Anteb | CM (Kec. Pereulak Barat) |
| Teuku Ardiansyah | Independent Consultant based in Aceh and Board member of Katahati Institute |
| Afrizal Tjoetra | Aceh Development Fund (CSO) |
| Agusta Muhtar | AJMI (CSO) |
| Zulfiansyah | AJMI (CSO) |
| Fahrul Rizha Yusuf | Katahati Institute (CSO) |
| Mariaty | KKTGA (CSO) |

| Name | Occupation |
|-------------|---|
| Marbawi | Bima (CSO in Bireun) and FT SPM Pendidikan LOGICA 2 |
| M. Nasir | Bima (CSO in Bireun) |

INDEPENDENT PROGRESS REVIEW TEAM AGENDA

Banda Aceh - Pidie Jaya- Aceh Timur

28 November - 4 December 2011

TEAM MEMBERS:

| Team 1 | | | Team 2 | | | Team 3 | |
|--------|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1. | Suhrman, IPR Governance Specialist | 1 | AbdiSuryaningati (Yenni), IPR Community Devt Specialist | 1 | | Linda Kelly, IPR Team Leader <i>(can joint either team 1 or team 2)</i> | |
| 2. | Win Untoro, Representative of Directorate General of Public Administration, MoHA (Ditjen PUM, Kemdagri) | 2 | Santi Handayani, Program Officer, AusAID * | 2 | | Suci Lestari Landon, Intepreter | |
| 3. | Leonard Simanjuntak, Unit Manager, AusAID * | | | 3 | | LailaYudiati, Program Manager, AusAID * | |

* AusAID member can swap as necessary to join certain meetings

| Time | Agenda |
|---|--|
| Monday, 28 November 2011 (Jakarta-Banda Aceh) | |
| 06.45 – | - Depart from Jakarta to Banda Aceh (GA 142, ETD 06.45 am, ETA 10.40 am) |

| | |
|---------------|---|
| 11.00 | - Picked up from Sultan Iskandar Muda Airport, Banda Aceh to LOGICA 2 Office by car |
| 11.00 – 12.00 | <p>Brief by AusAID and brief by IPR Team Leader for the meetings with stakeholders</p> <p><i>Venue : LOGICA2 Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : IPR Team, AusAID</i></p> |
| 12.00 – 13.00 | <p>Brief by SMT LOGICA2</p> <p><i>Venue : LOGICA2 Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : SMT LOGICA2</i></p> |
| 13.00 - 14.00 | Lunch |
| Time | Team 1, 2 & 3 |
| 14.00 – 16.30 | <p>Meeting with Provincial Secretary (Sekda Aceh) and related Provincial Agencies</p> <p><i>Venue : Governor's Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sekda and Provincial Senior Officials</i> • <i>Head of Personnel, Education and Training Agency (Badan Kepegawaian Pendidikan dan Pelatihan/BKPP)</i> • <i>Head of Women Empowerment and Child Protection Agency (Badan Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak/BP3A)</i> • <i>Head of Governancet Unit (Biro Tata Pemerintahan, Setda Aceh)</i> • <i>Head of Development and Planning Agency (Bappeda)</i> |

| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Health Agency (Dinas Kesehatan) • Head of Education Agency (Dinas Pendidikan) | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|---|---------------|--|
| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
| 16.30 – 18.00 | Informal meeting with Government Official required (AusAID /IPR Team arrangement) <i>Venue : Lobby at Hermes Hotel</i> | 16.30 – 18.00 | Informal meeting with people as required (invitation arranged by Yenni) <i>Venue : Lobby at Hermes Hotel</i> | 16.30 – 18.00 | Meeting with SEDIA <i>Venue : LOGICA2 Office/SEDIA Office</i> <i>Participants : Team Leader and senior staff of SEDIA</i> |
| 18.00 – 19.30 | Check in at Hermes Hotel and free time | | | | |
| Time | Team 1 + Laila | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 + Leo |
| 19.30 – 20.30 | Meeting with CID Senior Staff (Rene Schinkel / Diani Widiastuti) <i>Venue : Restaurant at Hermes Hotel</i> <i>Participants : CID Senior Staff</i> | 19.30 – 20.30 | Free time | 19.30 – 20.30 | Dinner meeting with donors <i>Venue : Restaurant Hermes Hotel</i> <i>Participants: CPDA, ADRF-GIZ, Kinerja USAID, and other donors</i> |
| Tuesday, 29 November 2011 (Banda Aceh-Pidie Jaya) | | | | | |

| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
|---------------|---|---------------|---|---------------|--------------|
| 09.00 – 10.00 | <p>Meeting with University Staff</p> <p>Venue : University of Syiah Kuala</p> <p>Participants : Syaifuddin Bantasyam (Lecturer, Department of Law and Society, Faculty of Law)</p> <p>MP: 081360034284</p> <p>Topic: Aceh context</p> | 09.00 – 11.00 | <p>Meeting with CSO</p> <p>Venue : Forum LSM Aceh Office</p> <p>Participants : Forum LSM Aceh, Gerak Aceh, Aceh Institute</p> | 09.00 – 11.00 | Joint team 1 |
| 10.00 – 11.00 | <p>Meeting with University Staff</p> <p>Venue : IAIN Ar-Raniri</p> <p>Participants : Prof.Yusni Saby, Lecturer</p> <p>Topic: Aceh context</p> | | | 10.00 – 11.00 | Joint team 1 |
| 11.00 – 15.00 | Depart to Pidie Jaya | | | | |
| 15.00 | Arrive in Pidie Jaya (LOGICA2 District Office) | | | | |

| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
|--|--|---------------|--|---------------|--------------|
| 15.00 – 17.00 | Discuss with LOGICA2 Pidie Jaya District Team Venue : LOGICA2 District Office Participants: DM, DO, SCC, CCs, FS, PMGM, PMPM | 15.00 – 17.00 | Meeting with local CSO/NGOs Venue : (LSM) LPLHa Office Participants : LPLHa activist and representative of Forum LSM Aceh (Pidie Jaya Coordinator) | 15.00 – 17.00 | Joint Team 1 |
| Time | Team 1, 2 & 3 | | | | |
| 17.00 – 18.00 | - Depart to Bireuen - Check in at Meuligoe Hotel, Bireuen | | | | |
| 18.00 – 19.00 | Team 1, 2 & 3 Wrap up Discussion re: meetings on day-1 and day-2 Venue : Meuligoe Hotel, Bireuen | | | | |
| Wednesday, 30 November 2011 (Pidie Jaya) | | | | | |
| Time | Team 1, 2 & 3 | | | | |
| 08.00 – 09.00 | Depart to Pidie Jaya | | | | |

| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|---------------|--|
| 09.00 – 11.00 | <p>Meeting with District Government</p> <p><i>Venue : Pidie Jaya Regent Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants :</i></p> <p>1. Regent (Bupati)/District Secretary (Sekda)</p> <p>2. Head of Personnel and Training Agency (BKPP)</p> | 09.00 – 11.00 | <p>Meeting with Other District Agencies</p> <p><i>Venue : Pidie Jaya Regent Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants:</i></p> <p>1. Head of Women Empowerment and Child Protection Agency (BP3A)</p> <p>2. Head of Community Empowerment Agency (Badan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat)</p> | 09.00 – 11.00 | <p>Meeting with Development Planning Board (Bappeda)</p> <p><i>Venue : Pidie Jaya Bappeda Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Head of Bappeda and staffs</i></p> |
| 11.00 – 13.00 | <p>Meeting with Government Section</p> <p><i>Venue : Regent/Bupati Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants :</i></p> <p>1. Assistant to District Secretary on Government Section (Asisten I Tata Pemerintahan)</p> <p>2. Head of Government Section (Kepala</p> | 11.00 – 13.00 | <p><i>Free time and lunch</i></p> | 11.00 – 13.00 | <p>Joint with Team 1</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|----------------|--|---------------|--|
| | <i>Bagian Tata Pemerintahan) and staff</i> | | | | |
| 13.00 – 14.00 | Lunch | 13.00 -- 13.30 | <i>Travel to Musa Ara Village</i> | 11.00 – 13.00 | Joint with Team 1 |
| 14.00 – 15.00 | Meeting with Health and Education Commission of Local Parliament (Komisi Pendidikan & Kesehatan DPRK) <i>Venue : DPRK Office</i> <i>Participants : Chairman of Health and Education Commission and members</i> | 13.30 – 15.30 | Meeting with Village Government 1 <i>Venue : Musa Ara Village Head Office, Bandar Baru Sub-district</i> <i>Participants : Village Head and staffs</i> | 14.00 – 16.00 | Meeting with District Health Agency <i>Venue : District Health Agency Office</i> <i>Participants : Head of Health Agency and staffs</i> |
| 15.00 – 16.00 | Meeting with District Government Budgeting Committee (Tim Anggaran Pemerintah Daerah/TAPD) <i>Venue : Regent/Bupati Office</i> <i>Participants : Members of TAPD:</i> 1. Sekda 2. Head of Bappeda | 15.30 – 16.00 | <i>Break, Ashar pray</i> | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|---------------|---------------------|
| | 3. Head of District Asset and Finance Management Agency (Dinas Pengelola Kekayaan dan Keuangan Daerah/DPKKD) | | | | |
| 16.00 – 17.30 | Depart to Bireuen | 16.00 – 17.30 | Community Level Discussion 1 Venue : Musa Ara Village Hall Participants : community mobilizer, women leaders, village cadres, community elders, microfinance group and representatives from other 3 villages (Paru Keude, Gampong Tutong, and Keude Lueng Putu) | 16.00 – 17.30 | Depart to Bireuen |
| 17.30 – 19.00 | Meals and free time | 17.30 – 19.00 | Depart to Bireuen and meals | 17.30 – 19.00 | Meals and free time |
| 19.00 – 20.30 | Team 1,2 & 3 Wrap up Discussion Venue: Meuligoe Hotel, Bireuen | | | | |

| Thursday, 1 December 2011 (Pidie Jaya-Aceh Timur) | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------|--|---------------|--|
| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
| 08.00 – 09.00 | <i>Depart to Pidie Jaya</i> | 08.00 – 09.30 | <i>Travel to SD Negeri Teupin Jangat (Primary School)</i> | 08.00 – 09.00 | <i>Depart to Pidie Jaya</i> |
| 09.00 – 10.00 | <p>Meeting with District Education Agency</p> <p><i>Venue : District Education Agency Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Head of Education Agency and staffs</i></p> | 09.30 – 10.30 | <p>Visit to Primary School and discuss with School Principal</p> <p><i>Venue : SD Negeri Teupin Jangat, Bandar Baru Sub-district</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Principal, teachers and school committee</i></p> | 09.00 – 10.00 | Joint with Team 1 |
| 10.00 – 10.15 | <i>Travel to Puskesmas Trieng Gadeng</i> | 10.30 – 11.15 | <i>Travel to Kumba Village</i> | 10.00 – 10.15 | <i>Travel to Puskesmas Trieng Gadeng</i> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|---------------|---|
| 10.15 – 11.00 | <p>Visit to Community Health Center (<i>Puskesmas</i>) and discuss with Head of <i>Puskesmas</i></p> <p><i>Venue : Puskesmas Trieng Gadeng</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Head of Puskesmas, doctors, midwife and sub-district health committee</i></p> | 11.15 – 12.30 | <p>Visit and discuss with microfinance group (<i>KSM</i>)</p> <p><i>Venue : KSM Barona, Kumba Village, Bandar Dua Sub-district</i></p> <p><i>Participants : KSM members, local motivator and village government/elders</i></p> | 10.15 – 11.00 | Joint Team 1 |
| 11.00 – 11.15 | Travel to Bandar Baru Sub-District Office | | | 11.00 – 11.15 | Travel to Bandar Baru Sub-District Office |
| 11.15 – 12.30 | <p>Visit to Sub-district Office and discuss with Sub-district Head (<i>Camat</i>)</p> <p><i>Venue : Bandar Baru Sub-district Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Camat and staffs</i></p> | | | 11.15 – 12.30 | Joint with Team 1 |
| 12.30 – 14.00 | Lunch and travel to Grong-Grong Capa Village (Team 1, 2, 3) | | | | |

| | |
|---------------|--|
| | |
| Time | Team 1, 2 & 3 |
| 14.00 – 15.00 | <p>Meeting with Village Government 2</p> <p><i>Venue : Grong-Grong Capa Village Head Office, Ulim Sub-district</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Village Head and staffs</i></p> |
| 15.00 – 16.00 | <p>Community Level Discussion 2</p> <p><i>Venue : Grong-Grong Capa Village Hall</i></p> <p><i>Participants : community mobilizer, women leaders, village cadres, community elders, microfinance group and representatives from other 3 villages (Mesjid Ulim Tunong, Nangrhoe Barat, Meunasah Bueng)</i></p> |
| 16.00 – 17.00 | <p>Travel to Bireuen</p> |
| 17.00 – 18.00 | <p>Team 1, 2 & 3 Wrap up Discussion</p> <p><i>Venue : Meuligoe Hotel, Bireuen</i></p> |
| 18.00 – 22.00 | <p>Depart to Aceh Timur</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|---|------------------|--|
| 22.00 – 22.15 | <div>- Arrive in Aceh Timur</div> <div>- Check in at hotel in Langsa</div> | | | | |
| Friday, 2 December 2011 (Aceh Timur) | | | | | |
| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
| 09.00 – 10.30 | <div>Meeting with District Government</div> <div>Venue : Aceh Timur Regent Office</div> <div>Participants :</div> <div>1. Regent (Bupati)/District Secretary (Sekda),</div> <div>2. Head of Personnel and Training Agency (BKPP)</div> <div>3. Head of Women Empowerment and Child Protection Agency (BP3A)</div> <div>4. Head of Village Government Section (Kepala Bagian Pemerintahan Desa/Pemdes)</div> | 09.00 – 10.30 | <div>Meeting with local CSO/NGOs</div> <div>Venue : (LSM) MASKOT Office</div> <div>Participants : CSO/NGO Officials</div> | 09.00 – 10.30 | <div>Meeting with Development Planning Board (Bappeda)</div> <div>Venue : Aceh Timur Bappeda Office</div> <div>Participants : Head of Bappeda and staffs</div> |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|---------------|--|
| | 5. Head of Education Agency 6. Head of Health Agency | | | | |
| 10.30 – 12.00 | <p>Meeting with Government Section</p> <p>Venue : Regent/Bupati Office</p> <p>Participants :</p> <p>1. Assistant to District Secretary on Government Section (Asisten I Tata Pemerintahan)</p> <p>2. Head of Government Section (Kepala Bagian Tata Pemerintahan) and staffs</p> | 10.30 – 12.00 | <p>Visit to Primary School and discuss with School Principal</p> <p>Venue : SD Kampung Jalan, Idi Sub-district</p> <p>Participants : Principal, teachers and school committee</p> | 10.30 – 12.00 | <p>Meeting with District Health Agency</p> <p>Venue : Aceh Timur Health Agency Office/ Bapeda Office</p> <p>Participants : Head of Health Agency and staffs,</p> |
| 12.00 – 14.00 | Jumat pray and lunch | | | | |
| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---------------|---|---------------|---|
| 14.00 – 16.00 | <p>Meeting with Budget Committee & Health and Education Commission of Local Parliament (<i>Badan Anggaran dan Komisi Pendidikan & Kesehatan DPRK</i>)</p> <p>Venue : DPRK Office</p> <p>Participants :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chairman of Budget Committee and members - Chairman of Health and Education Commission and members | 14.00 – 15.30 | <p>Meeting with Village Head Association of Aceh Timur (<i>Asosiasi Keuchik/Kepala Desa se Aceh Timur</i>)</p> <p>Venue : Village Head Association Secretariat, Idi sub-district</p> <p>Participants : members of Village Head Association (several village heads)</p> | 14.00 – 16.00 | <p>Meeting with District Education Agency</p> <p>Venue : Aceh Timur Education Agency Office</p> <p>Participants : Head of Education Agency and staffs</p> |
| | | 15.30 – 16.00 | <p>Travel to Matang Peulawi Village and Ashar pray</p> | | |
| 16.00 – 19.00 | <p><i>free time and travel back to Langsa</i></p> | 16.00 – 17.00 | <p>Community Level Discussion 1</p> <p>Venue : Matang Peulawi Village Hall, Peureulak Kota sub-district</p> <p>Participants : community mobilizer, women leaders, village cadres, community elders, microfinance group and representatives from other 3 villages (Leuge, Paya Meuligoe, Blang</p> | 16.00 – 18.00 | <p>Discuss with LOGICA2 Aceh Timur District Team</p> <p>Venue : LOGICA2 District Office/Harmoni Hotel, Langsa</p> <p>Participants: DM, DO, SCC, CCs, FS, PMGM, PMPM</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------|---|---------------|-----------------------|
| | | | Batee) | | |
| | | 17.00 – 18.00 | Meeting with Village Government 1 Venue : Matang Peulawi Village Head Office Participants : Village Head and staffs | | |
| | | 18.00 – 19.00 | Travel back to Langsa | 18.00 – 19.00 | Travel back to Langsa |
| 19.00 – 20.30 | Team 1, 2 & 3 Wrap up Discussion Venue : Harmoni Hotel, Langsa | | | | |
| Saturday, 3 December 2011 (Aceh Timur) | | | | | |
| Time | Team 1 | Time | Team 2 | Time | Team 3 |
| 07.45 – 08.45 | Travel to Peureulak Barat Sub District Office | 07.45 – 08.45 | Travel to Gampong Beusa Seberang | 07.45 – 08.45 | Joint with Team 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---------------|--|---------------|-------------------|
| | | | | | |
| 08.45 – 10.30 | <p>Visit to Sub-district Office and discuss with Sub-district Head (<i>Camat</i>)</p> <p><i>Venue : Peureulak Barat Sub District Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Camat and staffs</i></p> | 08.45 – 10.30 | <p>Community Level Discussion 2</p> <p><i>Venue : Gampong Beusa Seberang Village Hall, Peureulak Barat Sub-district</i></p> <p><i>Participants : community mobilizer, women leaders, village cadres, community elders, microfinance group and representatives from other 3 villages (Gampong Paya Sengat, Kabu & Bringen)</i></p> | 08.45 – 10.30 | Joint with Team 1 |
| 10.30– 12.30 | <p>Visit to Community Health Center (<i>Puskesmas</i>) and discuss with Head of Puskesmas</p> <p><i>Venue : Puskesmas Peureulak Barat</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Head of Puskesmas, doctors, midwife and sub-district health committee</i></p> | 10.30– 12.30 | <p>Meeting with Village Government 2</p> <p><i>Venue : Gampong Beusa Seberang Village Head Office</i></p> <p><i>Participants : Village Head and staffs</i></p> <p><i>other 3 villages (Gampong Paya Sengat, Kabu & Bringen)</i></p> | 10.30– 12.30 | Joint with Team 1 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| 12.30 – 14.00 | Lunch and travel to Langsa (Team 1,2 & 3) | | | | |
| 14.00 – 16.00 | Team 1,2 &3 Wrap up Discussion <i>Venue: Harmoni Hotel, Langsa</i> | | | | |
| 16.00 – 20.00 | <i>Travel to Medan</i> | | | | |
| 20.00 – 20.30 | <i>- Arrive in Medan</i> <i>- Check in at hotel in Medan</i> | | | | |
| Sunday, 4 December 2011 (Medan-Jakarta) | | | | | |
| Time | Agenda | | | | |
| 10.00 – 12.00 | Debrief SMT LOGICA2 on initial findings <i>(Mia Badib returns to Jakarta -- GA 183 ETD 08.45 ETA 11.00 am)</i> | | | | |

| 12.00 – 13.00 | Lunch |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| 13.00-15.55 | Free time |
| 15.55-18.10 | Depart to Jakarta (GA 191, ETD 15.55 – ETA 18.10) |
| Monday, 5 December 2011 (Jakarta) | |
| Time | Agenda |
| 10.00 – 12.00 | <p>Meeting with AKLN and PUM, MoHA <i>(if required, TBA by IPR Team)</i></p> <p>Venue: AKLN's office</p> <p>Participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Head of Centre for Management of Overseas Cooperation (AKLN), Bp Gunawan</i> - <i>Head of Deconsentration and Cooperation, Directorate General Public Administration (PUM), Drs. A. Sirajuddin Nonci, M.Si</i> |

ANNEX THREE: Evaluation Methodology

Introduction

AusAID has requested an independent progress report (IPR) to assess the performance and achievement of the Local Governance Innovations for Communities in Aceh Phase II (LOGICA2).

The goal of LOGICA 2 is to “contribute to a stable and peaceful Aceh by supporting effective governance that addresses approach priority village needs. “

The project objective is: “In response to community-wide advocacy, governments deliver services to improve living standards.”

LOGICA 2 delivers activities under this objective through a project approach focused on two components of: active communities and responsive government. Essentially this means that the project supports local governments to deliver services that improve living standards (health, education, personal safety and infrastructure), in response to community-wide advocacy. The project also builds the capacity of citizens to identify and protect their needs to government (village, district and provincial).

The project works in 432 villages in six districts in the province of Aceh, building on the experience and lessons learned of LOGICA Phase I.

Significantly the project has been funded for 30 months with the possibility of a two-year extension dependent upon the findings of a mid-term review. In addition AusAID is currently in the process of consolidating its support for decentralisation in Indonesia with a view of moving most programs to a facility modality by the end of 2013. The consolidated approach to decentralisation will be managed under a Decentralisation Common Results Framework (CRF).

Within this context, the objective of this IPR is to:

Assess the degree to which the activity has been successful in achieving its objective, and make recommendations as to whether it should continue for a further two years, with the possibility of using a facility modality from the second year of its extension to consolidate on smart practices developed through the current program.

In addition, the specific review objectives include:

- a) Assess progress towards meeting the overall goal and purpose of LOGICA 2, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.
- b) Identify lessons learned from the LOGICA 2 monitoring and evaluation system for potential broader relevance to future AusAID initiatives in Decentralisation area.
- c) Recommend as to whether the project should continue for another year or two.
- d) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of LOGICA 2 and identify its best practices to contribute to other AusAID programs, especially the Australia

Indonesia Partnership for Decentralisation (AIPD) and possible project delivery through facility modality which will be established in 2013.

- e) To assess how well the project addressed issues of gender equality, poverty and vulnerability in its design and implementation.

Recent information from AusAID also suggests that there are other areas of particular interest to be explored in the IPR. These are:

- a. The degree to which the project has built and is maintaining stakeholder ownership to ensure the project outcomes will be sustained after activity completion.
- b. The suitability of the project to scale up its education activities to more districts over the next 24 months, in line with the recommendation from the recent IPR for the Support for Education Sector Development In Aceh (SEDIA) project.
- c. Effective and efficient use of resources. LOGICA 2 utilises 116 staff and 152 community mobilisers alongside 1296 voluntary cadres across the 432 villages. The program also works with local NGOs to subcontract service delivery. AusAID would like some attention given to assessment of the effectiveness and efficiency of these approaches to project implementation.
- d. The degree in which the project has built civil society organizational capacity to continue the work through local government funding as was initially proposed

Finally in addition to a report against the objectives of the IPR, AusAID also seek a quality at completion rating for this project utilising the AusAID six point quality scale. In order to complete this scale there are questions for the team to consider which relate mostly to project design, implementation, management and systems for accountability.

Project over view

In preparing to review this project is important to consider the key assumptions underlying the design and implementation of the project as well as existing information and the gaps in that information.

Key assumptions are determined in the policy approach of AusAID, the project design and in the program logic utilised as a basis for the intervention strategy.

AusAID approach to decentralisation support in Aceh

The LOGICA 2 project needs to be understood within the context of a wider program of AusAID support for decentralisation in Indonesia, in particular through AIPD.

That framework outlines four pillars of work which include a focus on demand for and supply of better governance in Aceh. It also outlines several principles for any work undertaken in Aceh that focus such work towards incremental change, reform of existing systems and promotion of government agency. These principles assume that effective service delivery and change can be achieved for the people of Aceh through reform of the current system building upon existing structures. This assumption is a strong influence throughout the design and implementation of LOGICA 2 and some attention to its validity ought to inform this review.

Previous experience

As noted, LOGICA 2 is the second phase of LOGICA, which originally commenced in 2006. The subsequent design for phase 2 built upon lessons learned and experience of the previous phase with the continued emphasis on strengthening the interaction between people and local government. The design document for this second phase presents limited new analysis and largely appears to build upon the description of needs and interpretation from the first phase to determine the activities for the phase II project.

There are clearly some assumptions in such an approach to project design. The first is that the analysis and interpretation of the original project was sufficient in order to understand the reasons for its achievements. The second major assumption is that the conditions and activities of the first project can be replicated in communications and at a different time. These need to be tested in the application of LOGICA 2.

Program logic

LOGICA 2 has two 'end of project' outcomes in line with its two components of work:

Active communities:

Outcome: Citizens, particularly the marginalised, effectively advocate priority needs to government and contribute to service delivery reform to improve living standards.

Responsive government:

Outcome: Governments respond to citizen priorities, including those of the marginalised, by effectively allocating and delivering services to improve living standards

Under these two outcomes sit six intermediate outcomes and several outputs. As noted in previous reviews of this project, the description of many of the outputs and their relationship to intermediate outcomes is problematic from the point of view of a 'project approach' to program logic. There is an implication in the way the outputs and outcomes are presented and in the notion of LOGICA 2 as a project that suggests the outputs will be tangible achievements of the project which together will be *sufficient* and *necessary* to achieve the intermediate outcomes. This is clearly an inadequate description of the program logic underlying LOGICA 2.

In the most recent report for the project a revised program logic is presented. This examines the operating context of the project and proposes a critical process of change moving from citizen 'alienation' to citizen 'empowerment'. The program logic outlines a process whereby a virtuous circle of empowerment activities will start to generate more active and engaged communities. This will then intersect with the development of more responsive government through a range of internal and external strategies for change at various levels of government. The project seeks to identify the change which becomes possible when these two areas of activity engage in positive and constructive ways.

This reformed project logic identifies the work of LOGICA 2 as being a contribution to the development of more active communities and responsive government rather than the sole cause or determinant.

This more modest and thoughtful program logic suggests that the project has already moved closer to a facility design with multiple activities contributing to major outcomes in different ways and through different methodologies. This is a very significant reinterpretation of the project logic, albeit a sensible and timely reinterpretation. It suggests that the project should be understood and monitored not as an aggregate set of outputs and intermediate outcomes but rather should be monitored according to its progress towards its two overarching outcomes. Further, it suggests that the project contribution to those outcomes needs to be understood in the context, with consideration given to the other factors also likely to be influencing the outcomes.

This has implications for the IPR. The focus on the assessment should therefore be less upon the detailed project outputs and intermediate outcomes and more on the evidence base for outcome achievement and the degree to which LOGICA 2 can clearly be seen to have contributed to these. The assessment should also examine if this logic is driving project management and reporting and how well the communication of the project progress now accords with the revised program logic.

Project assumptions

As noted above there are several assumptions related to the original design of this phase 2 of the project. In addition, notwithstanding the revised project logic, there are various assumptions upon which the project is based. Some of these assumptions appear to still reflect a simple 'project' type logic. They include the following:

- The assumption that the major barriers to good quality service delivery for citizens are largely related to factors able to be influenced by LOGICA 2. These include gaps in Government capacity, regulations and administrative procedures.
- The assumption the project activities will be able to contribute in a sufficient way to shifting community attitudes and behaviors such that people will become more active on their own behalf. A further assumption is that the project influence will be sufficient so that citizens are also likely to become more active on behalf of others, in particular those who are vulnerable due to gender, poverty and other factors.
- The assumption that program outcomes could be achieved in a sustainable manner in what is a very short amount of time, notwithstanding the original project analysis which pointed to many factors which have change in the past.
- The assumption that change can become self reinforcing, that once people experience some positive change this will develop into a virtuous circle which reinforces ongoing action by citizens as well as increased responsiveness from government beyond any influence of project. This is a key assumption for the sustainability of the project.

Existing information about the project

Most of the existing information about the project is available from reports presented by the Managing Contractor (MC). Understandably these reports are focused on the activities

undertaken by the MC and the result of these activities. While these reports provide considerable information, in particular in the most recent activity report, it is of limited value in making an assessment about progress towards project outcomes¹³. The reports provide little information about specific contexts within each district and do not seek to analyse other influences which may be contributing to or inhibiting change. For example, it is significant that despite AusAID having a strong policy approach for its support for decentralisation in Indonesia, there is no information on the AusAID contribution to the achievements reported in the project reports.

It is noted that in the original design an independent monitoring team which focused on progress towards outcomes for the whole project was recommended. To date this independent monitoring team has not been mobilised. This is a major gap in the existing information sources.

It is also noted that the MC has sought to develop its monitoring and evaluation system and further information about the development of the system should be sought during this review. The degree to which this monitoring and evaluation or closely aligns with the redeveloped program logic will be important area of investigation.

This gap in information about achievements to date will be a limitation for the IPR. As far as possible other data, both original data collected by the MC and data available from other sources, will be sought to try to bridge this gap.

Summary

In order to fulfill the objectives of the IPR and given the revised project logic which suggests those outcomes are more than simply the sum of completed outputs, it will be important for the review team to focus its attention on evidence of outcome achievements to date. It will also be important for the review team to test as far as possible the design and program logic assumptions upon which the project operates. Through giving attention to both areas the review team will be in the best position to provide information as requested by AusAID.

The intention of the review team therefore will be to focus upon the two component outcomes and to seek to explore the following questions:

- Is there evidence that the project is making a significant contribution towards either or both of these outcomes within the six districts in which it is operating?
- In light of this evidence, are the various project assumptions correct, especially across the different contexts in which the project is operating? If not what implications does this have for the future of the project and wider decentralisation work within Aceh?

Clearly the evidence available for project reporting to date provides limited information for these two questions. The role of the IPR team will therefore be to explore additional

¹³ It appears from the reports which are provided that there is additional raw data collected from communities and from government which does directly provide outcome information. This is an important source of information and these original reports will be sought during preparation for the review.

available sources of evidence and undertake some primary data collection to try to address these questions.

Evaluation methodology

Approach

In line with the discussion above, the IPR will seek to identify the progress towards achievement of either or both project outcome areas. The methodology will draw from:

- established knowledge and standards about effective decentralisation for service delivery in Indonesia,
- targeted fieldwork at national provincial and district levels,
- Existing reports and information.

Analysis of these achievements including analysis within the context of the different project locations and according to other influences will provide a basis for then revisiting project assumptions and a wider interpretation and review of the project.

Focus

For project Outcome One the focus of investigation will be around the experience of the community members. Drawing from previous experience in effective decentralisation for service delivery, the following areas will be explored:

- The degree to which decision-making and control has been effectively shifted to more local levels
- Given that most service delivery is managed at the district level, how well is district government responding to community needs?
- What mechanisms are there for accountability and transparency of government to communities including what mechanisms exist for communities to question government decisions?

For project Outcome Two the focus of the investigation will be around the changes in government behaviour and operations. This will include an examination of:

- The functional assignments at provincial, district and village levels including how well these are understood and operationalised in practice.
- As a result of these assignments, examination of how services are being delivered.
- Budget tracking to examine the flow of funds from national through provincial to district and village level. In particular attention is to be given to how village level government and service units (etc. school, community health center, and sub-district office) are utilising funds, both those from national level and other sources.
- Some additional focus will be given to overall management and implementation of the project in line with the various objectives of the review (including strength of relationship and level of coordination with provincial and kabupaten governments).

Data collection

Data collection will be multiple, focused upon a triangulated approach to verify outcomes and achievements. Data collection will include:

- Comparison with existing knowledge and information about effective decentralised service delivery standards and approaches in Indonesia.
- Field-based research which focuses upon the experience of communities and governments (village, sub district, districts and provincial) over the past two years seeking to verify significant changes as well as major influences related to those changes. (This field research will be very limited and will not by itself provide valid evidence of change. It will be utilised to verify other information and therefore increase the confidence in that information.)
- Information from relevant stakeholders including government, civil society organizations and other donors
- Project information including district baseline reports, citizen government satisfaction reports, other project research and relevant research
- Reports from other donors and other AusAID programs.
- Review of phase 1 evaluation reports.
- Review with MC, in particular field-based staff.
- Review with AusAID.

Data collection will include a mixture of focus group discussions and focused interviews. Particular questions for the community and government respondents are attached at annex A.

Data analysis

Initially data analysis will be based upon a triangulated approach with information from different sources brought together to compare and contrast answers and information. The intention will be for individual team members to utilise their professional expertise to individually analyse data from different sources and provide some interpretation of the data. The team will then collectively analyse the material, contrasting both findings and individual analysis.

Following this analysis process, a draft report will be made available to the relevant stakeholders including AusAID, the MC and the Government of Indonesia for the purpose of commentary and further analysis and interpretation of results. The final report will reflect this additional information and informed analysis.

Scope of the review

The review is limited in the time available for field research. Ideally original research should be undertaken in all the districts across a representative sample of locations. Given this is not possible it is proposed by the review team that two districts will be explored in more detail. While information will be sought on the experience in all the districts through discussions with project stakeholders and through review of existing material, field research will only be undertaken in two districts of Pidie Jaya and Aceh Timur. The purpose of this research will be to verify through some original data collection the validity of other evidence, as noted above.

Selection of these two districts provides an opportunity to contrast locations where the project has operated over two phases (Pidie Jaya) and one phase only (Aceh Timur), as well

as contrasting project implementation in different geographical contexts. Both districts were identified as the highest-ranking provinces in terms of suitability for project location in the first project workplan and could be expected to therefore demonstrate the most significant progress towards project outcomes.

Within these districts the following respondent groups will be sought:

- local civil society/NGO organizations in both districts
- community level discussions in at least four villages per district, where the project has been very active¹⁴
- discussions with the village governments in the same locations
- discussions with school committees and health committees.
- interviews with the education service departments, health service departments and government section (*Bagian Pemerintahan Setda*) in each district
- interviews with the head of community health center, government hospital, primary school, secondary school, and sub district office.
- interviews with the district executive in each district
- interviews with the budget committee in each district
- interviews with the development planning board in each district
- Interviews with local council (DPRD) responsible with education and health.

At provincial level the following respondent groups will be sought:

- interviews with the development planning board at provincial level
- interviews with the budget committee at provincial level
- interviews with the health and education units at provincial level.

In addition information will also be sought from the following:

- other donors including the World Bank, UNDP, USAID, UNICEF, EU, ADRF -GIZ.
- other relevant AusAID programs including SEDIA
- district field staff of the managing contractor
- managing contractor senior staff
- relevant AusAID staff

Information that will be sought prior to the field research

In addition to the field research outlined above information will be sought from the MC and/or other sources to address the following areas.:

For community and gender equality:

¹⁴ The intention of the IPR team is to give as much 'voice' as possible to project beneficiaries, that is community people and government staff. Therefore it is requested that as far as possible community meetings are established with as broad a representation as possible. At a minimum however the IPR team will expect to be able to talk to women and to other marginalised groups in villages to explore their direct experience of project interventions.

- a) The development of each of the cadre (women), what has been done by each of them since receiving capacity development activities. How many (percentage) of them are now actively involved in various decision making process and in doing advocacy activities?
- b) Base-line on the most marginalized/vulnerable communities in each of the district and indication of progress on how they are being supported to be involved in decision making process

For government:

- c) Details of the funding available to the province of Aceh, including special autonomy funding and that available for resource royalties.
- d) Information about budget tracking and analysis
- e) Information about current functional assignments
- f) Information about MSS compliance in education and health services
- g) Information about citizen satisfaction survey

For other stakeholders:

- h) Other relevant evaluation and review reports from related programs, both AusAID and from other donors
- i) Other relevant research and publications which helped to eliminate the context and changes within the six districts of project operation.

As far as possible the IPR team would like to receive this information prior to the review mobilization

Limitations of the IPR

As noted above the time allowed for this review is limited and that limits the time for field research as well as the opportunity for wider investigation. In addition as noted earlier the existing monitoring documentation and project reports are largely focused upon activities managed by the MC, rather than progress towards project outcomes. There is therefore a limited amount of information which can be gleaned from existing reports.

In addition to this while two of the review team speak the Bahasa Indonesian, the team leader does not and is therefore limited in her ability to directly engage with some of the stakeholders.

Finally the review is somewhat challenged by the many objectives attached to the mission. There are clearly many areas of interest related to this project and its association with other areas of work. Given none of the review team have been significantly associated with any of this work, the findings and conclusions for this review will need to reflect the limited wider knowledge and experience of the team. It will be important to refrain from conclusions and recommendations which are beyond the expertise and direct knowledge of team members.

Team Members

In line with the focus and scope of the IPR as outlined above the IPR team members will be required to specialise in different areas.

The Team Leader, Dr Linda Kelly, will be responsible for the overall review approach, methodology and data management and analysis. She will focus in particular on the design of the project and the implications of this for outcome achievement. She will have responsibility for exploration of experience from the perspective of external stakeholders and will look at internal management and implementation arrangements. Dr Kelly will be responsible for the overall IPR report.

The governance specialist, Pak Suhirman, will be responsible for the review of how far the project has contributed to changes in government functions, behaviors and attitudes towards service delivery and accountability to people. Pak Suhirman will have responsibility for data collection, analysis and reporting in this area.

The community development and gender specialist, Ms Abdi Suryaningati, will be responsible for review of change experienced at community level, including the experience of women. She will review the contribution of the project to any identified changes, looking at the relevance and sustainability of the outcomes. Ms Suryaningati will be responsible for data collection, analysis and reporting for this area of the review.

Other people accompanying the team will include a Representative of Directorate General of Public Administration, MoHA (Ditjen PUM, Kemdagri), and AusAID personnel. It will be important to ensure that confidentiality of discussions is maintained and that respondents are free to discuss their views on all matters. For this reason the people accompanying the team may be asked to leave meetings at some points to ensure confidentiality.

IPR report

As required by AusAID, two reports will be prepared from this review. The first will be a draft report outlining the findings, analysis and conclusions of the review team. This draft is expected to be considered by stakeholders including AusAID and the Government of Indonesia. Their comments and further analysis of the findings and conclusions will then provide the basis for the final report.

The second report will be prepared which will directly rate to the project and according to the AusAID six point quality scale.

Indicative areas for enquiry with respondent groups

Community level respondents and CSO/NGO respondents

- How robust is the engagement happens at village level in between community representatives with service delivery point and with government apparatus? Do advocacy activities take place more often? What cause that?
- How far do the community advocacy activities influence government practices?
- Do the community priorities that have developed in various villages actually get the attention of the government besides receiving support from LOGICA2 and other village level programs?
- Does the community understand how their development priority being recognized and incorporated in the government plan (and budget) for next year? Some examples?
- What factors influence successful advocacy? What factors hinders change to happen?
- What happens if the advocacy activities do not result in changing of government behavior and actions? Is there a mechanism developed by the communities to discuss the lessons learnt and strategy to move forward? Any example on how communities cop with emerging situations and able to develop new engagement strategies? How LOGICA 2 help this process?
- If communities are involved in a Community Based Self-help Group (KSM): what other activities are done by your KSM to get support from government and to deal with issues affecting your full participation in local decision making processes (particularly if it is KSM managed by women or by the most vulnerable groups)?

In terms of gender and social inclusiveness

- How deep is the involvement of women and the most vulnerable communities in developing village level priorities and advocacy agenda and actions? Did adequate consultation process with them take place
- How far do community priorities that are developed through a participatory process address women and the most vulnerable communities' needs? Some examples of priorities that address women and the most vulnerable communities' needs.
- How far the cadre, particularly women, able to influence local decision making processes?
- How deep the cadre (women) consults with her fellow women and voices the interests of women? Does she applies the skills she gets on the training to consciously analyzing the factors influencing women and take necessary actions to address that factors in her respective area of work?
- Do you see and receive help/support from other member of the communities and informal leaders to deal with issues? Examples of support you get from those actors?

Government respondents

- In term of functional assignment, budget allocation and service delivery.

- What is the assignment of province/district government in education, health and administration services? Is local regulation established functional assignment of province, district and village?
- What is the source of funding for education department, health department and sub district for services? How do they allocate funds to finance services? Are there any significant changes before and after LOGICA 2 train and supervise the departments/service units.
- What is performance and competent standard should be complied by departments/service units in delivery their services? What is the role of LOGICA 2 to improve the quality of services to comply such standard?
- Are there any significant improvement of the quality of service delivery, especially for marginalized and poor people, before and after LOGICA 2 train staff and supervise department and service unit? Are there evident of success story?
- Are there any local regulation established by local government to improve service delivery, especially for marginalized and poor people? What is the role of LOGICA 2 in the process of formulating regulation?
- What methods were introduced by LOGICA 2 run successfully? Are there evident of success story? What factors are influence that success?
- What methods were introduced by LOGICA 2 that did not work? Why?
- Are there any significant differences between departments, service unit and budget committee in prioritizing budget allocation? Are there any evident? In this case, what is the role of community to advocate the budget allocation base on their demand?

In term of communication channel with community

- How departments/service units understand and response community needs? In what channels department/service units communicate with community to understand and response community need? What is the role of LOGICA 2 to improve the communication channel between departments/service units and community?
- How local council understand and response community needs? In what channels department/service units communicate with community to understand and response community need? What is the role of LOGICA 2 to improve the communication channel between local council with community?
- What is the role of school and health committee in improving service delivery base on community demand? Are there evident of success story? What factors make it happen? What is the role of LOGICA 2 in this case?
- Are there any collaboration between department/service unit and community to improve the service delivery? Are there evident of success collaboration? What factors make it happen? What is the role of LOGICA 2 in this case?
- Are there any examples of how communities monitor the quality of service delivery? What kind of method are there used? Are there evident of success story of how community monitoring be able to improve service delivery?