

# Independent Evaluation of Yogya-Central Java Community Assistance Program (YCAP)

## MANAGEMENT RESPONSE and LEARNING and DISSEMINATION PLAN

### Aid Activity Summary

| Aid Activity Name          | Yogya-Central Java Community Assistance Program  |                 |           |
|----------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------|
| AidWorks initiative number | ING646 – Yogya Reconstruction Program  |                 |           |
| Commencement date          | June 2006  | Completion date | June 2010 |
| Total Australian \$        | 30,000,000   |                 |           |
| Total other \$             | Personnel and other in-kind inputs from Government of Indonesia staff in Jakarta, Yogyakarta and Central Java province, and community contribution |                 |           |
| Delivery organisation(s)   | RHK Management in association with IDSS (International Development Support Services)   |                 |           |
| Implementing Partner(s)    | International and National Non Government Organisations (NGOs); Local Governments  |                 |           |
| Country/Region             | Yogyakarta Province and Central Java Province, Indonesia   |                 |           |
| Primary Sector             | School Construction, Improving Livelihood and Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)  |                 |           |

### Aid Activity Objective:

#### a) Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development

On 17 March 2005 the inaugural Joint Commission meeting of ministers for the Australia Indonesia Partnership for Reconstruction and Development (AIPRD) agreed a number of programs and activities to be funded from Australia's A\$ 1 billion post tsunami aid package. Endorsed by the AIPRD Joint Commission, the Partnership Framework outlines a program structure for the AIPRD based on two main themes: 1. Emergency Preparedness and Response; and 2. Promoting broad-based economic growth.

#### b) Yogyakarta - Central Java Community Assistance Program (YCAP)

On 27 May 2006 an earthquake measuring 6.2 on the Richter scale occurred off the coast of South Java and affected the provinces of Yogyakarta (Bantul, Sleman, Gunung Kidul and Kulon Progo districts) and Central Java (Klaten, Magelang, Boyolali and Purworejo).

The disaster killed 5,722 people, with an estimated 37,927 injured and several hundred thousand people left homeless. On 2 June 2006 the AIPRD Joint Commission approved \$A 30 million in AIPRD grant funding for immediate demolition, repair and construction works, and longer-term reconstruction for the Yogyakarta (and Central Java) Reconstruction Program. A managing contractor was selected to implement the Yogya-Central Java Community Assistance Program (YCAP).

The purpose of YCAP was to provide short and medium term assistance to affected communities and implement rehabilitation programs. The program goal was to assist affected families and communities in the project areas to return to normality as quickly as possible.

The YCAP was divided into two phases. Phase 1 operated from 2006 to 2008 and Phase 2 commenced in 2008 and concluded in 2010.

Under Phase 1, program components were:

- (i) sustaining household life;
- (ii) restoring local incomes; and
- (iii) school readiness.

Under phase 2, program components were:

- (i) disaster risk reduction;
- (ii) improving community infrastructure, particularly water and sanitation, irrigation, restoration of market places and (where resources allowed) small scale roads and bridges rehabilitation; and
- (iii) improving livelihoods, giving priority to those made vulnerable by the earthquake.

## **Independent Evaluation Summary**

### **Evaluation Objective is to:**

- a. Assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of YCAP, to provide information on accountability and lessons learnt that could be applied and/or shared across the aid program;
- b. Identify factors facilitating or constraining success and lessons learnt from the program and recommend mechanisms to enhance overall effectiveness of post disaster assistance; and
- c. Validate and follow-up the information and relevant assessments made by the Activity Completion Report.

**Evaluation Completion Date:** March 2010.

**Evaluation Team:** Mr Colin Reynolds (Team Leader – M&E Specialist); Mr Methodius Kusumahadi (Team Member – Community Development Specialist); and Mr Jeong Park (AusAID Disaster Management Adviser).

## **Management Response of Independent Completion Report (ICR) recommendations**

The Independent Completion Report (ICR) is well structured, used an appropriate methodology and contains very useful case study information and analysis. The conclusions presented are practical and the report identified constraints and recommends how these could be overcome for future programs.

The ICR team's report addressed all topics and questions outlined in the Terms of Reference. It concludes the program achieved above average outcomes, particularly in the second phase of its operation. A key success was to successfully undertake a transition from 'emergency' to 'development' approaches between phase 1 and phase 2 of the program.

AusAID agrees with the ICR's comments that the YCAP's emergency response was satisfactory. We welcome the ICR's conclusion that activities implemented under phase 2 were outstanding, particularly establishment of highly productive partnerships between YCAP, local government, NGOs and communities. We agree these methods could be used as a model for stakeholder engagement for future activities in disaster risk management and post disaster reconstruction.

Some lessons identified were:

- Clarity in communication of program intent (particularly in relation to levels of funding directly available) to stakeholders on program governance bodies is vital to avoid implementation disputes.
- Transition between emergency and development assistance does not happen automatically, it must be managed. The need to manage the transition should be explicitly recognised in the initial design.
- Application of Paris Declaration principles should not be pursued blindly, but tailored to implementation contexts.
- In developing a DRR strategy for a transitional program such as YCAP, DRR will be most effective when defined broadly. This priority should be reflected in budget allocations and appropriate performance indicators for construction activities which have the primary purpose of mitigating impacts of future disasters.

A summary of the ICR recommendations is:

#### **Recommendation One**

Future AusAID programs seeking to span a transition between an emergency response and development assistance should consider explicitly declaring these two parts of the program and defining how and when respective activities and modification of program priorities will occur.

**Response:** Agreed. Future designs should take account of the local economic and technical capacity of the affected province.

#### **Recommendation Two**

A coordinated or simultaneous approach to transitional programs (including an initial response team and a transitional/development-oriented team) should be used in future.

**Response:** Agreed.

#### **Recommendation Three**

AusAID should set standards for construction strength applicable to the natural disaster risks of a particular location and adhere to these strength standards.

**Response:** Agreed. The minimum standard should be agreed in consultation with the Government of Indonesia (GoI) before design and construction.

#### **Recommendation Four**

Future programs providing physical assets at local government level should be aware that local governments may not have operational budget for new assets and AusAID should prompt and assist local governments to apply for allocation of maintenance budgets.

**Response:** Agreed. The YCAP program handed over its physical assets to its government partners. The ICR highlights that local governments should prepare specific funds for maintenance. This fundamental issue will be raised more broadly within AusAID Indonesia to ensure activities address this early in design and in implementation.

#### **Recommendation Five**

It is strongly recommended that AusAID consider allocating 12 months of modest additional funding to provide limited ongoing support to YCAP activities to:

- continue efforts to empower cooperation between GoI, NGOs and the community;
- continue efforts to empower cooperation between Small and Medium Enterprises (SME), NGOs and bigger business entities; and
- continue efforts to strengthen women as income earners as a way to encourage ongoing cultural change.

This funding provision should have the multiple aims of consolidating the sustainability of phase 2 achievements, monitoring future independent uptake of program approaches and researching the best means of replicating YCAP successes.

**Response:** Not Agreed. The program was extended for an additional 15 months from the original closing date. A total of four years was appropriate to provide the assistance and to have effectively exited. The ICR found that YCAP had been successful in facilitating better and more effective partnership between local government and local organisations to carry on some related works themselves.

#### **Recommendation Six**

M&E frameworks of programs that transition from emergency to development assistance should define indicators relevant to both forms of assistance and recognise that optimal performance levels against the various indicators is something that should change over time.

**Response:** Agreed.

## **Learning and Dissemination Approach**

The report has been shared with relevant units in AusAID. This should ensure institutional learning from the experience. It is now standard that AusAID assistance through Australia – Indonesia Facility for Disaster Reduction (AIFDR) undertakes a 'Building Back Better' approach.

To continue the improvement in assisting natural disaster responses, the AIFDR is continuing to develop a DRR program that takes lessons learned from completed recovery programs including YCAP.