

**UNICEF**

External Evaluation

***Institution Building  
&  
Mainstreaming Child Protection in Indonesia***

***UNICEF supported Child Protection Bodies (LPAs)***

**Final Evaluation Report**

**Ms. Andrea HITZEMANN  
Consultant**

**March 2004**

## **FOREWORD**

Between 1997 and 2004, UNICEF supported through institution building the establishment and organisational capacity of Child Protection Bodies (*Lembaga Perlindungan Anak* or LPA) on national and provincial level in Indonesia. The aim was to support government and non-governmental efforts to ensure adequate implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) in Indonesia, with a special focus on child protection.

The programme was divided into two sequences:

- between 1997 and 2001: “Special Protection Measures for Children & Mainstreaming Child Rights in Indonesia”, funded by USAID and
- between 2000 and 2004: “Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection in Indonesia”, funded by the Governments of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and New Zealand.

Six independent provincial child protection institutions in the provinces of South Sulawesi, North Sumatra, East Java, Central Java, West Java and Nusa Tenggara Barat (NTB) are being supported as of March 2004. Additionally, the National Commission for Child Protection (*Komisi Nasional Perlindungan Anak – Komnas Anak*) has been established with considerable support from UNICEF between 1998 and 2001.

Since the Ministry of Social Affairs had established the child Protection Bodies on national and provincial level through a Ministerial Decree in 1997, all LPAs including the six above in the 31 provinces of Indonesia are also supported by the Indonesian Government.

In October 2002 the Child Protection Law was adopted by the Indonesian Government with major support and advocacy from UNICEF, and the Ministry of Women’s Empowerment together with Department of Social Affairs is in the process of establishing the Commission for the Protection of Indonesian Children (*Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia – KPAI*), which will be a separate body from Komnas Anak.

In the course of this evaluation, four out of the six provincial LPAs supported for different lengths of time by UNICEF have been visited in order to assess the achievements of LPAs and draw conclusions and lessons learned for UNICEF. Additionally, recommendations for UNICEF’s future collaboration with LPAs in view of consolidating Child Protection Bodies were formulated.

I would like to thank sincerely all those who have contributed to this evaluation and who have given their time and energy to participate in individual interviews and group discussions, helping to understand in detail the conflicting interests guiding the operation of the Child Protection Bodies in Indonesia. My particular thanks go to the UNICEF staff in the Child Protection Unit in Jakarta and in the Field Offices and especially to Mr. Agus Ryanto, who translated very patiently between Bahasa Indonesia and English.

But the most important contributions though came from the children themselves who we met in order to discuss issues of child protection concerning them. Their involvement must remain the ultimate aim so that we as adults are constantly reminded of the final purpose of our efforts.

Andrea HITZEMANN  
March 2004

## **Abbreviations, Acronyms and Indonesian terms**

ASA PKBI	Planned Parenthood Association of Indonesia
Biro Kesos	<i>Biro Kesejahteraan Sosial</i> (Bureau of Social Welfare), NTB
Biro Kesra	<i>Biro Kesejahteraan Rakyat</i> (Bureau of People's Welfare), Central Java
Biro PP	<i>Biro Pemberdayaan Perempuan</i> (Bureau of Women Empowerment)
Bupati	District Head
CP	Child Protection, UNICEF Unit
CPB	Child Protection Bodies, another term for LPA
CPSM	Centre for Participatory Social Management (local NGO)
CRC	The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child
DFID	Department for International Development of the British Government
Dinas Sosial	Provincial or District Office of Social Affairs (South Sulawesi)
FO	UNICEF Field Office
FORASU	<i>Forum Anak Sumatra Utara</i> (North Sumatra Children's Forum)
INGO	International non-governmental organisations
Komnas-Anak	(Komnas PA) <i>Komisi Nasional Perlindungan Anak</i> (Nat. Comm. for Child Prot.)
KPAI	<i>Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia</i> (Commission for the Protection of Children in Indonesia)
LPA	<i>Lembaga Perlindungan Anak</i> (Child Protection Body)
LBH APIK	<i>Lembaga Bantuan Hukum – Asosiasi Perempuan Indonesia untuk Keadilan</i> (Legal Aid Foundation for Women and Children) Medan
LSM	Lembaga Swadaya Masyarakat (Non-governmental organization)
NCCP	National Commission for Child Protection (abbr. of Komnas Anak used by SC US)
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NTB	Nusa Tenggara Barat (West Nusa Tenggara)
NTT	Nusa Tenggara Timur (East Nusa Tenggara)
NZODA	New Zealand Overseas Development Agency
PCA	Project Cooperation Agreement,
PIRAC	Public Interest Research and Advocacy Centre
PKK	<i>Pemberdayaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga</i> (Family Welfare Empowerment)
PKPA	<i>Pusat Kajian dan Perlindungan Anak</i> (Center Study and Child Protection)
PLAN	Plan International
PPAI	<i>Perserikatan Perlindungan Anak Indonesia</i>
RPK	<i>Ruang Pelayanan Khusus</i> (Special Service Unit)
SC UK	Save the Children United Kingdom
SC US	Save the Children United States
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development of the US Government

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In 1997 the Ministry of Social Affairs established Child Protection Institutions (LPA) at national and provincial level. The LPAs are registered as NGOs and seen to be independent “umbrella” institutions for child protection activities. They have four major functions:

1. Influencing policy makers to take greater account of children’s rights;
2. Promoting the participation of children;
3. Raising awareness of child rights among children and adults; and
4. Ensuring that children have effective means of redress when their rights are violated.

Between 1998 and 2004 UNICEF supported seven LPAs<sup>1</sup> whose multi-disciplinary Board had been elected democratically. They are supported in order to build on their capacity on child protection **and** to strengthen their institutional capacity. Four out of six LPAs were evaluated in terms of relevance and impact of their activities, their organizational set-up and long-term sustainability. Findings and recommendations were formulated for both, LPAs and UNICEF and lessons learned for UNICEF were summarized.

Over a five week period more than 140 people (including 14% children) from Government and civil society were questioned through guided interviews, semi-structured questionnaires and moderated group discussions. Additionally, a large number of documents relating to LPAs and UNICEF’S Institution Building Programme were analyzed.

Despite a generally critical perception of some international NGOs regarding LPAs’ independence, the four LPAs evaluated have contributed through their multiple activities - of which most are UNICEF funded but not all - to six major changes between 1998 and 2004:

1. The awareness of children rights has increased.
2. Children’s issues are higher up on the agenda of government and civil society.
3. Children’s participation in issues concerning them has improved.
4. Government has better accepted NGOs as partners.
5. National and local laws related to child protection has been put in place.
6. The Government has established KPAI which will link to provincial organizations.

LPAs’ main activities centered around the following key functions:

- a) Advocating and lobbying for policies and legislation
- b) Education/awareness raising and dissemination of information on the rights of the child
- c) Monitoring the implementation of child rights at national and community level
- d) Conducting research on child protection issues
- e) Developing a referral system for rehabilitation and reintegration of children
- f) Representing the interest of children in court
- g) Offering hotline service and counseling for children

The activities summarized under a, b, c and d are typical functions of an ‘umbrella’ organization and network of organizations because they support their members’ objectives. It is generally perceived that LPAs have to a large extent but to different degrees fulfilled these expectations. There are many examples for these achievements found in numerous reports and in the field.

---

<sup>1</sup> North Sumatra, West-, Central- and East Java, NTB and recently also NTT

The activities under e, f and g are activities usually carried out by NGOs or government services. Therefore it is perceived that LPAs have been competing with their member organization for funding in regard to those activities. This has led to confusion about LPAs mandate and structure and has had the consequence of member organizations becoming inactive, uninterested and finally dropping out of their respective LPA.

Board and Executive staff of three out of four LPAs evaluated have claimed to be dissatisfied with the weak commitment of other members. The fourth LPA (NTB) is an exception because the Board functions as Executive staff and all Board members except one are government employees.

The results of those activities under e, f and g, generally referred to by LPAs as “ direct service activities”, are rather weak, because specialized expertise and sufficient human resources are generally missing (like in the case of “hotline and counseling”).

Also, the development and implementation of a referral system requires special training for various institutions (hospital, police) and LPAs don't have the knowledge and experience to offer this. It also means that LPAs generally lack sufficient knowledge and experience for follow-up and support to the referral system. And in a third step, the sometimes necessary reorientation of concepts lacks because of lack of monitoring and evaluation skills.

In summary: LPAs have too little knowledge and experience and a high turn-over of staff or active members in comparison to a great number of tasks and expectations – especially in regard to activities that are referred to by them as ‘direct services to the children in need’.

Only the representation of children in court is effectively done by referring children to LPA member organizations which are legal aid institutions with sufficient skills of their own.

LPAs perceive themselves as “independent institutions” but not necessarily as “NGOs” (even though they are registered as NGOs). For most of them (including Komnas Anak on national level), the ultimate aim is to become totally government funded because this will guarantee their financial sustainability. This is also UNICEF's perspective.

To a much lesser extent, the government's programmatic influence then is discussed: How will LPAs advocate efficiently for government policy change in a situation of contrasting opinions if they are totally funded by the same government?

From those international NGOs that are currently partly funding LPA activities, LPAs are not independent, but rather depend on UNICEF and/or the Government.

This ambivalence has to be clarified by LPAs before they can access ‘independent’ funding for long-term sustainability.

With support from UNICEF, LPAs have to clarify whether they strive to become

- a) NGOs with direct implementation activities or
- b) Network/‘umbrella’ for their member organization

And in a second step, LPAs have to decide whether they strive

- a) for **independence** and thus try to diversify their funding sources or
- b) to be funded on a long-term basis by Government

These decision have consequences for

- a) composition of membership,
- b) self image and marketable image of LPA, and

c) type of activities primarily conducted

At present stage, LPAs are expected by their main funding partners to cover a large number of activities necessary to ensure protection of children from abuse, exploitation and neglect. LPAs are also expected to include a large number of governmental and non-governmental organizations into their structure as voting members.

This is hardly feasible for one organization and leads to overstretched expectations and competitive instead of complementary thinking of its members. Therefore the image of LPAs is not clear, funding from other sources is difficult to attract and professionalism is lacking in some areas.

Apart from clarifying the organizational set-up of LPAs, UNICEF needs to support LPAs institutional capacity through management skills training: planning methods adapted to LPAs capacities and focused on key staff and Board members, participatory evaluation skills and impact monitoring. An advocacy strategy should be developed and skills for targeted advocacy should be promoted.



With the Police Hospital in Semarang



Discussions with members of PPAI in Medan



UNICEF Field Office in Makassar ...



... and LPA in Mataram, NTB

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since 1998, UNICEF has been supporting Child Protection Institutions (LPA) on national and provincial level in Indonesia. They had been established through the Ministerial Decree No.81/1997 of the Ministry of Social Affairs in 1997.

In the beginning of 1998, Indonesia faced a deep political crisis when former President Suharto stepped down after 32 years of non-democratic rule. At that time, little knowledge was available in the country regarding democratic organizational structures. NGOs were not well looked upon and government agencies were reluctant to work with them.<sup>2</sup>

The LPA on national level was named “Komnas Anak”, whereas other LPAs were referred to as “Provincial LPAs”. In 2002, the Indonesian administration was decentralized and consequently, some district based LPAs have been created, either with or without UNICEF’s direct involvement.

All LPAs are registered as non-governmental organizations under the NGO law of 2001<sup>3</sup>. At the same time, some LPAs do not see themselves as NGOs (LSM) but rather as independent institutions striving to be funded by the government. UNICEF supports this long-term strategy for sustainability. And one of LPA’s main objective is to influence government budget allocation for child protection issues and child rights issues.

In 1998, LPAs were the answer to UNICEF’s goal to work with Government and civil society alike in order to foster democratic, participatory and children’s based programming: LPAs were the ‘bridge’ between NGO and government, university and media, community leaders and private sector, police, lawyers and hospitals. Subsequently, it was proposed that these very diverse members of both government and civil society be part of LPA as stakeholders, deciding together on programmes protecting children from abuse, exploitation and neglect.

This mandate involves both aspects of NGO work: advocating for change in policy and procedure on national and provincial level, and assuring direct service delivery to children in need of protection by referring them to relevant structures. It was expected that LPAs would support these structures in order to become more professional and effective in regard to child protection.

In 1997, UNICEF signed a grant agreement with USAID for a three-year programme.

***LPAs mandate*** is defined as:

- a) *Influencing policy makers to take greater account of children’s rights*
- b) *Promoting the participation of children*
- c) *Raising awareness of child rights among children and adults*
- d) *Ensuring that children have effective means of redress when their rights are violated.*

The following funding was then provided by the Netherlands Embassy for the period October 2000 to September 2004. The programme title was “Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection”. Other funds were secured from the Governments of New Zealand (NZODA) and United Kingdom (DFID) for the provinces of NTT and NTB. With financial resources coming to an end in 2004, need arises to address pending issues through a sound exit strategy and compile lessons learned from six years of institutional and programmatic support to LPAs.

---

<sup>2</sup> Child Protection Unit, UNICEF

<sup>3</sup> Child Protection Unit, UNICEF

## **2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY**

The *objectives of this external evaluation* as stated in the terms of reference are:

1. *To assess the progress achieved by the LPAs in realization of their mandate;*
2. *To evaluate the situation-specific relevance of the child protection activities initiated by the LPAs, and their strategic plans;*
3. *To evaluate the impact of the child protection activities initiated by the LPAs;*
4. *To review the strengths and weaknesses of the LPAs at the provincial and national levels;*
5. *To develop recommendations for the strengthening and sustainability of Child Protection Institutions (LPAs and Komnas PA);*
6. *To develop recommendations for UNICEF's future collaboration with the LPAs/Komnas PA, including formulation of an exit strategy.*

Through these objectives it becomes clear that the review of LPAs consists of:

- a) evaluating the impact of LPAs' programme activities **and**
- b) evaluating LPAs' organisational structure **besides**
- c) evaluating the effectiveness of the UNICEF programme itself

... in order to specify lessons learned for UNICEF.<sup>4</sup>

The evaluation of LPA activities and their impact was done in the most thorough way possible taking into consideration that each provincial LPA was visited for 3 to 4 days and Komnas PA for one day.

### **2.1 Methodological approach**

In the course of this evaluation, four out of six LPAs, supported both operationally and programmatically by UNICEF, have been visited between 28 January and 14 February 2004. More than 140 people, including 20 children, have been interviewed in four provinces and in Jakarta in order to assess the long term sustainability of LPAs, draw conclusions and specify recommendations for LPAs and UNICEF.

Discussions took place on an individual basis and in groups of 2-3 or up to 15 participants. Board members and members of the executive staff were met, as much as government and NGO partners, those critical as well as those in favour of the LPA approach. International NGO partners were equally included in the evaluation and of course UNICEF staff on all levels, in Jakarta Central Office and in the Field Offices<sup>5</sup> :

	Total	%
Komnas PA/LPA Board & Exe. staff	39	27.5
Children	20	14.1
Government	18	12.7
Local NGOs	14	9.9
INGO	11	7.8
PKK & BKOW	12	8.5
School including university	8	5.6
Police + RPK + Hospital	7	4.9
Media	3	2.1
UNICEF staff	10	7.0
Total	142	100.0

<sup>4</sup> For further details see annex: Terms of reference

<sup>5</sup> Refer to the complete list of people interviewed in the annex.

Questions asked were semi-structured and interviews targeted an in-depth analysis of specific organisational and programmatic aspects. Special attention was given to children involved in and benefiting from LPA activities. Only focus group discussions were applied with children.

Relevant documents were analysed in Jakarta and in the Provinces, the majority of the English language material. Translation was very well done even though some issues had to be dealt with in an very detailed way and topics might not always have been easy to talk about to a foreign evaluator.

## **2.2 Choice of LPAs**

The choice of the four LPAs to be included in this evaluation had been made by UNICEF prior to the arrival of the consultant. The criteria for selecting the four LPAs include: structure, system of governance, period of establishment and geographic location.

The LPAs chosen differ according to five criteria: different Provinces, period of establishment, organisational structure, differences in UNICEF's supervision, geographical characteristics and general perception of performance (by their funding partners):

<b>4 different Provinces</b>	<b>Period of establishment</b>	<b>Organisational structure</b>	<b>UNICEF's supervision</b>	<b>Geographical characteristics</b>	<b>General perception</b>
<b>North Sumatra</b>	1998	Board elected and Exec. staff hired	Supervised by Central Office	Close to neighbouring countries	More NGO oriented
<b>South Sulawesi</b>	1998	Board of Experts and Board of Trustees	Field Office in Makassar	Access to districts difficult	Performance declining
<b>NTB</b>	2001	Board de facto replaces exec. Staff	Field Office not in NTB	Small province	Very strong
<b>Central Java</b>	1998	Executive staff appointed directly by Provincial Forum	Field Office in Semarang	Very populated province	Very weak



### **3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

#### **3.1 UNICEF Programme context**

The Child Protection Unit has six components: Child abuse, birth registration, child labour, commercial sexual exploitation and trafficking, juvenile justice and legal reform, and institution building. Institution building is a crosscutting component because all the other components also work with LPAs. Institution building mainly supports the LPAs but also the Network of NGOs in Papua and one Child Watch Forum in Central Java and two in East Java. So, even though LPAs are the main focus, they are not the only.

In order to understand past and current problems faced by LPAs, one needs to look at the history of the establishment of LPAs: UNICEF has been one of the driving forces behind the decision to issue a Ministerial decree that would call for the establishment of LPAs. On the one hand, has this helped the creation of organisations to promote child protection, on the other hand has UNICEF's continuous involvement created the impression of LPAs being UNICEF led institutions: as much on donors' side as on the level of the LPAs them-selves. Thus, the question of ownership arose. UNICEF monitored very closely the election of Board members and the selection of Executive staff. Project Cooperation Agreements (PCA) between LPAs and UNICEF were running on a six months basis (because of low management and planning capacities) which hardly allows long term planning. And additionally, every activity, even if incorporated into the PCA, had to be evaluated by UNICEF Field Office before funding was released. This approach was changed with NTB, the most recent LPA supported by UNICEF.

An UNICEF evaluation (financial audit and programmatic) of LPA South Sulawesi, North Sumatra, East Java and Komnas-Anak took place in 2000.

#### **3.2 Relation between LPA and other financial partners**

Other donor organisations in the field of children rights collaborate with LPAs. But in contrary to UNICEF, they do not fund operational costs but activities and administrative costs on a limited scale. The following table shows a few examples:

<b>LPAs supported by UNICEF<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>SC US</b>	<b>SC UK</b>	<b>PLAN</b>
<b>North Sumatra</b>	Joint programme work: Child trafficking and street children	Some joint work	
<b>South Sulawesi</b>			Joint programme work: hotline service, birth registration
<b>West Java</b>	Joint programme work: Children in conflict with the law		
<b>Central Java</b>			
<b>East Java</b>	Joint programme work : Street children		Establishment of a children's help line, child prostitution
<b>NTB</b>			Joint programme work
<b>NTT</b>			PLAN is part of the Board of LPA
<b>Komnas Anak (national level LPA)</b>	Evaluation in 2001	Children's Congress	Organisation of Children's Congress in 2004

#### **UNICEF's support to LPAs**

Since 1997, UNICEF, together with the Ministry of Social Affairs, was very involved in the details of the creation of LPAs. All LPAs were set-up by the government the same way. From the beginning, LPAs at provincial level and Komnas-Anak were given an NGO status. UNICEF

<sup>6</sup> as of March 2004

insisted particularly in a democratic and transparent procedure that would allow the development of a representative institution. It was UNICEF Central Office overlooking this process and monitoring the quality of Board elections and NGO representation. UNICEF restructured the LPAs in selected areas in a democratic and transparent process.

UNICEF has chosen to support LPAs through one year PCAs that were directly followed by Central Office at the beginning. The role of UNICEF Field Offices (FO) had been very weak since the programme was directly managed by the Central Office. Since the critical role of the FO is now clear, a change of responsibility has taken place. Nevertheless, Field Offices are involved to different degrees.

Between June 2002 and February 2004, the four LPAs included in this evaluation signed together six PCAs (Project Cooperation Agreement) with UNICEF Central Office, running between 6 and 12 months and between US \$ 32,000 to 46,000 each. Through PCAs, programme activities were funded to a slightly larger extend than operation related costs.<sup>7</sup>

	<b>1. PCA</b>	<b>Costs</b>	<b>2. PCA</b>	<b>Costs</b>
<b>North Sumatra</b>	6/2002 - 12/2002	US\$ 42,175	11/2003 - 9/2004	US\$ 41,438
<b>South Sulawesi</b>	5/2003 - 4/2004	US\$ 39,778		
<b>NTB</b>	6/2002 - 12/2002	US\$ 32,440	5/2003 - 4/2004	US\$ 46,626
<b>Central Java</b>	9/2002 - 3/2003	US\$ 34,287		

Before 2000, UNICEF engaged in only 6 months duration PCA due to the perceived need for tight financial control and in order to be able to evaluate the progress of the LPA. The period was later extended to 12 months in order to create greater stability for the LPA and to minimize UNICEF administrative work. After signing the PCA, LPAs have to request funding for each activity separately, submit detailed cost calculation and await Field Office assessment before funds will be disbursed from Central Office. This procedure and in return acceptance of financial report by UNICEF Central Office has led to the above time gaps in LPA funding. Since corruption poses a major problem in Indonesia, financial management has to be extremely tight.

Between late 2002 and early 2003 six strategic planning workshops were held together with the LPAs in the respective six provinces. And a Training of Trainers workshop, attended by 24 representatives of the six LPAs, was conducted on strategic planning methods. Equally important was fundraising training provided during the same period.

The UNICEF Advocacy and Social Mobilisation programme links as well with LPAs on district and provincial level. There will be training in 2004 for 5 days of the advocacy unit for LPAs. Other training and support offered to LPAs earlier during the period under review includes for example:

August 2000	Capacity Building workshop (2 weeks)
2000	Donor meeting on fundraising
Ongoing	Financial trainings
Ongoing	Programmatic trainings

In 2000 all LPAs have been evaluated by professional institutions and recommendations for further support have been implemented. Though, it must be admitted that training did not always fit the needs on provincial level because of its theoretical approach.

<sup>7</sup> Refer to a much more detailed overview of UNICEF's programmatic and operational funding for the period 2002-2004 but also for the total six years 1999 - 2004 in the annex.

## **4. FINDINGS**

Four out of six LPA have been evaluated in terms of their programme activities and their organizational structure. They are representative for the six LPA UNICEF has supported since 1998. Nevertheless, they do not represent LPA in Indonesia in general.

The findings summarized in this chapter draw conclusions with examples in order to discuss lessons learned and recommendations at the end of this document. More detailed recommendations for each of the four LPAs visited have been shared with the respective Board members and Executive staff. A summary of these conclusions are attached in the appendices.

The four LPAs visited reflect the particularities of four different provinces in Indonesia. In terms of their structure and their activities, they represent four different organizations in four different settings.

### **4.1 Progress achieved by LPAs**

The main achievements of LPA are analyzed in relation to the progress made towards their mandate:

- a) *Influencing policy makers to take greater account of children's rights*
- b) *Promoting the participation of children*
- c) *Raising awareness of child rights among children and adults*
- d) *Ensuring that children have effective means of redress when their rights are violated.*

#### **a) Influencing policy makers to take greater account of children's rights**

LPA have contributed to a greater recognition of the non-governmental sector. Government officials and local NGOs discuss common issues regarding child rights and take mutual decisions around LPA activities. Activities have also been carried out with government officers that are *not* member of LPA. Funding has been secured through local government. In North Sumatra, LPA has trained teachers, police officers have been trained (RPK) and hospital employees have been included in child protection activities. Government officers are members of LPA Board.

In North Sumatra, LPA is involved in the drafting and monitoring of the Annual Programme Budget Allocation of the Provincial Government.

In South Sulawesi District Government is funding district LPA. Other LPA (NTB, South Sulawesi) have expressed their confidence of being able to assure long-term sustainability through government funding. Government institutions like Dinas Sosial in South Sulawesi, Biro Kesra in Central Java and Biro Kesos in NTB have confirmed that LPA is an accepted partner and that funding has been made available in the past and can be made available to a larger extent in future (Biro Kesra in Central Java).

In October 2002 the Child Protection Law (23/2002) was adopted by the Indonesian Government and a decision was taken to establish a formal Commission for the Protection of Indonesian Children (KPAI) through Parliament. Provincial LPA have considerably contributed to this progress.

Since adoption, the Child Protection Law is being discussed at provincial level and implemented through local regulations. In some provinces, LPAs are effective partners of local government to support this process.

**b) Promoting the participation of children**

All LPA have promoted the creation of children's Fora in their province. Some are at present better established than others. The most recent Children's Forum has been elected in Mataram, representing children from the capital of the province of NTB. Whereas the Children's Forum in Medan, North Sumatra, is well structured, has several sub-divisions and at least seven partner organizations other than LPA supporting them. Amongst other activities they have conducted a mapping of street children together with Save the Children and LPA.

Children have been involved in advocacy activities towards provincial governments, have participated in rallies and other awareness raising activities and are better recognized as partners that have to be taken serious regarding issues concerning them. LPA involving children in planning and advocacy activities have contributed to this change in perception.

**c) Raising awareness of child rights among children and adults**

All LPA witnessed a considerable increase of newspaper articles regarding the abuse of child rights between 1998 and 2004. The newspaper clippings are bound into booklets and used for information and advocacy activities. The number of cases brought up in public and investigated by the police has considerably increased. The cases in 2004 include many more issues considered taboo (like incest) than before 2000. It is perceived by LPA and their partners that public opinion regarding child rights has changed considerably during the last six years..

Awareness has been raised through public campaigns, research and publications, rallies and radio discussions. And to a large extent the greater awareness of the press has been achieved by including the media as stakeholders in LPA structures. Additionally, the training of media representatives ha proven to be a very effective tool.

**d) Children have effective means of redress when their rights are violated**

Since 1998, LPA have recognized the need for referral systems for children whose rights are being violated. They have concentrated on LPA counseling (hotline services), referral to members representing legal aid organizations and setting up referral systems with the police or the hospital.

All LPA evaluated had dealt directly with cases defending children in need and all LPA had referred cases to their legal aid members.

In addition, in Semarang, the Police Hospital runs a Special Service Unit for dealing with cases of child- and women- victims of abuse since November 2002. The current LPA Central Java Coordinator has been one of the driving forces behind the establishment of this Unit.

In Mataram, the Pediatric Unit of the General Hospital is in the procedure of establishing a similar Unit. The initiative was launched by the Chairperson of LPA NTB. And in Medan, PPAI is in the process to negotiate the establishment of such a unit at the General Hospital.

Also, RPK, an integrated Unit for child abuse cases at the police station in Medan, was established and trained with support from PPAI.

A number of other LPA partners, whose beneficiaries were not primarily children, have started targeting children together with women (like PKK since 2001). Besides, this NGO have shifted its point of view from primarily needs orientation to protection of children from abuse.

## **4.2 Relevance of child protection activities**

LPA engage in a large number of different activities which are discussed in detail with their financial partners, UNICEF, Save the Children and PLAN. The scope of activities varies and depend on funding, qualification of staff and commitment of LPA Board.<sup>8</sup> Activities are in line with strategic plans available for each LPA.

While NTB is very active due to heavy involvement of the whole Board in activity planning and implementation and its well qualified Board members, Central Java is less active due to internal struggle and much fewer human resources available.

In general, LPA activities have been highly relevant in order to...

- ... increase awareness of children rights,
- ... bring children's issues up on the agenda of government and civil society,
- ... improve children's participation.

Activities can be categorized as follows:

- a) Compiling data, newspaper clippings, research studies, reference library, publishing information or a book
- b) Awareness raising and advocacy, 'socialising' CRC the public and training, teachers, police, hospital staff, journalists, etc.
- c) Hotline, home visits, direct care for individual children, legal defense
- d) Involving children and establishing Children's Forum

The activities are all relevant in order to increase children's protection from abuse, exploitation and neglect. But the degree of professionalism with which they were realized and their impact varies due to experience of LPA, people involved and strategic planning and evaluation capacity.

For example:

Training local PKK members as a partner NGO, in detecting and reporting child abuse cases in villages is highly relevant. But if later on no reporting of cases takes place, one needs to inquire about the reporting procedure put in place, the contents of the training or the selection of participants before retraining should be considered as a complementary activity.

Strategic plans and training of trainers for strategic planning workshops have taken place for the six LPA supported by UNICEF in late 2002 and beginning 2003<sup>9</sup>. Training has been conducted by an experienced consulting. Strategic plans are available for all LPA. They are very detailed and might in some cases be rather complex for regular use. LPA reflections often evolve around daily operating constraints, pressing advocacy issues and weekly activities and less around strategic questions.

---

<sup>8</sup> For further details see appendices "Overview of UNICEF's programmatic and operational support to four LPA"

<sup>9</sup> for further details see: MUQTADIR, M.B., BILLAH, M.M. Final Report of ToT and Strategic Planning Workshop on six CPBs, Child Protection Bodies, Jakarta, November 2002

### **4.3 Impact of child protection activities**

#### *Compiling data, newspaper clippings, research, reference library, publishing information*

All LPA are implementing these type of activities, some with staff paid (North Sumatra), some with volunteers (South Sulawesi). Newspaper clippings are up to date and used on a daily basis for advocacy (NTB) or are less accessible and less used (Central Java). Research is particularly important in NTB in setting baseline, LPA has been restructured recently and University employees are part of the Board. Data is easy accessible and used for awareness raising and influencing policies.

Data and information are being published, like in South Sulawesi, in form of a book printed locally. The information is shared with other organizations, used for advocacy and awareness raising also among the media and journalist.

**Opportunity:** Activities are essential for sound advocacy and are of high interest to government and other NGO member organizations.

**Threat:** Costs for these type of activities are considerable and might not be met by financial partners on a long-term continuous basis.

#### *Awareness raising and training teachers, police, hospital staff, journalists, 'socialising' CRC*

A large variety of different activities is summarized under the heading “awareness raising” and the difference to ‘advocacy’ does not always seem clear. Similarly, the term ‘socializing’ is used for both. These activities have in common that direct impact is difficult to measure and often needs time and additional resources.

Training is done by all LPA but to different degrees and some see it as one of their major activities because it builds up capacities among their stakeholders/member organizations. Effect can easily be seen among the media which takes up child protection issues more readily. Expected outcome of training is not always well defined and some training leads to the unexpected creation of new structures.

**Opportunity:** Typical activities of NGO networks that increase their members’ capacities. Helps create a clear image of LPAs in the public and among its member organizations.

**Threat:** Design of training has to be tailor-made and effects of training have to be followed carefully in order to avoid an ‘inflation’ of training needs. Also, LPA is not to become mainly a training institution for its members.

#### *Hotline, home visits, direct care for individual children, legal defense*

These activities are part of the key functions that have been attributed to LPA from the beginning<sup>10</sup>. Especially the hotline service has proven to be difficult to carry out effectively (North Sumatra). Legal defense of children in need has been either assured directly by LPA staff (North Sumatra) or through member organizations (NTB). But care for individual children has also been done directly with resources available at LPA level (NTB, being situated on the premises of an orphanage).

---

<sup>10</sup> Institution building and mainstreaming... proposal to the Government of New Zealand, UNICEF, 2000

These activities have some times been referred to as “direct service” activities and it is felt in general that these activities promote a sense of competition for funds between LPA and NGO members of LPA. In Central Java, the LPA cooperates with an NGO not being member of LPA on direct care issues (ASA PKBI), but resources are very limited.

**Opportunity:** ‘Direct service’ creates confidence in the LPA, helps build its image in the public and is a ‘proof’ that all the money invested actually helps to protect children who are in need.

**Threat:** The number of children looked after individually by the LPA directly is usually very small, especially in comparison to the time and human resources invested. Also, personnel specialized has to be hired or the ‘direct service’ is not done professionally enough.

### *Involving children and establishing Children’s Forum*

Involving children as active partners in programme implementation and supporting children’s own organization is one of the strongest aspects of LPA. But obviously, LPA are not the only partners of Children Fora and therefore support offered to the children has to be well targeted and coordination with other funding institutions has to take place.

In North Sumatra, children are very active and ambitious but the LPA might not be able ‘to offer’ enough support and strategic direction. In NTB, children represent well different types of children problems but are just starting to become better organized with help from a LPA member who is also part of an NGO working with children. And South Sulawesi has close daily working relations between Children’s Forum and LPA together with UNICEF and PLAN. But in Central Java, it is difficult for children to meet regularly due to long distances within the province.

**Opportunity:** The distinct approach of LPA to include children in activities and decision making will also enable government agencies to focus stronger on children’s participation.

**Threat:** The same children (those who can express themselves well) are ‘in high demand’ by different organizations and the time they allocate to representative functions needs to be followed in order to not interfere with education.



#### **4.4 Strengths and weaknesses of LPA**

The four LPA evaluated are four different organizations. Strengths and weaknesses mentioned in this chapter are the result of interviews, general observation and analyses covering all four LPA – some to a higher and some to a lesser degree.

##### Strengths of LPA:

- high commitment to child rights;
- access to government officials through Board members (NTB);
- multidisciplinary Board members;
- large variety of child right activities;
- flexibility due to limited administrative procedures;

##### Weaknesses of LPA:

- Activities are not always linked to strategic planning.

Strategic planning is fairly new, documents are difficult to handle and there is a high demand to carry out activities for which funding is readily available (pressure on NGO in general). This pressure comes from any LPA partner organization, government and non-government and from within LPA.

The large variety of activities makes building up of experience difficult. In order to solve existing shortcomings, there is a tendency to rather engage into a new type of activity.

- Activities are not always based on data and research results.

Research needs time and funds and both are not always available before engaging into new activities. Also, research expertise within Board members is of definite advantage (NTB) but not everywhere the case. In some LPA, Board members perceive competition between their own tasks and duties and LPA interests.

- Indicators for impact monitoring are not available or not used.

Monitoring of activities is largely done in terms of following up on the implementation. Monitoring the impact is much more complex, time consuming and resourceful. Skills are not always available within LPA. Some planning documents do not include impact indicators.

Some of these weaknesses are due to lack of training (or high turn-over of LPA staff), training not having been applied (strategic planning), lack of funds (for impact evaluations) or lack of consistent planning (due to limited involvement of Board members or member organizations), lack of experience of staff and underestimation of time and resources needed for the implementation of activities. - Some of the causes of the above mentioned weaknesses will be better understood after the analyses of organizational aspects of LPAs.

## **4.5 Organizational analyses of LPA**

This chapter looks at the organizational aspects of the Child Protection Bodies which are the direct result of the design of UNICEF's instituting building programme. Again, this is not a thorough organizational analyses of four different organizations (LPA) and their **specific** environment but a broader picture of LPA and their structure in general.

Three observations have directed the analyses of organizational capacities:

- Three out of four LPA visited during this evaluation are unhappy with the way the organization works: High turn-over of staff and staff lacking experience (North Sumatra), limited involvement of stakeholders or of Board members at monthly meetings (South Sulawesi), disengagement of Board members and lack of support to Executive staff (Central Java).
- There is a general perception by UNICEF and other funding partners of “weak” and “strong” LPA. It has been observed that new LPA usually perform very well for the first years but decline later. Internal conflicts seem to hinder further development of LPA.
- LPA perceive themselves as NGOs, network of NGOs, umbrella organization for their members or independent institutions. Sometimes the perception of LPA and the respective UNICEF Field Office differs (South Sulawesi: umbrella vs. NGO). Other donor organizations and especially INGOs do not perceive LPA as government independent institutions.

There are three causes underlying these observations:

1. LPA have an ambiguous position.
2. LPA undertake activities that are felt to be competing with activities of their member organizations.
3. LPA have heterogeneous members/stakeholders.

### **The creation of LPA**

When LPA were established, it was done through a Ministerial Decree which implied a compulsory creation of LPA institutions in all Indonesian Provinces. Some of these LPA functioned well, others didn't, and some went through a democratic restructurization with UNICEF support.

In contrary to this creation by decree, an NGO would always be created through a felt need of civil society, a dynamic engagement of often only one person who would - especially in the beginning - consider the NGO as “his” or “her” NGO. Other similar NGOs would evolve over time but not at the same time in several parts of the country.

LPA are registered as NGOs, but neither consider themselves to be NGO (except for North Sumatra) nor behave like NGO (slowly building up scope of activities, ownership by those who put the organization in place, autonomous decision taking, etc.). Created by government decree also implies to a certain degree a government responsibility.

North Sumatra is a slight exception, the Chairperson acting nearly like ‘a father’ to the LPA: more senior, very committed to child protection issues, coming from the private sector, with analytical skills but unfortunately with less experience in how to run an NGO. But LPA North

Sumatra is still the LPA which is closest to being an NGO: it's the only LPA that changed its name and refused since the beginning to be associated as LPA.

But unlike regular NGOs, the Chairperson of PPAI could not take certain decisions: hotline service had to be assured even though it proved not feasible and additional personnel had to be hired even though there was enough personnel available.<sup>11</sup> - This is another indication that LPA were not perceived as independent from UNICEF, neither by themselves nor by UNICEF.

### **Funding and long-term sustainability**

As a result of this ambiguous position, LPAs consider themselves as independent institutions (but not necessarily as NGOs) and strive to become mainly or totally government funded:

*"We need another 5 years and we'll be totally government funded." (NTB)*

*"If the LPA gets money from the Government, this would be very good. Who else would support the LPA once UNICEF doesn't meet operational costs anymore?" (Chief of UNICEF Field Office in Surabaya)*

*"Now the Government is responsible." (Chief of UNICEF Field Office in Makassar, referring to LPA focal points on district level)*

Even though it is highly desirable for any organization to be funded on a more or less permanent basis, the organization risks to be influenced programmatically. In NTB a District LPA totally funded through the District Budget has rightly voiced concern: *"We would like to find additional funding sources for our activities in order to depend less on District Budget."*

An NGO totally funded through Government seems a complete contradiction. It definitely hinders any critics regarding budget allocation or even more delicate issues concerning government policy and procedures. If, in a further, very logical step, LPA became the provincial branch of KPAI, LPA would become a government owned non-governmental organization.

### **LPA scope of activities**

LPA activities include aspects of lobbying and advocacy, awareness raising and direct counseling for children in need besides the implementation of a referral system.

This portfolio is rather large and naturally competes with LPA members also engaged in one or several of these type of activities. It is very comprehensive and difficult to fulfill all expectation, building up considerable professionalism and expertise. It also creates competition for funds between LPA and its member NGOs, who are also involved in direct help to children in need of protection.

An NGO usually either concentrates on advocacy (like Greenpeace) or provides direct assistance for those in need (like Médecin sans Frontières) or is a network that caters mainly to its member organizations supporting them through joint advocacy and tailor-made training.

In the workshop documents regarding strategic planning, it was outlined that weaknesses and capacities clearly appeared during the workshops and were summarized in the workshop recommendations. For example:

---

<sup>11</sup> As stated by the Chairperson of PPAI (= LPA North Sumatra)

*"LPA Central Java needs to further discuss its organizational structure which until now is ambiguous. According to the legal notary act it is a foundation (NGO?) but in its constitution it is conceived as a network organisation." "Some of the workshops results like mission and organisational values have to be included into the statutes of the organization."<sup>12</sup>*

Unfortunately, this did not happen yet. No General Assembly has been conducted for LPA Central Java since the strategic planning workshop in January 2003.

### **LPA members/stakeholders**

LPA regroup all sectors of government and civil society: universities, media, NGOs and any other institution and partner dealing with child protection issues. These organizations are rightly referred to as stakeholders. But besides their pure interest in child protection, they are also considered "members" of the LPA with the right to vote the Board, the annual programme and evaluate the success of activities. In fact, no distinction is made between "member" (no membership fee or other commitment has been introduced) and "stakeholder", "partner organization" etc.

The interests of LPAs' stakeholders are very diverse because their activities are diverse: The more members an organization has and the more diverse their interests are, the more difficult it becomes to regroup everyone around one programme and to keep everyone interested in the organization.

For an NGO inexperienced in democratic functioning and new in terms of activities and role to play in civil society, to handle 160 members, like in the case of LPA Central Java (or even 67 after restructuring) is highly complex and difficult.

For some LPA their members are individuals representing different organizations and for other LPA, the organization is the member. Consequently, for meetings, it is not necessarily the same person representing the member organization each time. Both set-ups have different implications for the LPA. It is difficult to work with such a complex structure.

### **Major factors influencing LPAs' performance**

Apart from the above, some major factors have been identified that determine the performance of LPA. None of these factors guarantee the smooth operation of LP but they all contribute significantly:

The organigramme of LPAs differ greatly and reflect dynamic and experience of staff and Board members and underlying conflicts. The organigramme are tailor-made to suit the needs of the respective LPA.<sup>13</sup>

North Sumatra has just abolished the Programme Manager position, South Sulawesi has introduced a Board of Trustees and an Expert Council next to the Chairperson. In NTB the Board runs the LPA, even though there are executive staff, their work is limited to administrative matters and in Central Java the Board has no supervising function for the executive staff.

---

<sup>12</sup> M.Muqtadir B, M.M. Billah: The Report of Strategic Planning Workshop Child Protection Body, Central Java, February 2003, page 55

<sup>13</sup> See the organigramme in the appendices

The role of the Chairperson determines significantly the professionalism and seriousness of the LPA. He or she should not be corrupt, support a participatory management style and have some knowledge about child protection issues. But since the work is time consuming and not paid, not many volunteer for this position.

Financial performance and the general level of corruption in Indonesia are a serious matter for any NGO. LPA performance and Board member commitment are strongly linked to financial transparency.

The advocacy skills and experience available within the LPA Board and Executive staff is vitally important for LPA. The capacity of convincing others is essential for LPA. The same applies to planning and evaluation skills that are a base for securing funding and convincing financial partners.

Professional people to become part of the Board. There is a danger that strong members with NGO experience prefer to stay within their respective NGO instead of getting involved with LPA (fear of losing their independence?). There is another serious threat that LPA and its NGO members become competitors for funding and thus LPA losing valuable members.

### **Comparing LPA**

LPA are often compared with each other. Out of the four LPAs visited, NTB is the most convincing and active Child Protection Body, which is often linked to its organigramme which gives the board the authority to execute LPAs' activities.

But if one analyses NTB LPA in more detail, other aspects for its smooth functioning become apparent:

- Most Board members are civil servants and thus do not depend on income from LPA.
- The Government has offered without charge very good office facilities to LPA.
- The chairlady is a senior and very well respected person, who has easy access to decision makers in government and who oversees LPA activities by allowing each of the other Board members to play their role effectively. The Chairlady does not try to dominate the Board but is in charge of the overall management of the LPA.
- Clear division of tasks and responsibility amongst Board members, regular meetings and shared responsibility for the implementation of activities.
- NTB is a small Province and all Board members live in Mataram thus making meetings so much easier than in Central Java where Board members have to travel up to 6 hours for meetings in Semarang.

In summary, a number of factors determine the functioning of LPA, not just the organigramme.

#### **4.6 The national LPA: Komnas Anak**

The National Commission for Child Protection (Komnas Anak) was established in October 1998 after two years of discussion and planning and through a democratic election process. UNICEF played a key role in reconciling the different views of partners from various sectors of society and of bridging the standpoints of the key players.

The National Commission, who is built on similar structures as the Provincial LPA, is as well an independent institution with representatives from Government, NGOs, academia, private sector and media with the principles of public accountability and transparency. Its main objectives are to protect children against violations of their rights and empower families and communities to enable them to prevent the occurrence of violations of children's rights.<sup>14</sup> Besides, the Commission advocates for children's participation, participated in the drafting and pushed for the adoption of Indonesian Child Protection Law, which was adopted in October 2002.

The Commission has officially 150 stakeholders but only 3 members of staff on salary and sees itself as an "umbrella for NGO efforts"<sup>15</sup> but there is no hierarchal link to the Provincial LPAs. Their relationship is based on consultation and coordination activities. The highest decision making body is the National Forum for Child Protection, which met for the last time in 2002.

For its meeting in October 2001, a detailed evaluation had been prepared with support from Save the Children US.<sup>16</sup> The recommendations called for a decision regarding the status of Komnas Anak.

In order to focus on a clear identity and a fundable future, it was proposed to either:

- a. become a true Commission funded by the Indonesian Government but without directly implemented operations, or
- b. remain dependent on UNICEF funding and continue implementing operations, or
- c. become an true NGO with a new name and funding from members or non-governmental donors in order to become a pressure group and an advocacy agency without directly implemented operations.

The evaluation had concluded that the present status of Komnas Anak implied continuous support from UNICEF which was not UNICEF's intention. Also, there had been serious accountability problems for funds, leading finally to an end in financial support in 2001

In its conclusion, the report reads:

*"The notion of an National Commission on Child Protection composed of stakeholders from all sectors of Indonesian society is admirable but unworkable."*<sup>17</sup>

Unfortunately, the National Forum did not choose any of the above options, UNICEF's support came to a halt and with the adoption of the Indonesian Child Protection Law, which calls for the establishment of KPAI with a similar mandate than Komnas Anak, the National Commission has limited scope of securing government funding for long-term sustainability.

As a result, Komnas Anak today seeks funding from other sources and implements directly activities like any other NGO would do trying to make use of its special relation to the Provincial

<sup>14</sup> [The proposal "Institution Building and Mainstreaming Child Protection"](#) , UNICEF 2000, p.9

<sup>15</sup> Pak Seto Mulyadi, Chairperson of Komnas Anak

<sup>16</sup> Jeremy Condor: Urban Street Children Empowerment & Support Program NCCP Assessment Report, SC US 2001

<sup>17</sup> page 10 of the report

LPA. As a consequence the National Forum and its multidisciplinary Board have lost importance for Komnas Anak's functioning.

The relationship with UNICEF, who "endorsed Pak Seto during the first National Forum in 2001"<sup>18</sup> is one of disappointment on both sides. Up to now, Komnas Anak is confident of being recognized one day by the Ministry of Women Empowerment (also responsible for KPAI) as a state body in order to ensure long-term financial support.

In the meantime, Komnas Anak and its Chairperson, who is a very well-known TV facilitator on issues of child protection, will continue to advocate for children's rights and implement externally funded activities like for example "Trauma training for facilitators in ACEH " or support to poor children in urban Jakarta.

---

<sup>18</sup> Secretary Komnas Anak during the interview

## **5. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.1 Recommendations for LPA**

The long-term sustainability of LPA will essentially depend on four areas:<sup>19</sup>

1. The commitment of Board and Executive staff to the organization and its goals.
2. A clear organizational structure and mandate.
3. The level of transparent accountability.
4. Increased professionalism in monitoring, evaluation and fund raising.

The commitment of Board members depends to a large extent on their personal motivation for these posts. Board members have to be committed to increasing LPA's performance and visibility. Board members who are equally involved in 'their own' or another NGO, will find it difficult to decide how much time and energy to spend on each of their various obligations and eventually should take a decision.<sup>20</sup>

It is highly recommendable that LPA use a logical framework approach and operational plan for their planning over a time period of at least one year. This approach would imply impact indicators and should be seen as a management tool for the LPA and not as a instrument used by donor agencies.

The lack of commitment of stakeholders and Board members in LPA is largely linked to an unclear organizational structure. It is recommended that :

- LPA need to decide on a workable organigramme: the Board can assume executive functions (like in NTB) or it certainly needs at least to oversee the executive staff (which is currently not the case in Central Java).
- LPA need to decide whether they are NGOs or networks of organizations or institutions seeking to be funded in the long run mainly by government sources. This decision has implications on the type of activities LPA will implement.
- LPA need to decide whether they accept organizations or individuals as members. They need to make the distinction between voting 'member' and 'stakeholder' they collaborate with.<sup>21</sup>
- Number of members should be reduced (not necessarily number of stakeholders!) and membership fee should be introduced to increase commitment. A large variety of different members make it impossible to draw a clear direction for LPA.<sup>22</sup>

The level of accountability and transparency in financial management is a pre-condition for fund raising and especially important in a country where corruption poses a main threat to the sustainability of organizations. Credibility is the key term when external funding is sought. Without credibility there will be no sustainability in a competitive market of local NGOs.

---

<sup>19</sup> Specific recommendations for each of the four LPAs visited are found in the appendices.

<sup>20</sup> The Chairperson of LPA NTB has, for example, expressed the need of giving up her responsibilities in another NGO in order to be adequately involved in LPAs' management. Also, the Coordinator of Board member of LPA Central Java finds it very difficult to deal with 'her' NGO and be involved in LPA at the same time.

<sup>21</sup> At the moment LPAs feel overstretched with unlimited expectations from their stakeholders (e.g. North Sumatra).

<sup>22</sup> Example: NGO members might expect advocacy towards government resource allocation for child protection, whereas government members might expect LPA to offer more direct help to children in need of protection.

Currently, evaluations are done annually together with stakeholders in a large meeting over several days. While it is useful to conduct such a review before planning next years activities, there needs to be a more thorough evaluation of the impact of key activities. Obviously, these kind of evaluations, for which expertise has to be built up within LPAs, needs funding which has to be earmarked for this purpose within the original proposal.

As mentioned above, sustainability is linked to organizational structure, Board commitment and programme direction; in brief: How LPA is 'selling' itself to financial partners.

LPA can be funded in future through various channels:

- donor funded or government funded project proposals including 10% administrative costs, unforeseeable costs and evaluation costs;
- contributions from members (membership fee, percentage of consulting services etc.)
- fund raising activities (e.g. Gala evenings, selling of items/offering services)
- contributions from the wider community: from the business sector or from individuals

The decision about the right funding strategy needs to be made individually by each LPA according to the opportunities in the province they work in. It will depend on LPAs capacities, human resources and personal relationships, whether fund raising is more or less successful in future.

## **5.2 Recommendations for Komnas Anak**

- Create a clear image of an NGO that focuses mainly on advocacy towards the Government and awareness raising towards the public (because that's where the expertise lies),
- Improve the internal structure (membership base) and
- Improve the image as a transparent and accountable organization!

## **5.3 Recommendations for UNICEF**

1. An exit strategy would look at addressing particularly weak aspects in each of the six LPA, a tailor-made support might be needed, and where necessary, with external consultancy expertise instead of a training programme which suits all the LPA. At this stage, LPAs have specific constraints that have to be dealt with.

2. It would be difficult for any LPA to be suddenly cut off from UNICEF funding. On the other hand, since the PCA have not provided operational funds continuously throughout the last years, LPAs have experienced a lack of UNICEF funding before and have taken measures in the past.

3. It should be made very clear as to when UNICEF's financial support comes to a definite end. Links to other donor agencies should be created where they are not yet established. Support in fund raising could also include a joint conference of LPA where the main goal is to exchange experience in fund raising strategies. There is a lot of knowledge available within LPAs member organizations but very often this knowledge is not being tapped.

4. Fund raising activities are also linked to advocacy activities (advocacy for its own organization). The advocacy training scheduled for 2004 by UNICEF for all LPA will be a major gain for all LPA.
5. There needs to be a written agreement with LPA staff to be trained, that this staff has to be with the respective LPA for at least one more year after training. Otherwise, it should be thought to demand partial reimbursement of training expenses for this particular person.
6. Management skills might have to be readdressed, even if training took place in 2000. There has been considerable turn-over of staff since then. Impact monitoring and participatory evaluation tools are vital assets for any independent institution seeking financial support.
8. Last, not least, it seems to be difficult, due to cultural behavior, to change institutions and resolve conflicts. Participatory facilitation skills can be a great asset and any democratic working institution should strive to acquire such skills. UNICEF should support LPA further in developing those soft skills that are part of any good management style.
9. In total, three to five years of operational and programmatic support (shifting during this time from predominantly operational to predominantly programmatic support), should be sufficient for an NGO to develop its own image and initiative. Thereafter, LPA should be dealt with like any other NGO partner of UNICEF.
10. UNICEF should support 'new' LPA with an institution building approach only if at least three years of continuous operational support can be guaranteed, presuming that accountability of funds is transparent and correct. It is a major difficulty for any organization to receive operational funds only sporadic: good people need regular salaries, if not they will leave.<sup>23</sup>
11. Support to other LPA should focus in an early stage at management skills including planning and monitoring. Secondly, operational support should be envisaged from the beginning for a three to five year period without funding gaps so that personnel salary is assured. Thirdly, UNICEF should avoid any relationship that undermines ownership of LPA by Board members by suggesting UNICEF responsibility for program work.
12. If networks are supported in future, it is important to support activities that strengthen membership and commitment of members in the network organization.
13. The support for KPAI will depend largely on the type of structure and mandate KPAI will have. KPAI should not become the umbrella of Provincial LPA.

#### **5.4 Recommendation for PPAI (LPA North Sumatra)**

1. PPAI needs to decide whether it prefers the structure of an **NGO** or a **network of NGOs**. This is most important recommendation because the decision has consequences for the organisational structure, the functioning and the mandate of PPAI. The current term "stakeholders" is too confusing since it refers to members, partners, participants, target group and many more different relationships.

---

<sup>23</sup> PCAs have been discontinuous due to UNICEF administrative procedures. This has among other effects led to funds being diverted and put aside in order to be able to pay salaries continuously when operational funds were not disbursed.

2. Activities are very complex if one wants to achieve a change in the lives of children: When training teachers, one needs to know whether one wants to create a new teacher led structure or expects teachers to change student-teacher relationship in their classroom or work for change of school policies and regulation or...or... - ”How can teachers promote student involvement in issues of order and discipline?”, “How are they supposed to advocate for student-teacher relationship in their school?” - These are some of the questions to be addressed in training but also during evaluation. Activities have to be planned taking into account the complexity of the subject and the change expected. Teachers can not act as PPAI’s ‘long arm’ in the villages, because that would mean, PPAI creates a dependency and has to monitor them closely. This is organisationally not feasible given resources and time - and the teachers might not agree!
3. Allow experience to grow slowly among staff, strive for a maximum of professionalism. To direct eight members of staff without considerable management experience is very difficult. Appropriate and applicable tailor-made training is necessary including follow-up and technical on-the-job support. This is especially true for fund raising and advocacy (versus awareness raising) but also for planning/indicator setting and monitoring and evaluation skills.
4. Evaluations are an essential tool for better planning and targeting (such as need assessments before planning an activity!). They are compulsory for winning donor’s confidence. The results have to be explicit enough to help overcome constraints. The impact of activities has to be measurable: e.g. expected outcomes of teachers’ and PKK training? – What was expected after the three day training? How to measure it? Why did it not happen? If there is a discrepancy, in most case, an in-depth analyses is needed to better understand the constraints and possible strategies to overcome them.
5. The same applies to advocacy and funding. Advocacy needs the creation of relevant personal relationships. PPAI should ‘use’ individuals in PKK and Binsos as entry point. Reflect on how to go about advocacy strategically:
  - What do we want to be decided upon by decision makers?
  - Who exactly is deciding it?
  - Who has access to this person/these people?
  - How do we gain access to the influential person regarding the decision maker?
  - Who does it? What do we need? When and what activities exactly? How do we plan for them? ....
6. Fundraising also needs a well thought through concept. Creating a travel bureau or a photocopy shop might absorb too much manpower for the creation of the business and leave too little for the organisation’s original mandate. Applying for funding means to answer the following questions:
  - Which organisation do we want to approach?
  - Do our ideas fit the organisation’s priorities? What are theirs?
  - What is the ‘organisation’s language’?
  - Whom do we approach for first screening of our idea?
  - ...

## **5.5 Recommendations for LPA South Sulawesi**

1. It is better for LPA to stick to its advocacy mandate and professionalism the approach than to be pushed into direct service, which might be hoped for by some partners.
2. Keep office costs low, so that you can fund them with 10-12% of your project activities. Include administrative costs into project proposals.
3. Think about introducing annual membership fees to underline commitment of members. But distinguish between “powerful” members and ‘workful’ that can commit some of their time and energy for the LPA. Think about regular meetings. There should not be a conflict of interest between ‘own’ NGO and LPA, otherwise it is not the right member or LPA expectations are not right.
4. Find out why members don’t participate in activities (through telephone interview or questionnaire). Maybe LPA tries to do too much and would have to restrict its activities to the most essential ones. Doing too much or trying to fulfill every bodies expectations is a fatal mistake and tendency of NGOs seeking money and support.
5. Diversify your donors. Train staff in proposal writing. There is enough knowledge internally. Make clear where the difference in programm activities lies between LPA and members of LPA.
6. Market LPA with a logo linking it to children and other attractive information leaflet to be handed out to donors and partners.
7. Develop impact indicators and monitor them. This is not equivalent with a once a year evaluation meeting and a simple reports.
8. Involve children in all activities including advocacy, as much in the planning stage as when implementing and evaluating.

## **5.6 Recommendations for LPA NTB**

1. The knowledge needs to be distributed more evenly in the organisation. At the moment LPA depend too much on the Chairperson, her time and energy to overlook activities without remuneration. She is also the key person to link LPA to community leaders and government be it for fund raising be it for influencing.
2. The Executive staff is very young and inexperienced. They are actually just administrative staff without any competencies or decision making power. In the long run, more knowledge has to be built up within this part of LPA structure.
3. After fundraising training in 2003 a fundraising committee consisting only of Board members was established, a proposal developed and send to the training institution for feedback which has not yet been provided. There is a need for further increase of knowledge regarding funding strategies. But also, LPA has to rethink its organisational image since at the moment it would not be seen as a government independent institution due to its strong relationship to the government. Therefore, attracting funding from INGO might be difficult.

4. LPA has to develop its advocacy capacity in strategic planning with partner institutions. There is a confusion about what advocacy is in comparison to awareness raising and how to go about strategically. Experience still needs to be built up considerably.
5. Children have to be effectively included in decision taking in all stages of programm activities (planning, implementation and evaluation/monitoring): e.g. radio discussions, hospital crises centre, etc. How to foster greater utilisation of centre by abused children? It is not enough to establish the centre but then the work only begins. How can LPA contribute to the success of such a centre? LPA needs to be innovative thinking.
6. The impact of activities has to be monitored and evaluated (if possible together with concerned children). Use knowledge of University Women's Study Centre and use results for programm improvement.
7. Talk about issues that are taboo, lift the embarrassment, break new grounds, dare saying things one does not say in order to change people's perception of children and children's rights to a safe and healthy childhood. If LPA wants to protect children from harm and abuse happens in families, start targeting fathers. Look at the causes of a problem and tackle them.

## **5.7 Recommendations for LPA Central Java**

1. The most important recommendation relates to the upcoming General Assembly of LPA's members: UNICEF should support with assistance from outside and through an institutional development specialist with NGO knowledge, the redrafting of the statutes and the decision taking process regarding future structure and future responsibilities of the various parts of LPA. This should be done and discussed in small membership groups **before** the next General Assembly in order to arrive at a 100% acceptance of the new structure during the meeting. The General Assembly should then be facilitated by an outside and neutral facilitator, who will make sure that crucial issues are dealt with during the meeting. UNICEF cannot wait with its support until after this meeting because the new structure is essential and LPA lacks experience in how to set up a functional organisation.
2. The new Board needs to be carefully chosen. Membership should be limited and membership fee should be requested. Board members should come from Semarang in order to assure regular meetings and their serious implication into LPA. Rather start with a smaller membership and be open in increasing it with the time related to LPA gaining experience and reputation.
3. Executive staff needs clear job descriptions and expected qualification. Then hiring should be done through advertisement and interview committee (3-4 Board members). Current staff has to apply officially next to people interested but from outside.
4. Ibu Wieke has to make a special effort to include other LPA members (executive, Board or other) into LPA's activities in order to promote rather the organisation and less herself. The same applies to UNICEF who also refers only to her and does not promote a more equal distribution of knowledge in the organisation.

Most asked questions

5. LPA has to decide on clear advocacy priorities for year 1. Impact has to be evaluated and money has to be set apart for this exercise. Training will be necessary for advocacy strategy planning, impact monitoring and effective children participation.
6. LPA needs to actively change its image to the outside and might want to consider changing its name, depending on whether LPA in the long run wants to be closer to government or to the NGO sector.
7. Due to its relatively negative image in the world of NGOs or in Indonesia in general, and due to the relative wealth of the Central Java Province, LPA might want to consider to put a majority of its fundraising effort into increasing its credibility with BAPPEDA and Biro Kesra. If outcome of activities are better and funding proposals are better, there is a possibility of receiving increased government funding. LPA might also want to position itself in case the new KPAI structure will be reinforced on provincial level, which might mean some secure long term funding through the government. At the moment LPA has been lobbying successfully for a government building as permanent office.

## **6. LESSONS LEARNED**

The following lessons can be learned from the institution building programme and from UNICEF's support to Child Protection Bodies in Indonesia:

1. It is not proven that the need to bring together government and civil society actually calls for the creation of a new organization. There are many forms of bringing together the two sides: Coalition, consultative group, network – all without direct implementation of activities and therefore without direct competition to already existing organizations.
2. If a new organization is to be created, there should only be a support to local initiatives without 'babysitting' or 'micromanaging' the organization because this might prevent the development of ownership. Support should be limited right from the beginning, an exit strategy thought through from the start. The overall concept must be clear.
3. The prime goal of building an institution might be conflicting with the goal of seeing certain activities and services be delivered: With the support to LPAs, UNICEF wanted to create effective advocacy together with effective child protection together with effective organizations. An organization needs to grow slowly and build up expertise in the respective field before it can expand its scope of activities.
4. When institutions become member of a new organization (universities, government, NGOs etc. becoming member of LPA), they have to have a common interest as to how their membership in this organization increases their own capacities, improves their own work, facilitates their personal satisfaction. The more divers these members are and the larger their number, the more difficult it becomes to satisfy the expectations these members have. As a result, members, who were very active in the beginning, get discouraged and loose interest.
5. "Institution building" means foremost promoting professionalism in planning, monitoring, evaluation, advocacy, participatory approaches, management etc. At one stage, support needs to be offered tailor-made in terms of external consultancy working with the institution on their specific problems. This is particularly true in such a divers country like Indonesia, where LPAs in different Provinces are actually different type of bodies because of their weak relation to the national level and the very different social and cultural environment.
6. The shifting political environment influenced continuously the concept of UNICEF'S institution building programme: Whereas it seemed necessary to promote LPAs on provincial level in 1998, it seems more effective to promote LPA on district level in 2004. The same applies to the programmatic contents: Whereas hotline services were priority in 1998, birth registration is priority in 2004. Independent institutions or NGOs like LPAs need to be able to decide themselves about priorities if they do not want to be perceived as the executing arm of donor agencies – and thus not as independent.

## **7. TWELVE MOST ASKED QUESTIONS**

### **1. Was it right to pressure for the establishment of LPA in 1998?**

At the time of the creation of LPAs, the Indonesian Government was reluctant to work with NGOs. UNICEF aimed at making Governmental and non-governmental institutions act together on child protection issues. That Government itself would establish such an institution was a success: "If it was not for LPA, an NGO could not have invited the police for training." (UNICEF Field Office)

### **2. How effective was the process in establishing LPA?**

It was right getting Government and NGOs talk around child protection. But the establishment of LPA through a Ministerial Decree resulted in an ambiguous perception of LPA: They are independent and non-governmental and at the time same strive to become funded mainly through government. This is also very obvious with Komnas Anak who would prefer the status of KPAI than the present NGO status.

### **3. Did UNICEF choose the right strategy to establish independent Child Protection Bodies?**

The aim to integrate all sectors of civil society and different government bodies into the child protection bodies is understandable but very difficult to realize. The fact, that the organizations depended for a long time and in a very detailed way on UNICEF's support, prevented a sense of ownership and fostered dependency on UNICEF.

### **4. Are LPA independent institutions?**

LPAs are independent in terms of decisions regarding their programme. But they are not independent in terms of funding. Independent means having several resources for funds and not being forced to take decisions because of the financial partners' expectations. Independent means being able to turn funding down because conditions are unacceptable and still 'survive' as an organization. Independent means taking various views into account and voicing clearly ones own view as an organization. If LPA are truly independent will be seen when UNICEF withdraws its support.

### **5. Why do some LPA work well and others don't?**

Those LPA that work well have a strong and influential chairperson: North Sumatra, South Sulawesi, NTB. It does not mean that they don't encounter serious problems but they manage to solve them and keep the LPA functioning. This is always due to a great deal of personal commitment and personal relationships. In a way, these chairpersons act nearly like founders of the LPA and like any other head of an NGO who considers this NGO to be "his own". At the same time democratic and transparent management is needed.

### **6. Why do LPA work well in the beginning and then decline after some time?**

LPAs generally begin operating with great enthusiasm because the idea of linking government and independent / non governmental institutions is very attractive, especially with such a major financial partner like UNICEF. But the strict financial management and the obvious difficulties in meeting everybody's expectations discourage those who are the most active members of the LPAs. In most cases, they also do have their own organizations and other job responsibilities. The widespread acceptances of corruption might equally add to the decline in responsibility.

### **7. How can UNICEF promote ownership in LPA?**

Ownership can hardly be ‘promoted’ later. It must develop from the beginning. It is understandable that UNICEF needed to monitor programming and accounting quite closely given the fact that corruption is a major constraint to development in Indonesia and limited capacity to plan and implement projects. But on the other hand, LPA “had to implement” a programme like the hotline services because it was UNICEF’s priority (North Sumatra). Or they “were not allowed” - with UNICEF funds – to implement the programme, because UNICEF did not prioritize it (NTB). Given these directions, it makes it more difficult for a Board to develop ownership for ‘their’ organization.

### **8. What lessons to be learned for UNICEF?**

Institutions built with support from UNICEF should after some time be treated like any other of UNICEF’s partners. They should not be “micromanaged” and they should not be “bottle-fed”<sup>24</sup>. A clear exit strategy in terms of support to operational funding should be negotiated from the beginning and built into the concept. Management training and support have to come in at the very beginning in order to create self-responsibility. Those who are running the organization have to feel the need for such an organization in order to prioritize their commitment accordingly. The more UNICEF gets involved in details of running the organization, the less ownership will there be from those concerned.

### **9. What lessons are there to be learned by UNICEF from the support to Komnas Anak on national level?**

UNICEF supported considerably operational and programmatic costs of Komnas Anak. The Chairperson was one of the key players for UNICEF. On the one hand, this gave the organization the necessary power and confidence to address touchy issues like child prostitution, child labour and child protection in general. On the other hand, it made them believe there would be no limits to this support since UNICEF ‘depended’ on Komnas Anak.

### **10. Has the institution building programme been a waste of money?**

No, because LPA have been successful in various ways: Child protection issues are higher up on the agenda of government and civil society and both, NGO and government have experienced working together. Whether these institutions will be sustainable does not only depend on UNICEF’s institution building programme but also on the choice of leaders of these LPA and their honest commitment in a highly corrupt society.

### **11. Should UNICEF support these institutions in future?**

Any newly created LPA should benefit from a three to five year organizational and programmatic support. But then, the LPA has to be dealt with like any other of UNICEF’s NGO partners who might need training in order to become more efficient in service delivery.

### **12. If yes, how should this been done?**

Particular skills needed concern advocacy, planning, participatory monitoring and evaluation. Some tailor-made support is necessary for LPA that need to rethink their structure (North Sumatra, Central Java) or need to improve their fund raising capacities.

---

<sup>24</sup> Both expressions were used by UNICEF Central Office staff in order to describe UNICEF’S relationship with the LPAs.

## **Appendices**

- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation framework
- Mission schedule
- List of people interviewed
- List of documents
- Overview of UNICEF support to four LPAs
- Details of financial support
- Organigramme of four LPAs
- Field trip reports
- Summary of findings and recommendations for:
  - LPA North Sumatra (PPAI)
  - LPA South Sulawesi
  - LPA NTB
  - LPA Central Java

## **Terms of Reference**

### **External Evaluation of the Child Protection Bodies (LPAs)**

#### **I. Background:**

In 1997, the Ministry of Social Affairs issued a Ministerial Decree (No. 81/1997) on the establishment of Child Protection Institutions (Lembaga Perlindungan Anak-LPA) at the provincial level in Indonesia. In 1998, UNICEF began supporting some of the LPAs, in order to build their capacity on child protection and to strengthen their institutional capacity. The objective was to create democratic and independent child protection institutions, which included both government and civil society participation. Between October 1998 and December 2001, UNICEF supported the establishment of six independent provincial child protection institutions in the provinces of South Sulawesi, North Sumatra, East Java, Central Java, West Java and Nusa Tenggara Barat. In October 1998, UNICEF also supported the establishment of the National Commission for Child Protection (Komisi Nasional Perlindungan Anak-Komnas PA). The main aims of these independent bodies are to monitor, protect and promote children's rights. Thus, these independent bodies have four major functions, as their mandate namely; 1) influencing policy makers to take greater account of children's rights; 2) promoting the participation of children; 3) raising awareness of child rights among children and adults; and 4) ensuring that children have effective means of redress when their rights are violated.

UNICEF has supported the seven institutions both operationally (including rent and salaries) and programmatically. UNICEF's programmatic support aims to build the LPAs and Komnas PA's capacity to address sensitive and emerging child protection issues, including commercial sexual exploitation of children, birth registration, child labour, child abuse and juvenile justice. UNICEF is building the LPAs and Komnas PA's capacity through trainings, including on finance management, fundraising, and the development of strategic plans and directions.

During this five-year period, the LPAs and Komnas PA have contributed to mainstreaming child protection both at the national and provincial level. At the national level, this has resulted in a better appreciation of Child Rights among the government, NGOs and community as shown by the implementation of child rights-focused activities funded by the government and other sources. The institutions have also contributed to the adoption of the Child Protection Law in October 2002. The Child Protection Law calls for the establishment of an Indonesian Child Protection Commission (Komisi Perlindungan Anak Indonesia-KPAI), which will be a separate body from the Komnas PA.

At the provincial level, advocacy and mobilization activities carried out by the LPAs for example led to: increased reporting of child protection issues in the local media, adoption of local legislation on birth registration in South Sulawesi and drafting of child labour legislation in East Java.

The LPAs and Komnas PA are still facing critical issues of financial and organizational sustainability. Although some have managed to receive funds from other donors, including government, that support is still very limited and irregular. Until today, UNICEF remains the major donor of the LPAs programme and operations. Besides that, the LPAs and Komnas PA also face various organizational issues such as over-extended board members, high turn-over of staff, and lack of public ownership.

Donor support to UNICEF for the Child Protection Institutions is coming to an end next year. For this reason an external evaluation of UNICEF's support to the LPAs and Komnas PA is useful.

## **II. Objective:**

The objectives of this evaluation are:

1. To assess the progress achieved by the LPAs in realization of their mandate;
2. To evaluate the situation-specific relevance of the child protection activities initiated by the LPAs, and their strategic plans;
3. To evaluate the impact of the child protection activities initiated by the LPAs;
4. To review the strengths and weaknesses of the LPAs at the provincial and national levels;
5. To develop recommendations for the strengthening and sustainability of Child Protection Institutions (LPAs and Komnas PA);
6. To develop recommendations for UNICEF's future collaboration with the LPAs/Komnas PA, including formulation of an exit strategy.

## **II. Activity:**

The evaluation will be undertaken in four selected provincial LPAs, and Komnas PA at the national level. The criteria for selecting the 4 LPAs include: structure, system of governance, period of establishment and geographic location. The selected LPAs are located in the provinces of Central Java, South Sulawesi, North Sumatra and West Nusa Tenggara (NTB).

## **III. Tasks:**

1. Develop and refine a detailed evaluation framework and design in collaboration with UNICEF.
2. Conduct evaluation of LPAs in 4 provinces and of the National Child Protection Body (Komnas PA) in line with the agreed upon framework, using specified methodologies and approaches.
3. Prepare and submit evaluation report.

## **IV. Outputs:**

1. Evaluation design/framework agreed upon with UNICEF.
2. Evaluation Report according to an outline agreed with UNICEF. This should include, but not limited to a sound analysis and lessons learned of UNICEF's support to institutional capacity building for child protection.

## **V. Methodology** (to be refined in the evaluation framework):

1. Review of existing documents and data
2. Interviews with UNICEF staff at central and respective Field Offices
3. Field visits to the 4 LPAs in the provinces of Central Java, South Sulawesi, North Sumatra and West Nusa Tenggara (NTB) and at national level of the Komnas PA.
4. In-depth interviews with children, government officials, NGO representatives and other LPA stakeholders in the provinces mentioned above.

## **VI. Qualifications Required:**

1. Thorough understanding of human rights and child rights at a global level
2. Master's degree in relevant academic background
3. Knowledge of Child Protection institutions.
4. Experience in conducting organizational reviews.
5. Theoretical and practical understanding of child protection issues.

## **VII. Tentative timeframe:** 8 weeks (detailed schedule will be prepared, refer to task 1)

1. Formulation of the evaluation design, review of secondary data and discussions with UNICEF Jakarta staff and Komnas PA = 2.5 weeks
2. Field visits to 4 provinces, (4-full days plus one day travel per province) = 3 weeks
3. Data analysis & report drafting = 2.5 weeks (of which 1 week will be in Germany, therefore no DSA applied for this)

## **VIII. Budget Breakdown:**

- a. Fee
  - Preparation of evaluation design
  - Field work
  - Analysis & reporting
- b. Travel
  - International airfare
  - Field trips in 4 provinces
  - DSA

**IX. Supervisors:** Birgithe Lund-Henriksen, Child Protection Chief  
Yin Yin Nwe, Senior Programme Officer

**External Evaluation of the LPAs (provincial and national level)  
Revised Draft Evaluation Framework (26.01.2004)**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Lead Questions</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
Background and History	Which need led to the creation of LPAs? Which support was given from UNICEF or other structures? Which perception of LPAs is to be found in regard to status, ownership and mandate? Are there different prov. LPAs? Which type of programmes have been carried out by LPAs?	Donor proposals Evaluations and reports Discussion with UNICEF staff at national and regional level Interviews with DEPSOS, LPAs and NGOs
UNICEF programme design for institutional support	Which analyses led to this type of institution (LPAs)? Who were the beneficiaries / stakeholders? How did stakeholders participate in the formulation of programme design and impact indicators? How did the different organigramms of LPA evolve?	Donor proposals and donor reports Review of minutes of meetings Interviews with UNICEF staff, LPA and LPA Board Independent consultant reports
Institutional set-up and evolution of LPAs	Which procedures were used to set up LPAs? Which role did beneficiaries, stakeholders and donors play? How did the organizational structure evolve over time? Which are the strength and weaknesses of LPA structure and implementation mechanism? Comprehension of mandate? How are LPAs integrated into their NGO environment? Which links do LPAs have avec government structures?	In-depth interviews with Provincial Forum, LPA Board and executive bodies Analyses of LPA documentation Discussion with local government and NGOs
Project activities of LPAs – planning and implementation	Who was involved in the design of project activities? Was is based on analyses and strategic planning? Was the approach pursued appropriate to the context? How were project activities organized by LPA? How was monitoring done? By whom? How was the target group / how were children involved?	Project Cooperation Agreement with LPAs Interview with LPA staff at prov. level Evaluation reports and other LPA doc. Focus group discussions with children

Advocacy activities conducted by LPA	Was project proposal based on needs assessment / study or donor driven? Was UNICEF consulted / involved? What was the role of other international NGOs? Was a more comprehensive advocacy plan developed? Did advocacy mobilize local resources/ include children? Was the design appropriate given local capacities?	In-depth interviews with LPA staff and Board, international NGOs, stakeholders
Results and impact on target groups	Which quantitative and qualitative indicators were used to measure impact? Who had the responsibility to do so? Who participated? Involvement of stakeholders / children ? How are evaluation results used and incorporated into strategic planning? Were advocacy targets met? Did the activities conducted meet the objectives of the project?	Focus group discussions with LPAs, children, local government and local NGOs Individual interviews
Relevance of strategic planning and advocacy on national and local level	Which strategy was adopted for awareness raising? What was the impact of awareness raising? Was the design of a media campaign appropriate? How did stakeholders and children participate? Which were the constraints and the lessons learned?	Focus group discussions with NGOs and government, interviews with children representatives, parents at local level
Impact on the situation of children	How are violations of children's rights monitored? Who was involved? How successful was it? Which constraints were encountered with the monitoring? How did the involvement of children change awareness of children's issues on local level?	Focus group discussions with children and adults (teachers, parents), LPA staff, analyses of documentation
Economic sustainability and fund raising of LPAs	Are LPAs economically sustainable without UNICEF support? Which role does UNICEF support play (past / present)? Were training needs assessed? Which training was received by whom and how was it utilized for the long term sustainability of the organization? Which further training and support is needed by LPAs? Did LPAs create a network amongst themselves? How does it	Training reports Focus group discussions with LPAs Discussion with local and international NGOs

	support the function of the institution?	
Future role of LPAs	<p>How might local conditions and local (provincial, district) necessities change under decentralization?</p> <p>Which effects do LPA have on other institution building?</p> <p>Which future role do LPA have?</p> <p>Which need might there be for a refocused LPA?</p> <p>Which future link needs there to be between LPAs and between LPAs and stakeholders or LPA and government?</p>	In-depth discussions with LPA, NGOs and donors
Recommendations	<p>How can LPA at national and provincial level improve efficiency and impact of child protection activities including advocacy?</p> <p>In which way does LPA need to improve institutional capacity?</p> <p>How should UNICEF collaborate in future with child protection institutions in Indonesia?</p> <p>Which lessons are there to be learned for UNICEF and for LPAs at national and local level?</p>	Focus group discussions with LPA, NGOs and UNICEF

**Mission schedule as executed between 19 January and 21 February 2004**

<b>Day</b>	<b>Where</b>	<b>Whom</b>	<b>What</b>
<b>Monday, 19.01.</b>	Jakarta		Arrival at 18.45
<b>Tuesday, 20.01.</b>	Jakarta		Review of evaluation and donor reports
<b>Wednesday, 21.01.</b>	Jakarta	UNICEF, Child Protection Unit	UNICEF meeting on ToR, schedule and organizational questions
	Jakarta	Astrid Dionisio, UNICEF	Interview on structure and selection of chosen LPAs
<b>Thursday, 22.01.</b>	Jakarta	Julie Lebegue, UNICEF	Interview on the history of creation of LPA and Komnas
	Jakarta	Birgithe Lund-Henriksen, UNICEF	Interview on recent development of KPAI, Komnas and UNICEF's role for LPAs; expectations for this evaluation
<b>Friday, 23.01.</b>	Jakarta	PLAN	Collaboration between intern. NGO and Child Protection Bodies at nat. and intern. Level
<b>Saturday, 24.01.</b>	Jakarta		Review of documents and evaluation framework
<b>Monday, 26.01.</b>	Jakarta	Nono Sumarsono, UNICEF	Role of LPAs for UNICEF's work on the ground
	Jakarta	Save the Children US	Discussion on the Urban Street Children Empowerment and Support Programme, role of LPAs and Komnas Anak
	Jakarta	Save the Children UK	Status of LPA, support from SC UK to Komnas Anak, situation of child protection in Indonesia, current law
	Jakarta	Komnas Anak	Relation with UNICEF, historical development, current and future role of the organization
<b>Tuesday, 27.01.</b>	Jakarta	Meeting with UNICEF	Finalization of Evaluation Framework
		Ministry of Social Affairs, Depsos	Support given to LPAs and Komnas, administrative links, future role
<b>Wednesday, 28.01.</b>	Medan		Flight from Jakarta to Medan
		Meeting with PPAI Board members and executive staff	Mandate and achievement of PPAI, role of stakeholders and advocacy
<b>Thursday, 29.01.</b>	Medan	Meeting with different stakeholders/partners (gov. and nongov.) of PPAI	Working relationship with PPAI, weak and strong points, need for PPAI and its possible future role
<b>Friday, 30.01.</b>	Medan	Visit to RPK, Binsos, PKK offices	Project planning with PPAI, support given, follow up of activities
		Discussion with teacher participants of PPAI training	Relevance and appropriateness of training, expected impact, long term goal

		Discussion with children of the Children's Forum of North Sumatera	Activities of FORASU and relation with PPAI, support given and long term perspective
		Discussion with Executive staff of PPAI	Planning and evaluation methods, current activities and constraints
<b>Saturday, 31.01.</b>	Medan	Meeting with Board and Executive staff of PPAI	Feedback of evaluation results and discussion of remaining issues
			Flight from Medan to Jakarta
<b>Monday, 02.02.</b>	Makassar		Flight from Jakarta to Makassar
			Write-up of Medan results
<b>Tuesday, 03.02.</b>	Makassar	Meeting with UNICEF Field Office	Support for LPA, Child rights situation in South Sulawesi
		Interview with KHPPIA coordination	LPA under KHPPIA, division of advocacy issues and responsibilities; direct support
		Discussion with Dinsas Social	Cooperation with UNICEF and LPA
		Discussion with Children and LPA	Children's concerns and involvement together with LPA
		Meeting with UNICEF Field Office (cont.)	Future vision regarding social change and awareness raising of child rights on district level
<b>Wednesday, 04.02.</b>	Makassar	Meeting with LPA Makassar, Exec. staff and Board	Structure, activities, constraints and future perspective, relation with UNICEF
		Discussion with YPPA, district NGO and LPA Focal Point	Work relation with LPA and activities and results on district level, implication of children in village committees
<b>Thursday, 05.02.</b>	Takalar	Meeting with NGO Lembara and Focal Point of District	Activities on district level, implication of and impact on children, relation to LPA on provincial level
		Meeting with PLAN	Appreciation of LPA and common work plan, constraints of support to LPA
	Makassar	Meeting with UNICEF and LPA	Feedback of mission observations and recommendations, discussion on future perspective, collaboration with UNICEF
<b>Friday, 06.02.</b>	Makassar	Meeting with Ibu Tria	Women's role in society and parents' traditional relation to children
			Flight from Makassar to Denpasar
<b>Saturday, 07.02.</b>	Denpasar		Write-up results from Makassar results
<b>Sunday, 08.02.</b>	Denpasar		Flight from Denpasar to Mataram
	Mataram	Meeting with the Board of LPA	Structure and organization, past, present and future activities
		Discussion with religious leaders and important	Problems of child abuse and their role in combating it, relation to LPA

		community figures	
<b>Monday, 09.02.</b>	Mataram	Discussion with Women's network organization	Cooperation with LPA
		Meeting with Dinas Sosial	Government's responsibility for child protection and cooperation with LPA
		Discussion at the public hospital	Establishment of a special service for abused children and women
		Meeting with the 4 executive staff of LPA	Work relation to the Board, planning and monitoring of activities
		Discussion with the Chief of UNICEF FO from Surabaya	Success of LPA and long-term perspective, fund raising training
<b>Tuesday, 10.02</b>	Mataram	Meeting with the media: radio and newspaper	Collaboration with LPA, role of the media in bringing child abuse cases up
		Meeting with member organizations of LPA (NGOs and University)	Collaboration, planning and evaluation of common activities with LPA
		Discussion with Children Forum	Expectations and organization of children in NTB, role of LPA
<b>Wednesday, 11.02</b>	Mataram	Discussion with Senior High School Director of SMU 1	LPA activities regarding CRC awareness raising among teachers and students
		Meeting with representative of business community	Financial support to LPA, collaboration in child protection activities
		Meeting with Board and Executive members of LPA	Final discussion and evaluation feedback to LPA
			Traveling to Semarang
<b>Thursday, 12.02</b>	Semarang	Meeting with Programme Officer Field Office UNICEF	LPA Central Jakarta History and support given by UNICEF
		Discussion with LPA Board and Executive staff	Activities, strengths, weaknesses and partner organizations
		Meeting in Biro Kesra	Collaboration with LPA
		Discussion with Radio Trijaya	Interactive radio discussions with LPA
<b>Friday, 13.02</b>	Semarang	Meeting with BAPPEDA	Financial sustainability of LPA
		Meeting in the Police Hospital	LPA's involvement in the creation of the Integrated Service Center for abused Children and Women
		Meeting Perisal (NGO)	Critical view on LPA and its organization
		Meeting ASA PKBI (NGO)	Organizing street children, collaboration with LPA
		Meeting Head of the Women Study Center of the University	Future research, data utilization for advocacy

<b>Saturday, 14.02</b>	Semarang	Meeting with LPA and UNICEF	Feedback to LPA and UNICEF on observations and recommendations
			Flight to Jakarta
<b>Monday, 16.02 to Friday, 20.02</b>	Jakarta	Discussion of results and recommendations with UNICEF	Preparing Draft report
<b>Saturday, 21.02</b>			Departure to Germany and finalizing evaluation report

**List of people interviewed** (in chronological order)

**Jakarta**

Astrid Dionisio	Asst. Project Officer (Institutional Building), UNICEF
Birgithe Lund-Henriksen	Project Officer, Child Protection Section Head, UNICEF
Yin Yin Nwe	Senior Programme Officer, Head of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, UNICEF
Rajeshwari Chandrasekar	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, UNICEF
Julie Lebegue	Project Officer (Juvenile Justice), UNICEF
Nono Sumarsono	Project Officer (Birth Registration), UNICEF
Naning Pudjiyulianingsih	Program Unit Manager, PLAN International
Laurel MacLaren	Deputy Director – Program, Save the Children US
Wilson Sitorus	NGO Capacity Building Specialist, Save the Children US
Eko Kriswanto	Monitoring Evaluation/Child Rights Officer, Save the Children US
Carolus Rudy Pinem	Advocacy Officer, Urban Street Children Empowerment and Support, SC US
Kevin Byrne	Program Director, Save the Children UK
Bapak Budi Rahardjo	Assistant Representative, Save the Children UK
Dr. Seto Mulyadi	Chairperson, Komnas Anak
Arist Merdeke Sirait	Secretary, Komnas Anak
Muhammad Joni	Advocacy and Law Reform Commission, Komnas Anak
Makmur Sunusi	Deputy Director of Child Welfare Services, Ministry of Social Affairs
Sri Subekti	Child Protection, LPA, Ministry of Social Affairs

**Medan**

Dimardi Abbas	Chairperson of the Board, PPAI
Marasamin	Member of the Board, NGO/lawyer, PPAI
Mahmudi Arif	Coordinator data and information, Birth registration, PPAI
Samara Yudah Arefianto	Advocacy Coordinator, PPAI
Bintang Rumonda	Capacity building Coordinator, PPAI,
Devi Radli Mardeli	Advocacy Program staff , PPAI
Akhiruddin Archan	Data and Information Division, PPAI
Yeni Afriyeni	Finance, PPAI
Linda NOva	In charge of stakeholders, monitor media, info center, PPAI
Yunitri	Administration, documentation, PPAI
Muchin Simatupang	Division Manager of Education and Organization, KKSP (NGO)
Dedy Sofyan	Executive Director, KKSP
Abdoul Satar Siahaan	Executive Director, Peran Indonesia
Lukman Hakim	Publication, Peran Indonesia
Ibu Ika Jaleha	Legal Assistant, LBH APIK- Medan (legal aids institution)
Ibu R. Sabrina	Head of Women Empowerment Bureau, WERMENT, Medan
Mazida Jaffar	Head of Women Protection and Assistant Division, Women Empowerment Bureau
Emmy Suryana	Deputy Head of Women Protection
Bertha W. Sitepu	Deputy Head of Training and Education Division, RS. Pirngadi, Hospital Medan
Dharna Ginting	Staff of Training and Education Division, R.S. Pirngadi, Hospital, Medan
Nelson Sinaga	Executive Director, Handal Mahardika
Lisa Afrianti	Executive Secretary, PPAI
Hengki	Program Coordinator for Teenagers, Galatea Foundation
Ibu Setiani Purba	Head of RPK (Integrated Unit for child abuse cases at the police station)
Burhanuddin Siregar	Biro Bina Sosial Setdapropsu, Medan
Ibu Adelina Hotma	Vice Chairperson, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Amanza	Secretary, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Ridwan B.	Working Group 3, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Tarigan	Working Group 3, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Marzuki	Working Group 3, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Edward	Working Group 3, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Sarifuddin	Working Group 1, PKK of North Sumatra
Bapak Rusli	Vice Secretary, PKK of North Sumatra
Ibu Tristnowati	Vice Editor, Srifandi, PKK of North Sumatra
Bapak Rusli	Chairperson Forum Guru Medan, SMP 3 Medan (teacher)
Bapak Arifuddin	Vice Chairperson, Binjai Forum, SMP 3 Binjai (teacher)

Bapak Saritua	Chairperson, Binjai Forum, SMP 3 Binjai (teacher)
Lely Heryanto	Chairperson FORASU (Children's Forum North Sumatra)
Vina Simajunta	Secretary General FORASU
Vina Kartika	Secretary FORASU
Tia	Treasurer FORASU

## Makassar

Purwanta Iskandar	Chief of UNICEF Field Office in Makassar
Ibu Tarina	Operation Assistant LPA/CNSP, UNICEF Field Office
Ibu Ani	Staff UNICEF Field Office
Andi Sukri	KHPPIA Coordinator from Bappeda, Social Welfare Division on provincial level
Syamsuddin Lallo	Head of Sub-Division, Dinas Sosial South Sulawesi
Ibu Nurani	Staff of Sub-Division, Dinas Sosial South Sulawesi
Pak Fahrir	Staff of Sub-Division, Dinas Sosial South Sulawesi
Pak Muh. Dasir	Staff of Sub-Division, Dinas Sosial South Sulawesi
Pak Nuryanto	LPA, Coordinator for Children's Forum
Pahmia	Secretary of Majalah Anak Saribattang, magazine
Roslinda	Chairperson of Majalah Anak Saribattang, magazine
Ucok/Abd. Haris. Agam	Children Ambassador for Health (Duta Anak Indonesia, Bidang Kesehatan)
Ardiand Arnold	Chairperson Forum Anak Sul-Sel (Children's Forum South Sulawesi)
Henny Ika. P.	Chairperson, Children Counsel Makassar
Fadiyah Machmud	Executive Director of LPA Makassar
Amelia Tristian Gaus	Board Expert of LPA Makassar
Pak Gufran H. Kordi	Program Planning Division, LPA Makassar
Rosmiati Zain	Legal advisor from the legal aids institution, LPA Makassar
Mulyadi Prajitno	Advocacy Division, LPA Makassar
Ibu Hadjrah	Advocacy Division, LPA Makassar
Ibu Umrah	Operational staff, Admin. and Finance, LPA Makassar
Ibu Warida	Monitoring Coordination, Program staff, LPA Makassar
Pak Wahid	Chairperson of YPPA, NGO in Bantaeng, focal point for LPA on district level
Andi Gunawan (Wawan)	Focal Point for LPA in the Takalar District
Faisal Amir	Director of NGO Lembara in Takalar District
M.K. Ali	Country Director, PLAN International
Samuel Wungo	Area Manager South Sulawesi, PLAN International
Syamsu Salewangang	Program Unit Manager, Takalar, PLAN International
Ibu Wiwit Sri Arianti	Grant Coordinator Program, Takalar, PLAN International
Pak Mappinawang	Board Expert of LPA Makassar

## Mataram

Ibu Kerniashi Mudjithahid	Chairperson of LPA NTB, also Chairperson of BKKKS
Pak Mahmud	Secretary of LPA, staff of Dinas Sosial
Pak Sinung	Chief of UNICEF Field Office
Pak Asmuni	Vice-Chairperson of LPA, Psychologist University of Mataram
Pak Beauty Erawati	Advocacy Division, member of APIK, Legal Aids Foundation
Pak Ismail Thoib	Research and Development Division, Institute of Islamic Studies
Pak Azhar Zaini	Networking Division of LPA, also member of GAGAS Foundation
Ibu Munawarah Hasan	Treasurer of LPA, staff of the Office of Religious Affairs, Mohamedia Organization
Badaruddin Nur	Organizational Development of LPA, staff of the Educational Agency
Drs. Husaan Ahmadi	Head of the Religious Affairs Office in the City of Mataram
Umar Siradz	Educational and Cultural Observer of Mataram
Mahally Fikri	Manager of the Islamic Boarding School in Narmada
Dhedy Sukardi	Mataram Public Radio
Pak Sahan	Social Affairs Office and Women Empowerment, Mataram
Ibu Faizah	First Chairperson of the Women's Organization coordinating body (BKOW)
Nurhayati Usman	Second Chairperson of BKOW
Gita Setiyati	Division Head of Health and Environment of BKOW
Nursidah Sip	Division Head of Women Empowerment, Manpower and Family Planing, Biro Kesos (Bureau of Social Welfare and Women Empowerment)
Sri Suhamsi	Head of Sub-Division Women Empowerment

Dr. Ida Bagus Djelantik	Staff of the Pediatric Unit at RSU Mataram (Mataram General Hospital)
Dr. Wawang	Deputy Head for Services at RSU Mataram
Pak Supana	Staff of Deputy Head for Services
Pak Surkan	Chairperson of Amalia Foundation (NGO)
Ibu Halimatus Sadiyah	PSW UNRAM, Coordinator of the Division Child Protection and Welfare at the Women's Study Center, University of Mataram
Selly Ester Sembiring	Coordinator within LBH APIK (Legal Aids Foundation)
Pak Abdul Rachim	Chairperson of Santai Foundation (NGO)
Agus Talino	Director of PT Radio Swara Lombok and Representative of Bali Post in Lombok
S. Widjanarko	Businessman and Head of Charity Foundation for Children
Surham Afriadin Baja	Boy Chairperson of Street children Workshop
Suparlan	Boy (blind) representing disabled children, Senior high school Mataram
Yori	Girl from orphanage, vocational high school
Jumini	Girl from the orphanage, vocational high school
Khosnut	Girl with special needs
Fidia	Girl responsible for intra organizational links, Senior high school Mataram
Sofiante	Junior high school
Ivan	Senior high school
Mohamed	Elementary School
Junaidi	President of Street children
Ami	Islamic Senior high school Mataram

## Semarang

Widodo Suhartoyo	Project Officer Basic Services, Field Office Semarang
Laela Diryat	Board member LPA Central Java
Wieke Diah Anjaryani	Program and financial Coordinator, LPA
Ibu Esti	Admin. staff, data and info center, LPA
Usda El Ahmady	External and networking Coordinator, LPA
Ibu Dina	Finance staff, LPA
Ibu Andriani	Head of the Division of Women Empowerment, Social Welfare Office (Biro Kesra)
Ibu Winastuti	Head of Subdivision Reporting and Evaluation, Social Welfare Office (Biro Kesra)
Ibu Riry	Producer Radion Trijaya FM in Semarang
Yuni Astuti	BAPPEDA, Central Java
Amiek Soemarmi	University Women's Study Center, Secretary
Dr Tinuk Istiarti	Head of University Women's Study Center
Dr. Hascaryatmo	Police Hospital (POLDA)
Ibu Tary	Coordinator ASA PKBI (Planned Parenthood Association of Indonesia)
Ibu Heni	Assistant Coordinator of ASA PKBI, responsible for LPA relation
Fatah Muria	Executive Director of Perisai (NGO, Child Advocacy)

	Total	%
Komnas PA/LPA Board & Exe. staff	39	27,46
Children	20	14,08
Government	18	12,68
Local NGOs	14	9,86
INGO	11	7,75
PKK & BKOW	12	8,45
School including university	8	5,63
Police + RPK + Hospital	7	4,93
Media	3	2,11
UNICEF staff	10	7,04
Total	142	100,00

**Overview of UNICEF's programmatic and operational support to four LPAs** (PCAs 2002 - 2003 and 2003 - 2004)

**LPA North Sumatra (PPAI, Medan) June – December 2002**

Goal: To develop protection system for children as victims of abuse in Medan

Objective 1: To increase community and school awareness, understanding and commitment to take actions on child abuse

Objective 2: To develop referral mechanism with a pilot hospital to provide services to the victims of child abuse

Objective 3: To improve the capacity of child protection body in managing data and providing counselling for child abuse

Objective 4: To increase children participation in policy development in North Sumatra

Objective 5: Improve PPAI management development and operational capacity

	<b>Programmatical funding for activities</b> (what to do...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Operational and institution building funding</b> (how to function...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Total budget</b>
1	Community group discussions Training of pilot schools Media announcements Training journalists	65.945.000	--	--	<b>Rp 369.030.000</b> <b>(US\$ 42,175)</b>
2	Know-how training for doctors and nurses Development of referral mechanism Establishing service unit for child abuse in hospital and public announcements	55.335.000	Workshop for stakeholders to follow-up planning	27.395.000	
3	Training for hotline service Home visits	23.600.000	Website on CNSP Exposure trip to learn on data management	8.930.000	
4	Conduct children's day and formation of children congress in North Sumatra	44.000.000	--	--	
5	--	--	Monthly meetings with stakeholders Monthly internal meetings External evaluation Strategic planning Partly support salary costs for 7 staff Partly support for office rent and utilities	143.825.000	
<b>Total costs</b>		<b>188.880.000</b>		<b>180.150.000</b>	

**LPA North Sumatra (PPAI, Medan) November 2003 – September 2004**

Goal: To protect children from abuse and exploitation

Objective 1: To enhance public participation on child protection

Objective 2: To advocate for increase budget on children's welfare and protection

Objective 3: To develop children's capacity to participate for their interest

Objective 4: To contribute for the operation of PPAI

	<b>Programmatical funding for activities</b> (what to do...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Operational and institution building funding</b> (how to function...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Total budget</b>
1	Teacher's training Formation of Teachers' Forum on child abuse Training of medical professionals and police Facilitate establishment of crises centre Distribution of CRC materials	111.540.000	Support for one project staff	12.000.000	<b>Rp 348.080.500</b> <b>(US\$ 41,438.15)</b>
2	Workshop for government officials and legislative members in two districts Monitoring, analysis & drafting of APBD 2005	68.566.500	Support for one project staff	12.000.000	
3	Facilitate children's congress Training on organizational management Leadership training	109.250.000	--	--	
4	--	--	Procurement of one computer Contribution to staff salary Contribution to general office support	33.760.000	
<b>Total costs</b>		<b>289.356.500</b>		<b>57.760.000</b>	

**LPA South Sulawesi May 2003 – April 2004** (originally the PCA was meant to run from May to December 2003)

Goal: To protect children from abuse and exploitation

Objective 1: To conduct policy advocacy to the local government for increase budget allocation on child welfare and protection

Objective 2: To socialize and disseminate information on child rights and child protection through children events

Objective 3: To conduct monitoring on violations of child rights and facilitate case handling

Objective 4: To strengthen the internal capacity of the LPA

Objective 5: To contribute for the operational cost of the LPA

	<b>Programmatical funding for activities</b> (what to do...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Operational and institution building funding</b> (how to function...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Total budget</b>
1	Dialogue and hearings Newspaper clippings and case analysis Annual report on children's situation in S.S.	42.894.000	staff	12.000.000	<b>RP<sup>25</sup> 330,159,000</b> <b>(US\$ 39,778.19)</b>
2	Children's day discussions Socialize Child Protection law in 3 districts	60.075.000	--	--	
3	Training on reporting mechanism Regular discussions between PPA and KPPA Case documentation Printing posters on child abuse Strengthening KPPA capacity in 3 districts	101.520.000	staff	12.000.000	
4	--	--	Internal evaluation External evaluation (General Assembly) Strategic Planning to mainstream children's participation	58.535.000	
5	--	--	Staff salary General office support Procurement of one computer	37.900.000	
<b>Total costs</b>		<b>204.489.000</b>		<b>120.435.000</b>	

<sup>25</sup> Including 5,235,000 Rp miscalculation in the original PCA

**LPA Central Jawa September 2002 – March 2003**

Goal: To build LPA capacity to advocate child protection issues

Objective 1: To advocate for simplified birth registration procedures

Objective 2: To strengthen the data and information system of the LPA

Objective 3: To enhance the organizational capacity of LPA

Objective 4: To mainstream children participation

Objective 5: To contribute to the operational cost of LPA

	<b>Programmatical funding for activities</b> (what to do...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Operational and institution building funding</b> (how to function...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Total budget</b>
1	Conduct study on existing procedure and policy on birth registration	33.190.000	--	--	<b>Rp 294.865.000</b> <b>(US\$ 34,287)</b>
2	Media clippings and updating library Publication of Bulletin	23.475.000	--	--	
3	--	--	Internal evaluation Coordination meeting Strategic Planning workshop Socialization of the existence of LPA (World Day for Prevention of Child abuse)	169.230.000	
4	Meeting Forum Anak	34.970.000	--	--	
5	--	--	Staff salary General office support	34.000.000	
<b>Total costs</b>		<b>91.635.000</b>		<b>203.230.000</b>	

**LPA NTB June – December 2002**

Goal: To protect children from abuse and exploitation

Objective 1: To create awareness on child rights and issues affecting children among stakeholders

Objective 2: To develop CNSP information and database

Objective 3: To enhance management and operation capacity of LPA NTB

	<b>Programmatical funding for activities</b> (what to do...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Operational and institution building funding</b> (how to function...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Total budget</b>
1	Conduct rally in 2 kabupatens Media campaign through radio and newspaper Discussions on child rights at prov. level	65.890.000	Publication and printing of leaflet socializing existence of LPA to gov't	2.900.000	<b>Rp 283.843.000</b> <b>(US\$ 32,440)</b>
2	CNSP research in six districts	44.398.000	--	--	
3	--	--	Monthly meetings with stakeholders Monthly internal meetings Exposure trip Training volunteers on child rights involving stakeholders Workshop on child rights Strategic planning workshop Support for executive staff salary General office support	170.655.000	
<b>Total costs</b>		<b>110.288.000</b>		<b>173.555.000</b>	

**LPA NTB May 2003 – April 2004**

Goal: To protect children from abuse and exploitation

Objective 1: To conduct policy advocacy and programme development on child protection

Objective 2: To develop child protection information and data base

Objective 3: To provide inputs in the socialization and the implementation of law 23/2002 in NTB

Objective 4: To strengthen the internal capacity of the LPA

	<b>Programmatical funding for activities</b> (what to do...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Operational and institution building funding</b> (how to function...)	<b>costs</b>	<b>Total budget</b>
1	Conduct media campaign Organize dialogue Conduct rally against child abuse Training to initiate Mataram Child Forum Brochure on child abuse Panel discussion on child abuse Training police officers Workshop on child abuse in schools Seminar child exploitation in tourism Provide technical assistance to 3 district child protection institutions	219.045.000	--	--	<b>Rp 405.650.000</b> <b>(US\$ 46,626)</b>
2	Situation analyses on child exploitation in tourism in 3 districts in Lombok	30.075.000	--	--	
3	Conduct analysis Conduct public hearing and propose draft local legislation to implement law 23/2002	24.215.000	--	--	
4	--	--	Organize annual General Assembly Conduct training of volunteers Organize discussions with private sector Develop fund raising mechanism Procurement of 1 computer Contribution to staff salary Contribute to general office support	132.315.000	
<b>Total costs</b>		<b>273.335.000</b>		<b>132.315.000</b>	

## **LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED**

MUQTADIR, M.B., BILLAH, M.M. *The Report of Strategic Planning Workshop, Child Protection Body, Central Java, Jakarta, February 2003*

MUQTADIR, M.B., BILLAH, M.M. *The Report of Strategic Planning Workshop, Child Protection Body, West Nusa Tenggara, Jakarta, November 2002*

MUQTADIR, M.B., BILLAH, M.M. *The Report of Strategic Planning Workshop, Child Protection Body, South Sulawesi, Jakarta, December 2002*

MUQTADIR, M.B., BILLAH, M.M. *The Report of Strategic Planning Workshop, Child Protection Body, North Sumatra, Jakarta, December 2002*

MUQTADIR, M.B., BILLAH, M.M. *Final Report of ToT and Strategic Planning Workshop on six CPBs, Child Protection Bodies, Jakarta, November 2002*

UNICEF Indonesia, *Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection in NTT/NTB, Proposal to the Government of New Zealand, July 2000*

UNICEF Indonesia, *Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection in Indonesia, Proposal to USAID, October 2000*

UNICEF Indonesia, *Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection in Indonesia, Proposal to the Embassy of the Netherlands, June 2000*

UNICEF and the Government of Indonesia, *Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection in NTT/NTB, Second Annual Progress Report to DFID, April 2002 – March 2003*

UNICEF and the Government of Indonesia, assisted by the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United Kingdom, *Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection in NTT/NTB, First Periodic Report, January 2002*

UNICEF and the Government of Indonesia assisted by the Netherlands Ministry for Development Cooperation, *Institution Building & Mainstreaming Child Protection, First Annual Progress Report, 1 October 2000 – 30 September 2001 and Second Annual Progress Report, 1 October 2001 – 31 December 2002*

UNICEF and the Government of Indonesia, *Special Protection Measures for Children & Mainstreaming Child Rights in Indonesia, Final Report to USAID, March 2001*

BANGUN MITRA SEJATI, *Lembaga Perlindungan Anak Sulawesi Selatan 1998 - 2000 period, Independent Evaluation Report, June 2001*

UNICEF, *Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA):*

with PPAI, Medan, June 2002

with LPA NTB, June 2002

with PPAI, Medan, November 2003

with LPA NTB, May 2003

with LPA South Sulawesi, May 2003

with LPA Central Java, September 2002

CONDOR, Jeremy, *urban Street Children Empowerment & Support Program NCCP Assessment Report, Save the Children, Indonesia Field Office, May/June 2001*

BILLAH, M.M. et al., CPSM, *Evaluation of the National Commission of Child Protection, Period 1998 – 2000, Jakarta, 2001*

SAVE THE CHILDREN, *Urban Street Children Empowerment & Support, Quarterly Report July – September 2003, submitted to USAID Indonesia, October 2003*