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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APBD</td>
<td>Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (Budget and Expenditure, Regional Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBDesa</td>
<td>Anggaran Pendapatan Belanja Desa (Budget and Expenditure, Village Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APBN</td>
<td>Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara (Budget and Expenditure, National Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>Analisis Situasi Ibu dan Anak (Situation Analysis of Women and Children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANGDA</td>
<td>Pembangunan Daerah (Regional Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPPEDA</td>
<td>Badan Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Daerah (Planning and Regional Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPPENAS</td>
<td>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional (National Development Planning Agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Common Country Assessment Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFO</td>
<td>Chief Field Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Central Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Country Programme Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSD</td>
<td>Child Survival and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Department(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPRD</td>
<td>Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah (Parliament)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAPRO</td>
<td>Regional Office for East Asia and the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (The German Society for International Cooperation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOI</td>
<td>Government of Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HACT</td>
<td>Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHPPPIA</td>
<td>Kelangsungan Hidup, Perkembangan, Perlindungan (Maternal and Child Survival, Development, and Protection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K/L</td>
<td>Kementrian/ Lembaga (Ministries/ Agencies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG</td>
<td>Local Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoF</td>
<td>Ministry of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoHA</td>
<td>Ministry of Home Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTR</td>
<td>Mid-Term Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTRP</td>
<td>Medium Term Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSRENBANG</td>
<td>Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (Community Discussion about Local Development Needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYWP</td>
<td>Multi Year Work Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTB</td>
<td>Nusa Tenggara Barat (West Nusa Tenggara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Nusa Tenggara Timur (East Nusa Tenggara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD DAC</td>
<td>OECD Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUD</td>
<td>Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini (Early Childhood Education and Development Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNPM</td>
<td>Programme Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (National Programme for Community Empowerment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RG</td>
<td>Regional Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RKPDesa</td>
<td>Rencana Kerja Perangkat Desa (Work Plan, Village Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPJMD</td>
<td>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah (Medium Term Development Plan, Regional Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPJMDesa</td>
<td>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Desa (Medium Term Development Plan, Village Level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPJMN</td>
<td>Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (National Medium Term Development Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKPD</td>
<td>Satuan Kerja Perangkat Daerah (Regional Work Units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG</td>
<td>Subnational Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................... 2  
Acronyms .......................................................................................................................... 3  
Table of Contents ............................................................................................................... 5  
Ethics Statement ................................................................................................................. 7  
Executive Summary ........................................................................................................... 8  
Decentralization in Indonesia ............................................................................................. 8  
Overview of UNICEF Indonesia ......................................................................................... 8  
Key Questions ...................................................................................................................... 8  
Overview of Findings ........................................................................................................... 8  
Recommendations .................................................................................................................. 9  
Lessons Learned .................................................................................................................. 11  
1.0 Introduction ................................................................................................................... 12  
1.1 Decentralization ............................................................................................................ 12  
1.2 Decentralization in Indonesia ...................................................................................... 13  
1.3 Decentralization and Child Rights ............................................................................. 13  
1.4 Development of the Evaluation Plan ....................................................................... 14  
1.5 Structure of this Report ............................................................................................. 15  
2.0 UNICEF’s Engagement in the Decentralization Process in Indonesia ...................... 16  
2.1 Stakeholders ................................................................................................................ 16  
2.1.1 UNICEF .................................................................................................................. 16  
2.1.2 Government of Indonesia ...................................................................................... 16  
2.1.3 Other Community Organizations ...................................................................... 16  
2.1.4 Programme Beneficiaries .................................................................................... 16  
2.2 Funding ......................................................................................................................... 17  
   Table 1: Summary of Planned, Available, and Expenditure of Funds, January 2011- 2014 (USD) .................................................................................................................. 17  
   Table 2: Logical Framework for Decentralization Programme .................................. 18  
3.0 Evaluation Design ......................................................................................................... 22  
4.0 Evaluation Methodology ............................................................................................... 23  
4.1 Document Review ........................................................................................................ 23  
4.2 Key Informant Interviews ......................................................................................... 23  
4.3 Online Survey ................................................................................................................ 23  
5.0 Findings ......................................................................................................................... 25  
5.1 Fund Channeling .......................................................................................................... 25  
   Figure 1: Current Legal Basis for Funding Regional Government. .............................. 26  
   Figure 2: Four Alternatives Suggested for UNICEF and GOI for Consideration. ....... 26  
5.2 Findings against Evaluation Criteria ...................................................................... 27  
5.2.1 Relevance ............................................................................................................... 27  
   Table 3: HDI Scores for Provinces (2013) .................................................................. 40  
5.2.2 Effectiveness ......................................................................................................... 41  
   Figure 3: Number of Responses Related to the Belief that Decentralization Will Contribute to More Equitable Child Development (Based on 55 Responses). ................................. 43  
5.2.3 Sustainability .......................................................................................................... 45  
   Table 4: SSFA and PCA. ............................................................................................... 52  
5.2.4 Efficiency ................................................................................................................ 52  
5.2.5 Equity ...................................................................................................................... 55  
5.3 Gender ......................................................................................................................... 58  
6.0 Personnel ....................................................................................................................... 60  
   Table 5: Organizational Structure and SNG Reach ...................................................... 60

5
**Ethics Statement**

Harry Cummings and Associates has ensured the integrity and quality of this evaluation study. We sought out informed and voluntary consent from individuals who participated in the interviews and meetings and we have maintained the confidentiality of the respondents. The information, findings, recommendations and lessons learned enclosed in this report are independent and impartial. The consultants accept all responsibility for any errors or omissions.
Executive Summary
The executive summary describes the formative evaluation of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process in Indonesia. For additional information on the evaluation, please refer to the full evaluation report.

Decentralization in Indonesia
Decentralization is one of the many ways that Indonesia has progressed both socially and economically, yet this achievement has not been fully translated into sustainable human development, especially for children. Deep disparities exist for most child-related indicators across and within the provinces. Overcoming these disparities depends on the capacity, priorities and willingness of the local governments. Children constitute a large percentage of Indonesia’s population, therefore it is essential to create a demographic window of opportunity for the country to invest in youth. In fact, making decentralization work for children is one of the seven major strategies of the current 2011-2015 UNICEF Country Programme of Cooperation. It is believed that the participatory nature of decentralization can allow for more pro-child policies since practitioners, local leaders, community members, youth and children can be involved in the process of development planning.

Overview of UNICEF Indonesia
UNICEF Indonesia has a national office in Jakarta, five FOs in Makassar, Kupang, Surabaya, Banda Aceh and Jayapura, along with two sub offices in Ambon and Manokwari. There are approximately 84 employees working at the national office, and 53 employees working in the field offices, including the two sub offices. The annual budget over the period 2011-2014 averaged 26.2 Million USD.

Key Questions
The key questions to which this evaluation hopes to provide insights include:
• How relevant is UNICEF’s programme strategy to make decentralization work for children in Indonesia, considering the organization’s global equity focus and the government’s development priorities as outlined in the RPJM and other national strategies?
• Has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process helped the organization contribute to the equitable fulfillment of child rights in Indonesia?
• What are the enabling or constraining factors that influence the long-term sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization?
• How cost effective has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been as a means to promote equitable realization of child rights in Indonesia?
• What efficiency and effectiveness lessons could be learned from past experiences with closing/moving UNICEF offices at sub-national level?
• Are the most marginalized children in Indonesia reached through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?

Overview of Findings
FOs are a key resource of UNICEF; they provide administrative support, leadership on programming and engagements with partners, sensitivity to local conditions, the social and political context, and technical skills.
UNICEF tries to reach the “worst off” first and foremost by being disproportionally present in Eastern Indonesia (Makassar/Ambon, Jayapura/Manokwari, Kupang).

Effectiveness in UNICEF’s work is very much determined by the quality of the relationships with regional government. This has been a strong feature of UNICEF’s work in the past. It has changed dramatically in the last year however, and it poses an existential threat to UNICEF as it is configured.

Efficiency is pursued in UNICEF through five year and annual planning exercise and the continued reliance on cooperation with districts/cities that are known to UNICEF making it easier for UNICEF to engage.

UNICEF works in districts (with a rural character) and in cities (urban character). The models seek to be replicable across all jurisdictions, by aiming to have low cost-high impact solutions that are affordable for all districts/cities, even those with fewer resources.

There appears to be an incomplete understanding of the institutional framework for decentralization.

There is little clarity on the legal and practical division of labour between provinces and districts/cities on functions pertaining to children.

There is some degree of top down and bottom up integration and consultation with government in the planning processes.

Newly selected NGOs are saddled with tasks they may not be entirely suited for, while longer standing partners continue their recent decline.

UNICEF needs to get involved more in flexible agreements with SNG and third parties that have their own resources, and will work toward common ends, with a clear exit strategy from UNICEF that lets SNG and other parties get on with pursuing their mandates.

The regional governments that are involved in the ministry/agency managed activities do not feel that they have much ownership over these activities, and would much prefer to return to the direct funding model.

Recommendations
The following recommendations were derived from the findings of the evaluation. The recommendations listed below are not necessarily presented in priority order.

1. It is recommended that UNICEF maintains the broad features of the current organizational articulation through the 2016-2020 CPAP.

There is room for some changes in the short term, and for preparing the ground for potentially more fundamental changes. It may be beneficial to carry out a cost analysis of the overhead costs of the FOs and to review the structures and modalities of UNICEF.
2. It is recommended that UNICEF broadens the means of funding cooperation. This should be pursued by exploring: the reversion/revision of the Government regulation #10, the means by which ministries/ agencies transfer funds to the regional government, enhanced and increased funding by partner regional government and by tapping into village government funding.

3. It is recommended that UNICEF revisits the selection criteria for provinces and districts/cities, making more explicit the criteria that need to be considered, and revising the procedures and agreements with Indonesia to be used as guides.

4. It is recommended that UNICEF examines the current involvement of the village government in UNICEF efforts, and reposition this level of government to take advantage of the stronger role of village government as a service provider and as a significant source of development funds in the future.

5. It is recommended that UNICEF review the use of third party contracts prior to making additional commitments, to ensure that their use is aligned with the UNICEF upstream strategy. This may require attention to the focus of their activities, whether they are maintaining or building on prior investments, and whether they are willing/able to engage with regional government.

6. It is recommended that UNICEF revisits the coordination mechanism for projects, in light of the different approaches to partnerships with SNG, dropping the rigid use of the KHPIIA teams, with their tight multi-level construction, allowing instead coordination structures in the SNG and making use of existing child-related coordination mechanisms (where these exist).

7. It is recommended that UNICEF and Bappenas prepares a revised Pedum\(^1\) for the CPAP 2015-2020 that provides greater possibilities for the financial basis for cooperation, and for coordination.

8. It is recommended that UNICEF considers the possibility of attaining greater efficiency and effectiveness in the FOs by nationalizing CFO and other positions in the Papua Office, having greater exchanges of staff between offices, using task forces that cut across Jakarta and field offices, and removing minor administrative impediments.

9. It is recommended that UNICEF complete the shift to the new upstream strategy.

10. It is recommended that UNICEF engage more closely with the decentralization process.

11. It is recommended that UNICEF clarify what it means to drive for equity in the context of the limited resources and upstream strategy pursued by UNICEF.

\(^1\) General agreement between BAPPENAS and UNICEF.
12. It is recommended that UNICEF develop a closer communication with the MoF, as this may have alerted UNICEF to the end of the direct funding approach ahead of time, and might have allowed for a discussion of alternatives that would have given more strategic room to UNICEF in its response.

Lessons Learned
1. UNICEF needs to have a formal strategy in place on how to capture effective results. This strategy needs to be advocated and understood agency wide.

2. UNICEF needs to have in place a set of actions to promote the strategy of decentralization.

3. UNICEF should invest in the specialized knowledge associated with the technically “soft” topic of decentralization.

4. UNICEF’s internal organizational style needs to reflect the main principles of the organization such as gender, equity, reach and decentralization.

5. UNICEF should continuously invest in its partnerships, as well as assess the benefits and liabilities of these partnerships.

6. UNICEF needs to have a plan for evaluation as a routine part of its five year Country Programme.
1.0 Introduction
This report presents the findings of the formative evaluation of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process in Indonesia. The findings, conclusions and recommendations have led to the development of lessons learned. The evaluation covers programme relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and equity, as well as the impact on children from UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process.

1.1 Decentralization
Decentralization is widely recognized as a key component of good governance and development, is broadly described as the process by which decision-making authority is passed down to lower level governments. In the Indonesian context, these lower levels of government will be referred to as subnational government (SNG) – when all three levels are being discussed (provincial, district/city, and village). Regional government (RG) will refer only to provincial and district/city governments, and the specific terms (provincial government, or district/city government) will be employed when differentiating regional government. The smallest level of government, village government, will be referred to by this term – particularly since this level of government has been further formalized in a recent law. On occasion, local government (LG) may be used in its international generic meaning, which is then interchangeable with subnational government – though often the connotation implies the lower levels of SNG. The careful and judicious use of these terms will allow for a close connection in our discussion to the Indonesian system while also linking this discussion to the international context.

Decentralization includes three distinct processes: deconcentration, delegation and devolution. Deconcentration is a process in which the central government (CG) delegates certain tasks/responsibilities for particular services to regional branch offices (dekonsertrasi in Indonesian). This is often viewed as the weakest form of decentralization because it simply delegates responsibilities from the central government officials in the capital city to those working in regions, provinces or districts. It was the mainstay of the SNG system in the New Order period. Delegation (tugas pembantuan) in its intergovernmental meaning is the process where the CG transfers some tasks relating to their functions to LGs. In this case, CG retains considerable control and demands upward accountability to the delegating entity. Even so, SNGs have a measure of autonomy in decision-making, and accordingly must also be accountuble to citizens. This is a more extensive form of decentralization. Finally devolution is the process where the CG transfers substantial power for decision-making, finance and administrative management to the SNG. Under this type of process, LGs have large discretion (although still bound to some national policies) and have a particular duty to account for these functions to citizens. No single term (deconcentration, delegation or devolution) alone can describe the decentralization process in Indonesia but in the majority, the process can be described as devolution.

Decentralization is one of the many progressive governance measures instituted since the reformasi took hold, and most observers would agree that it has accounted for progress (albeit uneven) in Indonesia’s political, social and economic conditions. At the same time, most observers would also agree that the promise of decentralization, in terms of sustainable
human development, including for children\(^2\), has yet to be fully realized. Most troubling, despite progress on many aggregate welfare indicators, deep disparities exist for most child-related indicators across and within the provinces. In Indonesia’s decentralized form of governance, overcoming these disparities depends largely on the capacity, priorities and willingness of the LGs. Children constitute a large percentage of Indonesia’s population, and therefore it is essential to create a demographic window of opportunity for the country to invest in youth. Rightly so, making decentralization work for children is one of the seven major strategies of the current 2011-2015 UNICEF Country Programme of Cooperation. There is, in principle, the potential for decentralization, by virtue of its participatory and empowering nature, to allow for more pro-child policies as practitioners, local leaders, community members, youth and children become involved in the process of development planning and implementation.

1.2 Decentralization in Indonesia
Decentralization is one of the many ways that Indonesia has progressed both socially and economically, yet this achievement has not been fully translated into sustainable human development, especially for children. Deep disparities exist for most child-related indicators across and within the provinces.

From our work in Indonesia\(^3\), we know that decentralization was being promoted starting in the 1970s.\(^4\) We know that these efforts became more focused in the 1990s with the adoption of a number of national laws and regulations. Many of the responsibilities of the CG were downloaded to the LG. Districts and municipalities now had the power to make many decisions concerning service provision and development directions, a right that was previously exercised by the provincial government. We understand that Indonesia is one of the most decentralized countries in the world, with about 500 provincial, district and city governments accounting for nearly 40% of public spending. This level of fiscal decentralization is higher than the Organization for Economic Co-operating and Development’s (OECD) average of 31%\(^5\).

1.3 Decentralization and Child Rights
Decentralization has the potential to allow LGs to act responsibly and accountably when it comes to child rights and governance for children, since decentralization allows the power to be devolved and exercised closer to the population it serves. It has the potential to allow children to have better access to schools, health centers and safe drinking water, leading to an improvement of child rights.

\(^2\)UNICEF’s definition of a child is any individual who is 18 years of age or younger.


1.4 Development of the Evaluation Plan
The focus of the evaluation was to inform the development of the 2016-2020 UNICEF Country Programme of Cooperation with the Government of Indonesia (GOI), and specifically to identify the best options for UNICEF’s engagement in Indonesia’s decentralization process in order to more effectively contribute to equitable achievement of results for children. It also assessed UNICEF Indonesia’s capacity and strategies to deliver results for children in line with the key priorities of Indonesia’s decentralization process and UNICEF’s global equity focus.

From the Terms of References (TOR) (included in Appendix 1), the key questions to which this evaluation hopes to provide insights include:

- How relevant is UNICEF’s programme strategy to make decentralization work for children in Indonesia, considering the organization’s global equity focus and the government’s development priorities as outlined in the national medium term development plan (RPJMN) and other national strategies?
- Has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process helped the organization contribute to the equitable fulfillment of child rights in Indonesia?
- What are the enabling or constraining factors that influence the long-term sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization?
- How cost effective has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been as a means to promote equitable realization of child rights in Indonesia?
- What efficiency and effectiveness lessons could be learned from past experiences with closing/moving UNICEF offices at sub-national level?
- Are the most marginalized children in Indonesia reached through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?

The results of the evaluation will be used to:

- Justify areas of improvement and refine activities of the current programming;
- Inform UNICEF Indonesia, GOI and other key partners who engage in promoting child rights in the decentralized context of Indonesia; and,
- To update equity focused programmes for children in other countries worldwide.
1.5 Structure of this Report
Following this introductory section, Section Two of this report provides a detailed description of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process in Indonesia.

Section Three provides an overview of the historical/retrospective approach to evaluation design that was used in the evaluation.

Section Four provides an overview of the evaluation methods that were used in the evaluation including key document review, key informant interviews and an online survey.

Section Five presents the evaluation findings as they relate to programme relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and equity.

Section Six presents a summary of evaluation findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned, derived from the evaluation process.

The Appendices follow the report which include: the terms of references, literature review, evaluation matrix, list of documents reviewed, data collection tools, individuals interviewed/individuals (and organizations) present at HCA meetings, selection of UNICEF partner regional governments in relation to the equity goal of UNICEF, the list of innovations, UNICEF’s list of implementing partners and the challenges and opportunities of decentralization for UNICEF.
2.0 UNICEF’s Engagement in the Decentralization Process in Indonesia

While regional and decentralized governments were considered starting in the 1970s, these efforts became more focused in the 1990s with the adoption of a number of national laws and regulations. Many of the responsibilities of the CG were downloaded\(^6\) to the LGs. Districts and municipalities now had the power to make many decisions concerning service provision and development directions, a right that was previously exercised by the provincial government.

UNICEF has concentrated on building and strengthening capacities at the provincial and district levels so that these lower tier governments have the tools and decision-making power to design and implement developmental policies and allocate budgets for developmental programmes in order to meet the requirements of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which Indonesia is a signatory to. The primary goal is to ensure the well-being of children, especially the most vulnerable.

2.1 Stakeholders

2.1.1 UNICEF

UNICEF, including the country office and FOs, organizes its efforts so that they align with the government’s policies and plans, at the national and regional level. Some of these policies include the RPJMN and the regional equivalent (RPJMD). It takes as its starting point for some initiatives, the laws and regulations (set by the different levels of government) covering women/children issues, and seeks ways of assisting their implementation.

2.1.2 Government of Indonesia

This includes all levels of government: national, provincial and district level. Indonesia’s multi-level government system is also a variable and shifting mix of decentralized and centralized features, with the changing framework often weak in rigor and consistency, and thus open to interpretation and contestation. After a permissive and rapid start to decentralization, the national government has sought to impose more rigid rules for planning, budgeting and financial management.

2.1.3 Other Community Organizations

Community organizations are often involved in the well-being of children, youth and mothers, this may include promoting education rights, gender equality, economic development and healthy lifestyles. In the current environment, many of these community organizations are directly hired by UNICEF.

2.1.4 Programme Beneficiaries

Children and Youth and Their Families

In the majority of cases, the direct changes associated with UNICEF’s programmes are experienced by UNICEF’s partners. They then deliver programmes to children, youth and their families, the ultimate beneficiaries of the actions of UNICEF, its governmental and non-

---

\(^6\) This is the equivalent of deconcentration or perhaps delegation in the decentralization literature. It refers to the allocation of responsibilities to the lower tier governments without giving full financial and decision-making authority.
governmental partners. The accumulated effort of various initiatives relating to education, health and income have been designed to make a positive impact on this group.

2.2 Funding
As stated in the GOI and UNICEF 2011-2015 Country Programme Action Plan Mid-Term Review Report, “The UNICEF Executive Board approved a total commitment not exceeding US$ 27,700,000 from UNICEF Regular Resources, subject to the availability of funds, to support the activities outlined in the CPAP. UNICEF was also authorized to seek additional funding (Other Resources) up to US$ 127,500,000 to support the programmes outlined in the CPAP” (p.11). The report also reveals that as of August 2013, approximately 54% of the required funding was received. It is updated to 2014 below.

Table 1: Summary of Planned, Available, and Expenditure of Funds, January 2011-2014 (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned (as per CPAP)</td>
<td>31,040,000</td>
<td>31,040,000</td>
<td>31,040,000</td>
<td>31,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Available</td>
<td>26,784,257</td>
<td>26,736,978</td>
<td>25,604,992</td>
<td>26,220,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>26,784,257</td>
<td>26,736,978</td>
<td>25,604,992</td>
<td>19,404,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UNICEF Indonesia.
*As of 3rd Quarter.

2.3 Logical Framework
The UNICEF decentralization programme has not developed a Logical Framework (LF) or Theory of Change model.\(^7\) It is suggested that the model the consultants have drafted (Table 2) be refined and incorporated in the next Country Programme. It is our perspective that best practice in LF development does not require that all elements in the Model be measured; the LF is a picture in words of what is to be accomplished. The monitoring and evaluation strategy for the programme should be developed in an evaluation plan for the programme which includes a Performance Management Framework or Evaluation Matrix of indicators to be used, timing and responsibilities.

\(^7\) The terms Logical Framework and Theory of Change are not equivalent, both represent ideas of how actions should lead to outcomes. There has been a recent move to increased use of the ideas associated with Theory of Change, however, the differences between this approach and more traditional logic modelling are not always clear. For a discussion of these approaches see http://betterevaluation.org/plan/define/develop_logic_model
The LF portrays a picture of the project and probable outcomes from the process of decentralization. *Narrative summary* refers to the words describing the project. *Indicators* are a measure of progress that can be reliably measured and that produces valid results. *Means of verification* informs us of where we can find the necessary data to prove that the objectives defined by the indicator have been reached. Finally *assumptions* refer to the external conditions necessary for the success of the project and *risks* refers to the probability that the assumptions will not hold. This was developed based on our understanding of UNICEF’s work related to decentralization.

Table 2: Logical Framework for Decentralization Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Summary</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
<th>Assumptions and Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal (Impact)</strong></td>
<td>To improve child rights and the governance for children (especially the disadvantaged) in Indonesia through capacity building at the subnational level.</td>
<td>List of Policies and programmes designed to improve the well-being of the most marginalized children.</td>
<td>Programme documents including: CCA, CPD, CPAP (2011-2015), MTR, Country Representative, UNICEF regional and national office staff, GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives (Outcome)</strong></td>
<td>1. Strengthen governance at all levels, including addressing long standing issues of size and quality of the bureaucracy and in clarifying and easing out the relationship between the three tiers of the government to improve the pro-child potential of decentralization.  2. Improve the coordination between actors in the field relating to child welfare and lack of harmonization of rules and regulations concerning women and children.  3. At the district/municipal/village</td>
<td>1. # Partner organizations by region and year that have received strengthening initiatives from UNICEF.  2. # of Partners by region by year that report that coordination has been improved partly through UNICEF efforts.  3. Districts/municipalities</td>
<td>Programme documents including: CCA, CPD, CPAP, MTR, Country Representative, UNICEF regional and national office staff, GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level, build knowledge and capacities in order to enable local authorities to fulfil their mandate and responsibilities effectively.

4. To improve the participatory potential of decentralization for child and youth programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs</th>
<th>Reported improvements</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Planned partnerships have been created and knowledge management systems relating to the welfare of children have been improved. | 1. # of planned partnerships created by yr/region  
2. # of KM systems created and improved by yr/region. | 1. UNICEF regional and national office staff and GOI staff.  
*Key document review.*  
*Key informant interviews and an online survey with UNICEF regional and national office staff and GOI staff.* |
| 2. Meetings, working sessions held.                                    | 2. # of meetings held by yr/region with UNICEF, GOI and other stakeholders nationally and regionally. | 2. UNICEF regional and national office staff and GOI staff.  
*Key document review.*  
*Key informant interviews and an online survey with UNICEF regional and national office staff and GOI staff.* |
| 3. Regular communication is maintained between the different levels of government allowing for the easier interpretation of plans, strategies and programmes related to the welfare of children. | 3. See 2 above. UNICEF staff report communication has improved giving it at least a 4.0 out of 5.0 in terms of level of improvement. | 3. UNICEF regional and national office staff and GOI staff.  
*Key document review.*  
*Key informant interviews and an online survey with UNICEF regional and national office staff and GOI staff.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Inputs/ Resources</th>
<th>Inputs/ Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Input received from children is included in municipal planning and budget programmes.</td>
<td>1.1 GOI initiatives, GOI staff, UNICEF staff (regional and national), and children.</td>
<td>1.1 Key document review. Key informant interviews and an online survey with UNICEF staff (regional and national), GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Creating planned partnerships and improving systems of managing knowledge relating to the welfare of children.</td>
<td>2.1 GOI initiatives, GOI staff and UNICEF staff (regional and national).</td>
<td>2.1 Key document review. Key informant interviews and an online survey with UNICEF staff (regional and national) and GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 UNICEF staff work with NGOs and GOI to promote child friendly development strategies in the regions.</td>
<td>3.1 GOI initiatives, GOI staff, UNICEF staff (regional and national) and staff from the involved NGOs.</td>
<td>3.1 Key informant interviews and an online survey with UNICEF staff (regional and national) and GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Maintaining regular communication between districts-provincial- national governments and vice versa in order to understand plans, strategies and programmes related to the well-being of children.</td>
<td><strong>Inputs/ Resources</strong> 4.1 GOI initiatives, GOI staff and UNICEF staff (regional and national).</td>
<td><strong>4.1 Key informant interviews and an online survey</strong> with UNICEF staff (regional and national) and GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Encouraging the drafting of local regulations relating to development planning and resource allocation at the district and provincial levels.</td>
<td><strong>Inputs/ Resources</strong> 5.1 GOI initiatives, GOI staff and UNICEF staff (regional and national).</td>
<td><strong>5.1 Key document review. Key informant interviews and an online survey</strong> with UNICEF staff (regional and national) and GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Strategies used in development planning, policy creation and resources allocation is justified with evidence.</td>
<td><strong>Inputs/ Resources</strong> 5.1 GOI initiatives, GOI staff and UNICEF staff (regional and national).</td>
<td><strong>Key document review. Key informant interviews and an online survey</strong> with UNICEF staff (regional and national) and GOI staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Evaluation Design
The Evaluation of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process in Indonesia used a historical/retrospective approach to explore plausible links between UNICEF policies, strategies and programmes related to decentralization with children’s welfare.

The historical/retrospective approach relies on the memory of people who participated or were affected by UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process. This approach asks programme participants and stakeholders to contribute information and opinions based on their experiences. The historical approach also relies on records/documents that can be used to recreate and evaluate the relevant dimensions of the programme.

The evaluation framework for the project included both process and outcome evaluation features. Typically, resources, activities, and units produced (outputs) constitute a process evaluation (e.g. did the project do what it intended to do?). Outcome evaluation corresponds with measures of change in individuals, institutions and communities (e.g. did the project change what it intended to change?).

Contribution analysis\(^8\) was used to assess causal questions and make conclusions about the contribution of UNICEF to particular outcomes. This approach recognized that UNICEF is one of many actors contributing to change observed. The value of contribution analysis is that it provides an approach to reduce uncertainty about the contribution the project is making to the observed results through an increased understanding of why the observed results have occurred and the roles played by the project and other internal and external factors.

---

4.0 Evaluation Methodology
A variety of data collection methods were used in the evaluation including document review, key informant interviews and online surveys to conduct a contribution analysis of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process.

Combining different approaches was useful in triangulating results. The concept of triangulation is based on the assumption that any bias inherent in particular data sources, investigator, and method will be neutralized when used in conjunction with other data sources, investigators and methods.

4.1 Document Review
HCA reviewed all relevant background documents. The information/data contained in these documents helped to inform the development of the evaluation framework and also represent as a source of information on the performance and success of the programme.

UNICEF has maintained an archive of documents related to decentralization in Indonesia and these were reviewed in detail by HCA. For a detailed list of these documents, please refer to Appendix 4.

4.2 Key Informant Interviews
Key informant interviews are guided interviews with individuals who have specialized knowledge about a particular issue area. They are used to gather in-depth, qualitative information on a subject and can be conducted in person (face to face) or by telephone. They can be structured or unstructured and they can be exploratory in nature. The interview is used to gain an understanding from the informant’s perspective and it reveals information about key characteristics of an issue area.

The key informant interviews aided in gathering qualitative data. HCA conducted 55 interviews with key stakeholders to identify actual outcomes as a result of UNICEF’s engagement. Please refer to the Appendices for the specific categories of individuals interviewed. The sustainability and equity of UNICEF’s engagement was examined through the interview questions. Specific key informants were identified in consultation with the evaluation management team.

Each of the stakeholder groups held a unique perspective on the strengths and challenges of UNICEF’s engagement and the benefits that this engagement provided to children. Key informant interviews were used to confirm/determine the evaluation questions included in the terms of references in the Appendices.

4.3 Online Survey
The online survey (Appendix 5) attempted to get a representative view of UNICEF staff on decentralization using a set of standardized questions. It was available to all UNICEF staff in Indonesia. All UNICEF staff were guaranteed confidentiality. Names of respondents were not collected or monitored.
The online survey was completed by 55 respondents between October 26 and November 17, 2014. The majority of the respondents were the staff from the Jakarta office (64.8%), while the remaining were from the subnational offices: Banda Aceh (3.7%), Surabaya (9.3%), Makassar, including Ambon (11.1%), Kupang (3.7%) and Jayapura, including Manokwari (7.4%).

Survey questions focused on the major questions of significance indicated in the evaluation matrix. Please refer to the Appendices:

- To what extent were the indicator targets and outcomes achieved?
- Are there any innovative good practices which can be identified?
- Are there any major obstacles/ risks that need further examination?
- How would you (UNICEF staff- Jakarta and regional offices) rate your knowledge of decentralization, in general?
- Which kind of UNICEF programming receives relatively more attention?
- Is UNICEF’s programming well aligned with government’s decentralization policies and initiatives?
- Which areas does UNICEF’s work emphasize, specifically in Indonesia?
5.0 Findings

This section of the report presents the evaluation findings. The findings draw on data and information collected through direct engagement with the different stakeholders that included government employees, UNICEF staff and staff from community organizations. The findings also draw on the data and information contained in the various documents reviewed.

The findings are divided into three subsections: fund channeling\(^9\), findings against evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and equity) and gender.

5.1 Fund Channeling

Prior to the fiscal year 2014, funding for projects implemented with UNICEF support, with governments in the provinces and districts, was transferred directly to the regional government or relevant regional government unit from the line ministry or UNICEF. In some cases, cash was brought from Jakarta to the areas where UNICEF was operating and deposited with the relevant coordinating/project committee.

In the case of direct funding, the national government (i.e. Ministry of Finance) did not have a clear understanding of who was funding what. In 2013, UNICEF and its partners were asked to change so that funding to government programmes supported by UNICEF among others, was delivered through national government ministries/agencies – thereby also making it easier for the Ministry of Finance to monitor these funds.

The local coordinating committees (coordination forum for Maternal and Child Survival, Development, and Protection Kelangsungan Hidup, Perkembangan, Perlindungan Ibu dan Anak - KHPPIA) had existed primarily to ensure the effective use of UNICEF funds (and related counterpart funds). This mechanism was already struggling in some regions, but with the absence of direct funding these bodies have become largely inactive. The related regional government units that made up the KHPPIA do continue to meet in some cases under related government initiatives, such as the Child Friendly City movement. Please refer to ‘the challenge of the new funds channeling mechanism’ in section 5.2.3.

The new approach to funding activities related to UNICEF programmes in the regions has not worked.

Ministries/agencies have failed to spend some of the UNICEF funds, and when undertaking activities in the regions they have had difficulties in getting the funds there. The regional governments that are involved in the ministry/agency managed activities do not feel that they have much ownership over these activities, and would much prefer to return to the direct funding model.

A return to the direct funding model may not be possible, or may not be possible in the near term. There are other means of undertaking activities in the regions however, and these have already been part of the Indonesian system of inter-governmental transfers (relating to

---

\(^9\) Fund channeling has been separated in this section to make it easier for the reader to grasp information related to fund channeling, as this is referred to multiple times throughout the report.
decentralized, deconcentrated, and assistance task modalities, see Figure 1). Based on the Figure 1 modalities, and the pattern of granting or cooperation seen in the case of other development partners, the consultant developed the alternatives for UNICEF consideration (beyond a return to direct funding of regional government) in Figure 2.

**Figure 1: Current Legal Basis for Funding Regional Government.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Likely Performance</th>
<th>Alignment With Decentralization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Continue as in 2014 (guided by GR #10/ 2011); UNICEF grants are on granted via ministries.</td>
<td>Uncertainty in legality of disbursements/ cumbersome/ risky CG ministries may not give attention to timely disbursement and management.</td>
<td>Poor; CG is managing and implementing activities that fall under RG functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UNICEF provides TA, and RG provides other parts of budget from APBD.</td>
<td>Can work well (see USAID- RTI- KINERJA); shows commitment. Some “poor” RG may struggle to contribute their part from APBD.</td>
<td>Well aligned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ministries fund RG via Deconcentration and/ or Assistance Tasks mechanisms (no UNICEF funds, except perhaps for ministry level activity).</td>
<td>Can work well (commonly used), but as in Alternative #1, there is no guarantee ministries will give attention. Works best when ministries want to get something done, and enlist RG to help them (i.e. the funding relates to CG functions).</td>
<td>Well aligned if the functions (project) has to do with CG functions. If it relates to functions of RG, then not well aligned (the funds are not on treasury at RG level).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UNICEF funds RG through MoF.</td>
<td>Is being set up now by AusAID/ EU/ ADB; a regular version, and a reimbursement version. Not clear is it will work well, but preparations are encouraging.</td>
<td>Well aligned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Four Alternatives Suggested for UNICEF and GOI for Consideration.**
Fundraising and Field Offices
FO fundraising is currently being tested in Surabaya. Lessons learned from this will form a basis for future expansion to other areas. If the experience is a positive one then Makassar may be the next FO to promote fundraising. Currently, in Surabaya, there is a team of in-house face to face fundraisers that recruit largely monthly pledge donations by soliciting people in shopping malls and streets. The team is based in the FO and is supervised by the Private Fundraising & Partnerships team in Jakarta. The local team supports them with capacity development and provides a local guardianship, as donors often call in to check the authenticity of the fundraisers. This method has been adapted because face to face fundraising has proved to be the most successful, raising almost 80% of UNICEF Indonesia’s funds from the private sector.\(^\text{10}\)

UNICEF Indonesia uses two outsourced face to face fundraising agencies, Appco and Optimo, for managing most of the face to face fundraising operations, besides the in-house team in Surabaya. Appco has been working with UNICEF Indonesia since 2006 and has conducted face to face fundraising campaigns in many cities including Surabaya and Makassar. Optimo has offices in several cities and is in the process of expanding to newer cities. However, this is done independently of the field offices, as it is a specialist activity managed under a central contract.\(^\text{11}\)

The evaluation team was informed that there may also be opportunities to work with corporations and major donors in the cities outside of Jakarta, on a case by case basis. However, this will be led by the Private Fundraising & Partnerships team in Jakarta, with some support from FOs, in terms of project visits and being part of events related to partnerships.\(^\text{12}\)

5.2 Findings against Evaluation Criteria
5.2.1 Relevance
The DAC/OECD guidelines provide the following definition:

“Relevance: The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor.

In evaluating the relevance of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent are the objectives of the programme still valid?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?”\(^\text{13}\)

\(^{10}\) UNICEF (Jakarta)
\(^{11}\) UNICEF (Jakarta)
\(^{12}\) UNICEF (Jakarta)
\(^{13}\) http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
1. How relevant is UNICEF’s strategy to make decentralization work for children in Indonesia, considering the organization’s global equity focus and the government’s development priorities as outlined in the RPJMN and other national strategies?

**UNICEF makes determined efforts to be relevant to Indonesia.**

UNICEF endeavors to be relevant in Indonesia, recognizing that it is a middle-income country that is gaining in financial and technical capacity. There is widespread acknowledgement in UNICEF and among partners that Indonesia still requires some technical support, but that in the main, it should have the means to replicate innovations once these are proven. As a number of public expenditure reviews have shown, the challenge for Indonesia is how to increase efficiency, equity and performance. The upstream focus that is increasingly seen in UNICEF’s work in Indonesia reflects this macro level assessment. It also reflects the priority to work with Indonesia in its decentralized capacity to strengthen provincial and local capacities.

The decision to support decentralization through the UNICEF country programme fits the national agenda. There is ongoing evidence of the importance of decentralization in the Indonesian societal and governance context. The evidence exists superficially in the continued expansion of the number of provinces and districts over time. They clearly respond to the political reality of a diverse, multicultural country with many regions seeking to access the power and money associated with a dynamic and growing country.

There is no doubt that Indonesia’s macro level status hides large disparities, spatial as well as between population groups. The increasing Gini coefficient in recent years is an indication of the persistence of inequalities.

After a permissive and rapid start to decentralization, the national government has recently sought to impose more rigid rules for planning, budgeting and financial management; these have curbed some excesses but have also stifled initiative and creativity.

Working in this difficult context requires UNICEF to be sensitive to formal and informal systems. It has in fact shown considerable success in developing bottom up approaches, as well as in taking advantage of national tendencies to impose some approaches, most recently the system approach to child protection. In this case, as in others, regional government do follow the national lead, some out of habit while others out of conviction. Results are therefore very uneven. Where UNICEF is present there is much success, but UNICEF has yet to consistently find approaches to extend this success to regions that are not its “focus” partners. National level policies and regulations are influenced, but these do not necessarily translate into changes on the ground at that scale. The adoption of policies at the district, provincial and national level is not sufficient to guarantee their sensitive implementation.

It is important to also recognize that UNICEF is nested organizationally in a global system. UNICEF makes it a point to adapt global UNICEF initiatives to country conditions. It is

---

reminded of this necessity on numerous occasions by government counterparts at all levels that insist on a “made in Indonesia” model. When it develops models, good practices or innovations, UNICEF makes attempts to embed these in the national/regional government systems, providing assistance for scaling-up and institutionalization measures. The revised framework becomes in turn a frame of reference for subsequent UNICEF cooperation with the government, at national and regional level.

The linkage of UNICEF content to Indonesian policies should not be overstated. The policy and plans of GOI, and also of its subnational governments, are rarely strategic.

What is more meaningful is the effort that UNICEF has put in preparing government counterparts to elucidate, or even enter for the first time, sections dealing with specific/emerging issues relating to women/child initiatives, services and rights. The methodology for influencing these documents in this meaningful way has been well elaborated in some cases, though in others it remains tacit individual/institutional knowledge. This kind of support has been seen at national level and in selected regions. An example of the outcomes of this endeavor has been the Analisis Situasi Ibu dan Anak (ASIA).

UNICEF is shifting away from several practices that characterized it in decades past. It is reducing its wide regional coverage, avoiding where possible providing top up funds to close service gaps in the regions, or following (mendampingi) planning processes as a general capacity development activity. Instead, it is becoming more strategic, seeking good partners for a more focused approach to the development of widely applicable models and good practices. This is apparent from UNICEF Indonesia’s Annual Report 2013, which states, “In 2013, UNICEF further broadened its engagement with a variety of partners, including private sector, media, academia and faith- based organizations to further enhance the realization of children’s rights in Indonesia” (p.9).

The shift also requires all stakeholders to appreciate where they have been and where they are headed. It appears that within UNICEF, and particularly among government partners, various individual or units are spread along various points on the journey from the previous approach to the new approach. The continued pressure from government partners for UNICEF to become more active in more districts is one indication of this reality (although it also reflects a relevant concern for equity that has been another challenge faced in UNICEF’s work and communications). The request to become more active in more districts was often the first request of the evaluators in the interviews in the provinces.

**UNICEF activities in support of decentralization.**

**UNICEF Field Offices**

In a country as diverse and geographically vast as Indonesia, keeping track of regional issues is difficult but important. The five field office provide an important mechanism to do so. The

---

16 Refer to Appendix 8 for the list of innovations.
18 The literature review (see Appendix 2) indicates that one of the focus areas of UNICEF has been to develop partnerships in order to achieve outcomes for children and one of the desired outcomes (by 2015) is for UNICEF to form partnerships to attain results for children and women.
organizational articulation of UNICEF in the regions\(^{19}\) is an important means for UNICEF to remain relevant to Indonesia. The FOs have been able to engage in a flexible and opportunistic fashion, taking advantage of a direct funding modality (to 2013). More recently, the FOs have been increasingly drawn into the new modus operandi of the organization associated with the new funding models, and they are making the transition – away from more direct support for service delivery and ad hoc capacity development. The persistence of these roles variously impede its potential contribution (dissipating its energies on low impact activities) and provide benefits (gaining trust, understanding of regional systems, ideas for new interventions or modalities). Despite contending with these opposing pulls, the FOs make a substantial contribution to UNICEF Indonesia, one that is sometimes not fully appreciated.

The Field Offices have seen many changes since 1950, when UNICEF first began its work in Indonesia. These changes can be seen as an ongoing attempt of UNICEF to remain relevant while mindful of the resources available to it. In the 1960’s, UNICEF was working at the grassroots level, in 100 villages in eight provinces.\(^{20}\) Following decentralization at the turn of the millennium, UNICEF followed suit, extending itself to 12 field offices covering 15 provinces. The zenith of this expansion was seen in the wake of the disaster in Aceh, where that office swelled to around 300 – and those resources likely floated the entire organization for some time. After the disaster response subsided, UNICEF reduced in size and has been under some continued pressure to attain efficiencies. In recent years, several FOs\(^{21}\) were shut or reduced in scope (Semarang closed in 2012, leaving Central Java to be served by Surabaya; the Ambon office was reduced to a satellite of Makassar).

Direct Cooperation Agreements (DCA) were signed with numerous governments; the approach was in large part that of assisting each district/city to close service gaps related to women/children. Over time, UNICEF engaged more intensively also with the provincial governments, seeking to help them to play a guiding role toward district/cities. In recent years the modality for this regional engagement has been similar to that at national level – via the HACT (Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer). This simplifies procedures and manages risks by assessing implementing partner\(^{22}\) systems, programmatic monitoring and undertaking spot checks on fiduciary issues. The ability to find entry points at all levels has been a clear strength of UNICEF, and one that appears to be highly valued by its donors. This field structure has also seen some smaller changes, in terms of FO staffing and communication, planning, and reporting procedures. These generally reflect attempts of UNICEF to be responsive to changing circumstances and needs, originating internally and externally. Aside from the extraordinary response seen in Aceh, most changes have been more in the order of one or two staff members. The FO therefore do not look exactly the same, differing largely in terms of the number of specialist staff that fall under the programmatic clusters. Their operating systems are also similar but not exactly the same. Some reporting channels differ among FO, and the pattern of placing international staff in

\(^{19}\) By this we mean field offices, satellite offices, reach of provinces/districts/cities and other formal relationships, exchanges between JKT and FOs. (insert organization chart)


\(^{21}\) Bandung/ West Java Office was closed in 2010 and the Ternate sub office was closed in 2010.

\(^{22}\) ’Implementing Partner’ refers to implementation by Partnership (including Government partners receiving DCT; PCA and SSFA with NGO partners also receiving DCT) or Procurement (institution contracts (IC) or long-term arrangement (LTA)).
the Papua office in particular stands out. In recent years, many internal Jakarta-FO
procedures in UNICEF’s internal accounting systems have changed, affecting the way FOs
work. Most of these seem to support increased centralization of administrative and financial
management systems.

As shown in the Appendices the official criteria offered in the Bappenas-UNICEF general
agreement (Pedum) are not actually followed, and how decisions are actually made is not too
clear. Decisions for programming and how districts are chosen could be more transparent.
Otherwise, this could have debilitating consequences in terms of attaining the aims of
UNICEF, particularly on the principle of attaining equity for Indonesia’s children. Possible
consequences are mission drift and dissipation of energies on numerous requests that can
sap UNICEF of the ability to generate results where they count.

**UNICEF does not have a decentralization strategy, but may not need an elaborate strategy.**
The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) (2011-15) contains the following statement as a
cross cutting strategy:

“Continued support to decentralization. Special efforts will be directed at developing the
technical capacity of local governments for evidence-based planning and budgeting at the
provincial, district and village levels in selected areas. Selected districts will be assisted in
developing and enforcing local laws in favour of children and women, promoting popular
participation in setting the public agenda, effectively analyzing the situation of children and
women for informed decisions and allocation of resources. District and community
interventions will be accompanied by provincial and national components for policy
development, monitoring and evaluation, and creating a platform for replication. Supporting
model design to enhance quality of and access to basic services require a strategic targeting
approach and implementation in selected districts will vary by programme support areas to
address disparities and fulfill the rights of vulnerable children and women. Making
community voices heard by district authorities requires strategic partnerships with community
based organizations, religious groups, knowledge institutions, the private sector, local and
mass media.”

It is not entirely clear what the UNICEF strategy is for its engagement in decentralization in
Indonesia. Our finding corroborates that of the 2006-2012 regional thematic evaluation of
UNICEF. This regional evaluation found that all offices have an “emergent” strategy. At a
very broad level this is also the case for the Indonesia country office.

At a very general level, and cast in terms of aid effectiveness, UNICEF joined 25 other
development partners in signing the Jakarta Commitment in January 2009, entailing
(paraphrasing) (i) stronger national ownership; (ii) equal partnerships of mutual benefit; (iii)
moving from financial assistance to a more strategic and catalytic role; (iv) a more
programmatic approach; (v) stronger focus on capacity development and a results-
orientation. That general pledge makes it more necessary for UNICEF to engage on
Indonesia’s terms, which means engaging with a decentralized system of government. The
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23 Literature review (see Appendix 2) indicates that access to basic sanitation services have increased by 52% since 2008,
however, less than 35% of households in rural regions have access to basic sanitation facilities.
25 Kumar A.K. Shiva and Katherine Hay (2013). Thematic Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to Decentralization in East Asia and
the Pacific: 2006-2012, May.
CPAP also included two outcomes that appear to address decentralization (These remain relevant today in the decentralized Indonesian context):

1. “Improved government and community-based organizations capacities at national and sub-national levels for implementing a holistic early childhood development, strengthened legislation and increased budget allocations for achieving school readiness for children below 7 years age.\textsuperscript{26}
2. Decision makers at national and sub-national levels have access to and utilize a comprehensive monitoring and data collections systems on child protection for policy, planning and budgeting purposes” (p. 12).

In term of the UN system in Indonesia, the United Nations Partnership for Development Framework (UNPDF) states its goal in the five year period 2011-2015 to be “Making decentralization work, particularly in the disadvantaged and remote regions to narrow the development gap with other regions through proper policies, regulations and capacities”, the UNPDF continues, “A special effort will be made to move upstream, limit service delivery, and enhance knowledge creation for national and regional policy making processes.”\textsuperscript{27} The upstream reference is also widely used in the CPAP (see below).

Descending to UNICEF itself, the CPAP is sanguine on UNICEF’s potential to make decentralization work for children. It holds that the political transformation in Indonesia and calls for greater attention to the dynamic relationship and synergy between central and sub-national governments.” UNICEF will move from project-based service delivery to capacity development of sub-national authorities in evidence-based planning and budgeting, policy formulation, management and monitoring of quality social services”. This statement still remains relevant in 2014.

There are however few details in the CPAP to explain how UNICEF will work to achieve the stated aims. Adding confusion to its broad message are inconsistencies in what is meant or what is being conveyed. As also in the regional thematic evaluation, there are mixed messages being voiced regarding whether UNICEF works within the context of decentralization, or if it also works on the improvement of the decentralization framework (or some combination of the two). To a large degree it appears that UNICEF is content to work in the regions to facilitate decentralization, without specific actions taken or proposed. The thinking seems to be that if UNICEF works through FO’s, Indonesia’s decentralized capacity will be strengthened.

\textbf{The messages on decentralization suggest the larger strategic shift is not fully realized.}
The CPAP does signal that UNICEF intends to provide technical assistance, “at sub-national level to ensure the continued adaptation and development of a protective legal and policy framework within the parameters and requirements of decentralization.” A notable approach that has some clarity is the commitment to pursue poverty-reduction programmes, through

\textsuperscript{26} Literature review (see Appendix 2) indicates that though minimal, disparities still exist between males and females for primary school completion rates. Even though school participation rates have increased over the years, disparities are magnified with differing income levels.

the Musrenbang, the participatory planning process from village to national level. The CPAP deems this mechanism to be “the most appropriate and strategic point for ensuring evidence-based planning and budgeting for children...to ensure plans and budget allocations at all levels are in line with the priorities of poverty reduction and realization of children’s rights.”

In practice, UNICEF appears to not make much use of the Musrenbang process. As part of its shift away from service delivery and engaging with numerous regions, UNICEF probably has less of a reason to deal with the Musrenbang process – unless it is to advocate a specific approach or planning tool. In short, it is no longer UNICEF’s strategy to channel funds for service delivery or to even try to directly shape allocations in a wholesale fashion across many jurisdictions. For this reason, the CPAP appears to be somewhat dated in its framing of the UNICEF role in Indonesia’s decentralized government context.

There is no clear repository of decentralization expertise—or access to it—for UNICEF.
The thinking about decentralization in UNICEF Indonesia is diffused, with no one being given specific responsibility for this thematic issue. Familiarity levels vary widely, a reality readily acknowledged by UNICEF staff, particularly in view of the international rotations in the Jakarta office, where country assignments are 4-5 years in duration usually.

From a UNICEF staff perspective, The survey carried out for this study showed that when staff were asked how they rated their knowledge of decentralization, 6 of 54 respondents rated themselves as very good (5 out of 5 on a 5 pt. scale) and only 14 out of 54 rated themselves as less than satisfactory (1 or 2 out of 5). In a similar question, 30 out of 54 respondents indicated their knowledge of decentralization in Indonesia was adequate or more than adequate.

UNICEF documents sometimes display a lack of familiarity with the structures and procedures of the government system. For an example, in the Issues Brief- Making Decentralization Work for Children in Indonesia, it states, “In contrast, the 1999 decentralization laws drastically devolved functions of the central government to local governments (mainly to the district/municipal levels which became autonomous), granting them decision-making powers that were equal to those exercised by the provincial governments.” This is off in several ways: “autonomous” here is regarded as an absolute value/state, whereas there was a degree of autonomy before the Laws 1999, and a higher degree of autonomy after that. Also, it is not helpful to say that districts/cities were given decision-making powers “equal to those exercised by the provincial governments.” One would need to understand what is meant by “powers” here. If it means functions, this statement is patently wrong – the two levels have different sets of functions. If it means that they can engage in certain governance processes (planning, budgeting etc.) these were already being undertaken prior to the laws of 1999, and in a generic sense have always been similar between provinces and districts/cities.

Secondly, in the Cerita dari Indonesia, it states, “UNICEF memberikan advokasi pada gubernur Papua untuk meminta sekolah agar memainkan peran kunci dalam peningkatan kesadaran di kalangan kaum muda. Hasilnya, pada tahun 2011 Gubernur membuat peraturan wajib belajar HIV/AIDS bagi siswa Sekolah Dasar (SD) sampai Sekolah Menengah Atas (SMA).” It can strongly be argued that UNICEF should have been advocating the Mayor/Bupati (not the
Governor) for messages on HIV/AIDS regarding elementary/junior high school students, in line with functional assignment (GR 38/2007).

There is a wealth of practical experience in the FOs relating to SNG, born of engagement with SNG and by virtue of their composition – entirely national staff. The latter however have their own limitations in terms of limited exposure to the international context, and being at a distance from the national arena where policies and programs on decentralization are made, often with little consultation with regional/local actors.

UNICEF does not appear hooked into decentralization initiatives of other development partners, including those of UNDP, an organization that has seen considerable efforts in this area in Indonesia. While UNDP is currently playing a leading role in reviving and redefining the role of the Donor Working Group on Decentralization (established soon after reforms began), UNICEF has not been part of that group at any time. It has also not been part of the Donor Working Group on Minimum Service Standards, a forum that speaks to several concerns dear to UNICEF, such as access to district/city managed services and standards of services that pertain to mothers and children.

UNICEF has not sought to gain inputs from UNDP on decentralization related issues. It does not appear that UNICEF has been aware of UNDP’s support for the decentralization process (e.g., on the role of the province). The ONE UN system approach has its transaction costs, but there could be an attempt to see whether these costs are outweighed by the collaboration that could come from exchanges between UNDP and UNICEF. UNDP itself might gain in return. It is not inconceivable for instance that UNDP provides inputs relating to national and provincial level, while UNICEF responds in kind based on its greater familiarity with district/city (and in the future possibly village government) levels.

Another way for UNICEF Indonesia to become more decentralization savvy may be to share its experiences, and vice versa, with UNICEF Cambodia and other countries in Asia where an effort has been made to engage with newly established/empowered SNG. In Cambodia, UNICEF has attempted to assess the capability of communes to take on various roles associated with the UNICEF mandate. Commune Councils were established in 2001. UNICEF has more recently been exploring roles for the District/Municipal Councils, established in 2009.

A basic understanding of decentralization in the Indonesian context may be made part of the orientation of new staff. More specific themes could be picked out to become the focus of a mini-session every six months or annually on the occasion of organization wide meetings/retreats.

Effective anchoring to national institutions relevant to SNG-UNICEF partnerships is critical. The long list of national government counterparts met by our team is evidence of the multiple connections at this level; twelve ministries/agencies, with sometimes several focus points within them, dealing with different initiatives in the sector. As is the case at the regional level, counterparts are on the whole appreciative of the cooperation with UNICEF, and desirous of continued support. There are however some areas of concern. As voiced by the Ministry or Women’s Empowerment and Child Protection (KPPPA), UNICEF seems to
cycle through new initiatives at a rapid clip, jumping from one to the other as the moment dictates. This opportunistic approach has its merits, but it leaves some counterparts in the lurch, as their expectations are for a more complete package of support around any one initiative.

Another area of concern relates to the rather limited replication seen in a number of innovations sponsored by UNICEF. Even when they have considerable early success at a small scale (or even at district scale), the replication effort dissipates in these cases. There can be several reasons for this occurrence; one of them is not making full use of the national guidance that is possible. This is particularly the case for the Ministry of Home Affairs, where UNICEF is strongly linked to the Regional Development Directorate General, perhaps reflecting the joint/bottom-up planning approach that characterized the UNICEF-government engagement prior to this CPAP period. In the current CPAP, it appears that a more flexible engagement is needed within MoHA, considering its important guidance role, and specifically the relevance of the mandates in its units, covering several areas of concern to UNICEF. Hence, it would be more useful to engage more than one Directorate General.

UNICEF will need to stay abreast of organizational changes in central Government. With a new Ministry that includes villages (Kementerian Desa, Transmigrasi, dan Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal), the Directorate General for People and Village Empowerment in MoHA may be shifted to this new ministry; the government’s organizational structure will remain unclear until a President’s decree is issued. If UNICEF is to work with village government it will need to discern how to engage with one or both.

While it is important to not stretch limited resources over too many relationships, there may be value in scanning more broadly, including not only the mentioned directorates in MoHA but also training arms of MoHA in the regions, or the Agency for State Administration (LAN) which is instrumental in career and other training for civil servants, and has Jakarta and regional sites. Embedding good practices and models in the offerings of these agencies may go a long way toward a greater impact throughout Indonesia.

One additional ministry that deserves more attention is the Ministry of Finance. UNICEF has had little interaction with this ministry, and yet this is where the funds channeling policies have been originating. It has also not linked with other DPs other than UNDP to gain a better perspective and channel its concerns more effectively. As some UNICEF members have pointed out, it may have been useful to link with the World Bank, or the Decentralization Working Group, to pursue this issue collectively. Despite having had three years (of exceptions) since 2011, UNICEF appears to have been blindsided by the policies, with considerable disruption and no clear game plan for responding. The lack of Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (Regional Level) (APBD) funds to continue the work of the KHPPIA teams in the regions is one indication of this lack of anticipation and preparation. The scrambling to channel more funds to third parties was a last minute strategy, one that may be salutary in some respects, but also has its dangers if poorly implemented.

---
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A more anticipatory stance in UNICEF might have been helpful. But having such a stance presupposes a sensitivity to the shifting decentralization context, with its risks and opportunities.

**UNICEF has been finding ways to manage, on an incremental basis, its engagement with decentralization.**

In the absence of the requisite dedicated or external expertise, UNICEF maximizes that which it has internally. Decentralization policy of UNICEF, if it can be discerned at all, spills from technical and managerial programmatic decisions, rooted in the dynamics of the clusters and their relationships with government and FOs. These decisions do not appear to establish policy as such since they are micro level and usually not directed to decentralization per se. They relate to specific assessments or considerations that affect programming, such as degree of local interest, administrative capacity of SNG/FOs/third parties, personal relationships that facilitate entry points, and other factors.

By accretion, these individual choices could be said to add up to an “emergent strategy,” but it is a form of muddling through, where strategy is kept implicit, if even recognized. Improvements on decisions are made over time, and through a process of incrementalism the operations of UNICEF seek to remain relevant to the changing governance context of Indonesia. However, this way of making strategy (while having some advantages, such as flexibility) does not generally lead to coherence in programming and possibly may not yield the best results against high-level goals of UNICEF. That there is a felt need for this review suggests that the UNICEF country office has some discomfort with the status quo in this regard.

**Moving toward a more explicit strategy for UNICEF in decentralization.**

There is a healthy amount of internal discussion that touches on decentralization related issues, at least between clusters at central level, and similar ones in FOs. These are felt to be helpful in working across clusters and in challenging assumptions when important decisions are at stake. This informal approach may not be sufficient to come to grips with both the challenges and opportunities of working in a decentralized context or working on decentralization. It may be necessary, as a first step, for UNICEF Indonesia to appreciate collectively how decentralization can affect its work, as a shared base for making some explicit kind of strategy on decentralization. It behooves UNICEF to scan the decentralization arena to safeguard against the risks, and seek to position itself to take advantage of opportunities.

UNICEF may not need an elaborate decentralization strategy, but it may wish to develop a core set of principles or “Good Practices in Decentralization” that will influence its decision-making as it works in its programmatic clusters and across them. These principles can lend coherence to the programs and ensure that UNICEF is not a lagging behind in terms of good practices relating to decentralization, and more broadly that it is in tune with aid effectiveness principles. UNICEF itself will need to agree on what is relevant and salient for its work. This should not stop UNICEF from making some exceptions at times, but these should be few and purposeful - to gain entry and build trust, so as to later make a contribution that is more than worth the original compromise.
Beyond the above guiding principles, UNICEF may benefit from some reflection on some weightier questions, above all:

1. Is it enough for UNICEF to manage itself well within the current Indonesian decentralized system of governance to further its aims?
2. Could UNICEF benefit from supporting significant changes in the decentralized system of governance that will make it even more effective in furthering its aims?

In practice, UNICEF emphasizes the first, but does some of both. It is not clear what determines the balance, and what triggers a shift from one to the other. One UNICEF key informant suggested that UNICEF works to build good practices that are championed by the system itself, and when it notes blockages then it adds a layered intervention to dislodge the bottleneck, largely through advocacy (and other upstream activities). Responses to the online survey for this evaluation suggest a greater appetite for contributing to the decentralization framework than is currently reflected in UNICEF’s work. It may not be possible, or advisable, to pre-set a particular mix of effort, but keeping these two notions in mind, and determining where the most impact can be obtained could be helpful.

The questionnaire survey of UNICEF staff showed that 75.9% of respondents supported the following priority for the CPAP:

“Making decentralization work for children through support of technical capacity development for evidence-based planning and budgeting, management and monitoring of quality basic social services.”

There were several suggestions in the survey on ways to strengthen decentralization strategies:

1. “Review of budget allocation, human resource capacity and structures at decentralized level as evidence to inform advocacy;
2. Review of model of interventions; and
3. “Realistically review whether we can afford to staff our offices with the right people and resources to really work at decentralized levels. If not, we should accept a more modest approach to working in Indonesia (e.g. standard setting, monitoring services, supporting treat-based reporting, etc.).”

There is also a need to discern which partners are to be the focus, and in which kind of relationships. This entails answering the following:

1. Which level of SNG should receive the most attention, or if more than one is to receive significant attention, what is the relationship between the levels (division of labour, interconnections)?
2. What use of third parties will be made, and what is the point of this involvement, and how is the triangle UNICEF, SNG, and third parties expected to work?

When staff surveyed were asked to complete the statement: “In the future, UNICEF support for the decentralization policies/initiatives of the government should:” some 90.6% of respondents suggested it should increase substantially or increase somewhat. Referring to the already mentioned compendium of good practices in decentralization could help to answer these questions.
Another important question is how the focus on equity and reaching the most marginalized can best be made operational, and this inevitably will implicate additional choices related to the decentralized system of governance:

1. How many SNGs need to be made partners and at which levels? (considering resources and the strategic approach used – model/system development and upstream influence)
2. How are the larger aims of reaching the most marginalized, and achieving equity to condition the choice of which SNG become partners to choose, and the nature of the models/systems to be developed?
3. For how long are SNG to remain partners, and with what support?

Some of the above questions will receive more attention in this report. They are covered in this section to indicate a kind of scanning approach related to decentralization that is necessary to inform UNICEF’s overall strategy.

As a final thought, it is only after answering some of these larger questions that it will be possible to discuss meaningfully the fine-grained management decisions. It is not possible to discuss efficiency for instance in the abstract, without joining it to effectiveness.

2. What conceptual framework does UNICEF employ regarding the linkage between decentralization and its work with children and does this correspond to literature/experiences?

The consultants could not find any specific strategy being used by UNICEF to support decentralization in Indonesia. To assist in exploring what outcomes might be expected, the consultants have constructed a draft logical framework, which could be used to elaborate a strategy. We welcome your comments and would be prepared to facilitate a workshop to fill this in.

3. Does UNICEF have staff that are sufficiently knowledgeable of decentralization issues relevant to UNICEF and able to incorporate this knowledge in programming?

There appears to be an incomplete understanding of the institutional framework for decentralization.

There is a strong attachment to Bappenas (and somewhat less but still strong link to Ministry for Women’s Empowerment and Protection of Children KPP-PA), and a weak link to Home Affairs, the general guidance body for SNG – even with KHPIPA secretariat being placed in Bangda directorate general. There is low familiarity with Direktorat Jenderal Otonomi Daerah (Directorate General of Regional Autonomy) and other agencies, which are key to some important aspects, and will be even more so with recent changes (see Law 23/2014 on RG, and Law 6/2014 on village); Minimum Service Standards (versus focus on just MDGs, which is Bappanas based), and guidance on capacity development/good practices sharing, and working with province/deconcentration stream to make province/Governor more of an engine for support and replication toward district and city innovations. There is no link at all to Ministry of Finance, not even through other related DPs.
There is insufficient familiarity with functional assignment.
Some appreciation for the roles of different levels, especially at national level (policy, standards, budget, technical support, monitoring); that the province should be involved in supporting districts/cities. But there is not much clarity on the legal and practical division of labour between province and district/city on functions pertaining to children. In part this stems from deficiencies in the legal framework (PP 38/2007; recently updated and placed in Law 23/2014 on regional government, but with persistent deficiencies) but it also indicates an insufficient engagement with these issues. As the role of the village government expands, this will add additional impetus for discerning which level ought to do what, and how it relates to other levels. At the moment, there are good examples within the UNICEF engagement to build on (province incentivizing district/city through grants), and also initiatives that are best avoided (or not supported by UNICEF if SNG or CG insist on it: Province managed pilots in the city of Makassar’s wards (Kelurahan Layak Anak), province integrated service centre for women/children when one exists at city level).

There is some degree of top down and bottom up integration and consultation with government in the planning processes.
Knowledge of the Indonesian planning process appears to be sound in UNICEF, for all levels of government. Even so, the UNICEF planning was more connected with that system in prior years, or at least had a more bottom up dimension. For perhaps several reasons, in particular in the new funding modality of working through the ministries and agencies, the proximity to this process has been lost. There is a need to influence and reflect the priorities of regional government, but this should not necessarily mean taking part or supporting the planning process in many regions, for its own sake.

UNICEF appears to support a formalistic approach to coordinating structures and procedures. There is use of vertical coordination structures established formally by Bappenas/MoHA and central ministries/agencies. These pose a dilemma for UNICEF as they indicate government leadership, but are in spirit rather contradictory to decentralization, as they impose structures on sub national governments.

There is a keen sensitivity to local political/change dynamics, less so at national level. There is no one in UNICEF Indonesia that is charged with keeping an overall track of decentralization framework and dynamics, to anticipate impact on UNICEF. Slow response to the new funding modality (via K/L) is one indication. The haphazard, and off the mark support for village heads (mass socialization) is another. There are more changes afoot that are only partly on the radar and may require a more proactive scanning and positioning from UNICEF:

1. Possible end of direct elections of regional heads; they will become more aligned with DPRD and parties; discerning real commitment will require going beyond the District Head.
2. Increased village government role in social services
3. More provinces and district/city splitting, even if now under the control of the government (not Parliament any more)

Refer to subsection “Barriers to Capacity Building and Well-being of Children and Women” in the Literature Review section in Appendix 2. It discusses the four main themes that act as barriers to the well-being of children and women.
4. How closely does UNICEF wish to link to the new government national policies and plans (post-election) particularly on issues of decentralization, and does it have a game plan for making this connection possible?

In the interviews, respondents noted there was some attempt to influence the village law 6/2014, though informal rather than institutional linkages. UNICEF is not part of the revived Donor Working Group on decentralization that is extending its scope to bureaucratic reform. The latter is high on the political agenda of the new government, framed as bureaucratic reform that is to yield better services.

5. To what extent is UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process aligned with UNICEF’s global equity focus for addressing the needs of the most marginal and vulnerable children?

UNICEF has clearly given priority to the provinces with the worst scores on the HDI (Table 2, UNICEF focus areas as of 2013 are indicated by a checkmark), although there are some provinces that do not fit (Jawa Tengah, Sumatera Utara) (see Appendix 7 for the criteria used to select provinces).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Focus Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Papua</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>Jawa Timur</td>
<td>Jawa Barat</td>
<td>73.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sulawesi Utara</td>
<td>77.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusa Tenggara Barat</td>
<td>67.73</td>
<td>Jawa Barat</td>
<td>Indonesia (BPS)</td>
<td>73.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yogyakarta</td>
<td>77.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusa Tenggara Timur</td>
<td>68.77</td>
<td>Jawa Tengah</td>
<td>Bali</td>
<td>74.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>DKI Jakarta</td>
<td>78.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua Barat</td>
<td>70.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku Utara</td>
<td>70.63</td>
<td>Jawa Tengah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Barat</td>
<td>70.93</td>
<td>Kepulauan Bangka Belitung</td>
<td>74.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Barat</td>
<td>71.41</td>
<td>Jambi</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Tenggara</td>
<td>71.73</td>
<td>Sumatera Selatan</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Selatan</td>
<td>71.74</td>
<td>Bengkulu</td>
<td></td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorontalo</td>
<td>71.77</td>
<td>Kalimantan Utara</td>
<td>74.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banten</td>
<td>71.90</td>
<td>Sumatera Barat</td>
<td>75.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Tengah</td>
<td>72.54</td>
<td>Sumatera Utara</td>
<td>75.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku</td>
<td>72.70</td>
<td>Kalimantan Tengah</td>
<td>75.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>72.87</td>
<td>Kepulauan Riau</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh</td>
<td>73.05</td>
<td>Riau</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Selatan</td>
<td>73.28</td>
<td>Kalimantan Timur</td>
<td>77.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses indicate a variety of criteria actually used, or thought to have been used, to select regions. Moreover, the actual regions where collaboration is taking place extend well beyond the focus regions (within selected provinces). There is value in the actual approach, but there needs to be some consistency, and greater awareness, shared perceptions, focused on the exigencies of the “model building/upstream work” strategy that has been emphasized since the CPAP/MTR 2013.

---

30 *Human Development Index - HDI* A tool developed by the United Nations to measure and rank countries’ levels of social and economic development based on four criteria: Life expectancy at birth, mean years of schooling, expected years of schooling and gross national income per capita.
6. Is UNICEF maximizing the resources available at subnational level in furthering its work? What level of resources are being used/ mobilized by UNICEF?

Field Offices as the key resource of UNICEF.
FOS contain administrative support, leadership on programming and engagements with partners, sensitivity to local, social and the political context, and technical skills. There is some frustration with Jakarta not giving enough push on some products with respect to national institutions, however on the whole, FO staff believe they are getting enough support and leeway (or tolerance of local initiative) to get their job done. There is sufficient long tenure of key staff, and movement between FOs to give continuity and a fresh view. Some unfilled positions are found in the FOs but not any more than might be expected; Papua staff admit their costs are higher, but this is to be expected for Papua. Moreover, specialists in CSD in Jakarta believe the reductions in the FOs are short-sighted; Bean counting and losing sight of their contribution, and that donors would not give UNICEF funds were it not for their view that this is a comparative advantage that UNICEF has.

Fundraising of national and FO seem rather centralized, even if leads are gathered regionally they are than passed on for JKT management. For Surabaya or Makassar there is more scope for responsibility and for regional management in this regard. No incentives appear evident to promote fundraising from regional offices. Links with SNG in jointly managing CSR are also not evident. There should be greater responsiveness: to new issues, like:
- Village empowerment framework, anticipating but not acting yet
  - As a transition mechanism for the Village Law, PNPM Mandiri includes community assistance among its components. PNPM facilitators are prepared to assist village governments in creating a village plan and budget (RPJMDes/RKPDes/APBDesa). Sub-district head will need support to evaluate the village budget (APBDesa). In Java, in one workshop, participants recommended that provincial governments provide funds to hire assistants with professional contracts in the 2015 provincial budget (ABPD). These assistants should include technical assistants, consultants, and civil servants working with communities. UNICEF could play an important role to show how this new configuration could be applied to children’s welfare, effectively linking SKPD, UPTD and village government, making the best use of the PNPM legacy.
- Antennae not out yet for direct elections may mean less policy (evidence) driven RGs, less innovative leadership from District Heads, more linkages to parties, and more money politics. This could affect the selection/anchorage strategies of UNICEF. UNICEF may need to identify innovative/risk taking/learning and more intensive preparation.

5.2.2 Effectiveness
Effectiveness is defined as the following:
“A measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives. In evaluating the effectiveness of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:
- To what extent were the objectives achieved / are likely to be achieved?”
1. Has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process helped the organization contribute to the equitable fulfillment of child rights in Indonesia?

It is clear from the answers to question 3 on the survey that the majority of respondents think that engagement in the decentralization process by UNICEF has helped. Of the 54 respondents, 28 found this to be clear or very clear (Figure 3). In a separate question, 30 of 54 respondents said they felt the province or district has benefitted most, with the most important beneficiary being the District according to 23 respondents. Several individuals explained why they felt this way:

“In this large decentralized country where most of the programmatic decisions are taken at decentralized level (implementation, quality, resource allocation), there seems no choice for UNICEF to engage at decentralized level to further its equity agenda.”

“UNICEF works specifically in the area of survival, health, education and child protection which are the area that are mostly decentralized to be managed by local government. Head of district and his team became the direct duty bearer to fulfill mother and children rights.”

Those that contradicted this specified the following:

“UNICEF is not fully engaged in decentralization considering that some decisions were made based on national recommendations rather than provincial or district needs.”

The evaluators would confirm the judgment of UNICEF staff. Based on the key informant interviews with partners, the review of documents and the survey, we would confirm that the organization has contributed significantly.32

It could do more and we address this in the recommendations. We pay particular attention to the development of models in districts and villages in targeted regions and the ways in which the lessons from those models can be scaled up and promoted (“socialized”) to all levels of governments and other partners. There has been a lack of consistency in the way in which models tested in the provinces have been scaled up. Available documentation on Best Practices is variable and apparently non-existent in some places, even when the results are seen as being universally successful.

The second part of the effectiveness question is partially dealt with here and in the discussion of equity later on in this report. The data show (Table 2) that provinces that are lower on the HDI have been prioritized. The interviews carried out convinced the evaluators that where possible the villages most in need in the targeted districts were being targeted with programming initiatives. In addition, there was evidence that need was a priority, and areas

---

31 From OECD DAC guide.
32 The literature review (Appendix 2) indicates that UNICEF and its supporters understand the importance of child protection and a large proportion of their budget is allocated to this.
with special needs (i.e. malaria in Sabang District, Aceh\textsuperscript{33}) were targeted even when they were not in one of the targeted districts for a given province. There is evidence of a need to be both flexible and systematic in programming and UNICEF is attempting to do that.

![Figure 3: Number of Responses Related to the Belief that Decentralization Will Contribute to More Equitable Child Development (Based on 55 Responses).](image)

1. Are UNICEF’s efforts linked to key government initiatives/programs to improve services that are critical to children (e.g. Minimum Service Standards, Public Service Standards, service complain mechanisms, service charters, Ombudsman, freedom of information/government information centres)?
2. Has UNICEF’s engagement at decentralized levels helped or hindered the effective and equitable fulfillment of child rights for all children in Indonesia?
3. What unintended outcomes have resulted from UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process?

\textbf{Relationships with regional government.}

Effectiveness in UNICEF’s work is very much determined by the quality of the relationships with regional government. This has been a strong feature of UNICEF’s work in the past. It has changed dramatically in the last year however, and it posed an existential threat to UNICEF as it is configured.

The cash transfer mechanism, used with regional government prior to 2014, was an ideal instrument to engage in a flexible and responsive way. Strong relationships were built over the years with SNG IPs, that to some degree are persisting through the disruptive effect of the new mechanisms put in place in 2013.

The FOs are given credit, by both Jakarta and FO staff, for fashioning strong relationships with regional governments that encompass working level staff as well as the leadership. It is not uncommon to hear RG staff mention appreciatively the bridging role that UNICEF plays between RG units – that tend to work in silos – as well as between the bureaucracy and the political leadership. The informal relationship some CFOs and specialists have been able to forge with District Heads/Mayors has been instrumental in advocating initiatives and in fostering good communication and timely action. In one region, this bridging was even employed to smoothen the political tensions between competing leadership centered on party/province-city differences.

One of the unanticipated benefits of the coordinating meetings (KHPPIA) chaired by BAPPEDA and held in the provinces between UNICEF and its partners up until 2013 was the opportunity it opened up to do strategic planning with key partners for the medium term plan within the province and agree on targeted interventions on particular issues.

Through this mechanism, prior to the aforementioned funds channeling changes, RG and UNICEF worked well together to prepare annual plans that would travel upward to the national level, being conditioned as other considerations were brought to bear. What was approved was generally in line with the proposals (not surprising since these which were of course in line with the MYWP). The 2014 process was more awkward, with the Ministries/Agencies feeling that they needed to play a stronger vetting role as the UNICEF derived funding (and the agreed results to be achieved) would be their responsibility. Some felt unprepared for that role. They also evidently felt unprepared to follow through on some of these plans in view of the intensity required and their own personnel limitations (certainly time, but also lack of familiarity with the content perhaps). This turn of events has soured many of the provincial and district/city teams on the cooperation. As one provincial members of the KHPPIA stated “we are not interested in being event organizers for the central government.”

It is clear that the sense of ownership over the cooperation with UNICEF has dropped drastically. The KHPPIA – the forum to discuss plans, implementation and results of the cooperation with UNICEF are wilting, and some are inoperative. This may have already started to a degree prior to the change in the funds mechanism; the East Java and Pasaruan City units relevant to children appeared to be working, but they identified themselves as the Tim Gugus Tugas KLA (Task Force for Child Friendly City/District). The evaluation team could not assess if this redefinition was happening elsewhere, but it is clear that the KHPPIA structures are no longer working in any meaningful way in many regions. In Kupang, only the provincial Kabid Sosbud (Head of Social, Cultural Division) turned out to meet the evaluation team, with the education unit representative joining later. The district of Jayapura readily admitted that they no longer meet as they used to do (every quarter) since the meetings were focused on the spending progress. Meetings have not taken place in Banda Aceh for over a year.

The KHPPIA Secretariat in BANGDA (MoHA) acknowledges that the reporting for 2013 (and 2014 first six months) is essentially not being done as there was no anticipation of the changes, that might have led to the provision of APBD to sustain the KHPPIA teams (UNICEF cannot provide funds now of course).
**Relationships with third parties in the regions.**
There are signs of both features in the pattern and reaction to this funding. Newly selected NGOs are saddled with tasks they may not be entirely suited for, while longer standing partners continue their recent decline (BAKTI is the new NGO used in Makassar, while Lembara and LPA are older and feel marginalized now); capacity that used to reside in at least one regional child protection network is actually diminishing.

NGOs’ increased use is requiring intensive work from FOs to identify, screen and negotiate contracts, and above all to bridge them to the regional government, particularly when the NGOs are not so used, or interested, in working with regional government. RG has made this point in several sites, that the NGOs are not really engaging well with them.

**Summary**
The decentralized structure is necessary in a country as decentralized as Indonesia and gives UNICEF a comparative advantage. The Field office knowledge of the regional situation is a significant advantage in a large country like Indonesia with many regions and cultures and regions and contrasts in needs among the regions. The current crisis over funds transfer mechanisms is hindering both efficiency and effectiveness.

The equity focus is best expressed in the attempt to scale up Field Office projects to the provincial and national level. Significant innovations have been developed in areas of need and many have received national attention. More work needs to be done on documenting Best Practice innovations and promoting them nationally on an on-going basis.

The recent prioritization of programming at the village level by the Government, suggests the need for even more presence at the field level.

The absence of a clear strategy on decentralization as documented in the *Thematic Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to Decentralization in East Asia and the Pacific: 2006-2012* seems to be a weakness that needs to be addressed. It would move UNICEF from a situation where they are working in a decentralized context to one where they are focusing on programming for decentralization. We note that there has not been a clear agency approach to the scaling up of lessons learned in the districts, sub districts and villages.

The value of the UNICEF “brand” in Indonesia is generally high and serves to support its role in social programming for children, mothers and youth. The question of cost effectiveness remains to be explored.

### 5.2.3 Sustainability
The OECD DAC Guide states:

> “Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.”

---

34 Refer to Appendix 8 for the list of innovations.
35 Global opinion surveys conducted by UNICEF routinely place Indonesia near the top of countries, in terms of “favorable” opinion of UNICEF’s work (around 80%).
When evaluating the sustainability of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- To what extent did the benefits of a programme or project continue after donor funding ceased?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the programme or project? \(^{36}\)

1. To what extent have the results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been replicable to parts of the country where there is no UNICEF presence?

A great number of activities have been carried out during the period, and some of them have not been linked to the avowed strategy of evidence based model building/replication and advocacy. It appears that the shift is revealing that UNICEF staff/programming is found at different points in the journey towards the new paradigm. Some SNG actors are particularly evident in the old paradigm, when UNICEF was concerned with directly, or through its partners, immediately responding to local gaps in services. The desire to see continued UNICEF funding for such work, to add regions where UNICEF is helping, and the lack of attention to SNG roles in replication are indications of a lag in moving toward the new paradigm.

The potential for sustainability would be increased if there was a model building, scaling up strategy in place. However, this is not the case. This leads to situations such as:

- FOs are generally not promoting the UNICEF assisted innovations (adapted or otherwise) from other regions because they don’t have the necessary information available to them in a consistent manner.
- SNG counterparts are not aware of the menu of UNICEF assisted innovations that are available to them.
- There are insufficient strategies, or lack of clarity, in the way UNICEF assisted innovations are to be scaled-up, institutionalized in a given jurisdiction, and how this achievement can be replicated in other jurisdictions.
- There is little sense of the cost/benefit of UNICEF assisted innovations, and therefore consensus and coherence in UNICEF in which ought to get priority/investment in UNICEF and in terms of vying for national and SNG attention and resources.

The last point above is particularly germane. If there was a knowledge management\(^ {37}\) or technology transfer plan in place, with a standard template to be used to capture the best practices in a successful model project, then an easy tool would be available to use in promotion of the best practices.\(^ {38}\) A recommendation designed to support this idea follows at the end of the report.

---

\(^{36}\) OECD DAC Guide

\(^{37}\) Literature review (see Appendix 2) showed that knowledge management remains poor across the country, especially in the health sector.

\(^{38}\) In interviews, the consultants asked for documentation on successful BEST Practice innovations and found it generally was not available.
2. What are the enabling or constraining factors that influence the long-term sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization?

In a number of cases, UNICEF has played a role in scaling up local successful projects to the province or national level. There is a high probability that those initiatives will be sustained in the long run. However, there is a risk that even for nationally and provincially supported initiatives, policy approval can be insufficient to ensure full sustainability. Once approved, policies must be continuously promoted to all Ministries to ensure that effective implementation/ adoption of the policy takes place.

The challenge of the new funds channeling mechanism

For some members of SNG, provincial level at least, the UNICEF relationship may be fraying beyond repair, unless the direct funding is restored. As a consequence, there is the danger that SNG will see diminishing value for having UNICEF proximate to them in the field.

Seen from the UNICEF side, notwithstanding the current feelings of some SNG, as indicated above, the funding restriction may have the beneficial result of forcing UNICEF to search for and work with third parties who will in the long run gain capacity and be stronger partners for SNG.

This unwanted reconfiguration may also offer UNICEF the opportunity to discern SNG with high levels of commitment, who will dip deeper into their own budgets (APBD) to work with UNICEF, and will be willing to work with third parties who will be around after UNICEF departs, or operates solely from Jakarta.

The shift noted above may well spell the death of the KHPPIA coordination forum, but this is already been dropped in the regions, or is moribund. The Surabaya provincial and district/city governments appear to be more comfortable just using their own coordinating forum, generated under the Child Friendly District/City initiative – an integrating concept that can well accommodate any UNICEF contribution.

Use of third parties may need to be reviewed, as some now (Aceh, Makassar FOs) are using NGOs more as event organizers. At the same time, some previous NGOs used by UNICEF, that were helping on substantive issues, have not been used, causing these NGOs to reduce the scope of their activities and in fact reduce their organizations to the point of barely existing. This may be dissipating skills and the strength of the network. Whether the new contractors, in their specified role, can act to revitalize the network is a question that needs to be asked.

Perhaps UNICEF needs to get involved more in flexible agreements from SNG and third parties that have their own resources, and will work toward common ends, with clear exit strategy from UNICEF that lets SNG and other parties get on with pursuing their mandates. This should include scaling-up the good practices as far the jurisdiction or resources allow. It may be that UNICEF can change the direct funding agreement to be more of an MOU type instrument, with no financial flows from UNICEF – resources are employed in concert with a clear division of roles. UNICEF will provide inputs that are valued by the organizations -
whether this pertains to model development (e.g., with churches) or promotion/socialization of tested models (e.g., Child Find) or a combination of the two.

**Options to mitigate the effect of the new funds channeling mechanism**

There are several possible reactions to the current dilemma of funds channeling. UNICEF has chosen to try the ministry/agency and substantially enhance contracting of third parties (NGOs, Academia, churches). That has worked for 2014, but ruffled feathers in some provincial governments. In addition, it will likely weaken the relationship between UNICEF FO and local governments. Widening the search for a way to deal with this dilemma yields at least the following possibilities:

1. Working hard to reverse the new Ministry of Finance (GR #10) rules,
2. Accepting the rules and not using the K/L route at all to reach SNG,
3. Explore the use of the modalities of Deconcentration (Dekonsentrasi -D) and Assistance Tasks (Tugas Pembantuan-TP)
4. Have regional government use more of their funds
5. Get regional government used to working closer with third parties

It should be said that the last option should probably not include “on-granting” via the third parties, an option mooted in one FO. This end run around the regulations may have some risk. Another one that has some appeal at first blush might also be avoided; giving the K/L funds that then are offset by the K/L transferring agreed amounts via (D/TP) mechanisms.

A more aligned option would be however to have a kind of quid pro quo with K/L, where UNICEF provides technical support as required for the K/L, and counts on the K/L to fund selected regions for specific cooperation with UNICEF, through their own channels.

**Knowledge Management, Advocacy, and Replication**

Over the last decade or more, UNICEF Indonesia has worked with a multitude of government and other partners to generate or introduce to Indonesia a long list of models, good practices and innovations (Please refer to the appendices). Not all of UNICEF’s work is oriented to this end. Advocacy work seeks to work upstream at both regional and national levels. For instance, at district/city level, UNICEF supports efforts to develop regional regulations on free birth registration. Additionally, technical support is provided in response to dire or emergency situations, such as the diphtheria outbreak in East Java, which saw a UNICEF response that was designed to stem that particular threat.

The success of UNICEF models/good practices seem to come by the force and will of highly dedicated members of UNICEF (particularly in the FOs) who work hard to gain some measure of understanding and acceptance of new approaches among a few champions in the partner regional and national governments. These vital experiences may become lore within UNICEF but are rarely captured in the documentation that supports replication.

The tacit nature of UNICEF knowledge presents some challenges when the task is to replicate more widely. As one example, the ASIA tool itself is after three iterations over a decade still

---

39 See the summary at the start of Section 5 for additional details.
tantalizingly close to being widely disseminated - but seems stuck on the cusp of a large impact. There appears to be some uncertainty on the value of pushing this more assertively. Perhaps this is justified – the Papua province Bappeda for instance has its doubts about the feasibility of communicating essential elements of the approach – from the heavy tome developed in 2013 – to the districts/cities. This reality may signal that UNICEF has difficulty in effectively close the innovation cycle, in terms of assessing quality and working with regional and national actors to institutionalize and broadly replicate. Please refer to Appendix 8, Table 9 for the list of innovations.

There also appears to be some support activities that are rather disjointed or not clearly leading to clear outcomes. These are not evidently building towards models/good practices; these are perhaps the legacy of a prior style of working that is difficult to shed entirely as it also has some benefits in building trust and positioning UNICEF for more promising entry points, that can lead to investments in model/good practices that yield more dividends in terms of the UNICEF mandate.

Conversely, there appears to be some efforts that loosely fall within the UNICEF umbrella that are not formally efforts of UNICEF to develop models/good practices, but which may be building up to be good candidates for these if enough attention is given to them. The efforts of the population unit in Pasaruan City to reach parents who are wary of facing government offices and requirements, by setting up after school registration session for them, is promising. Notwithstanding the possible sub-optimal level of investment or recognition of model/good practices development, there is no doubt that the attention given to the latter over the last decade has led to great success in many cases. Notable examples are:

1. Midwife-traditional healer partnership, which saw maternal deaths plunge to practically zero in Takalar District over the period 2007-2010.
2. Malaria eradication: Sabang City in Aceh achieved this status, and efforts are being made to eradicate it from all of Aceh by 2015 (may take longer but effort is definitely underway, Aceh Jaya has been identified as a large source of cases, and attention is being given to it now).

There is a need to impose some rigor on UNICEF sponsored models/good practices that validate these and impart greater legitimacy and weight, making the replication subsequently more likely. UNICEF has assessed some of these internally, and on some occasion has used external validation (e.g., peer reviewed journal, or a special assessment from the EAPRO staff). The views of the counterpart have also been taken into account. In recent years, a more appealing packaging has been used to gain the attention (with audio visuals and well written manuals and concise briefs for policy makers). By and large however, UNICEF models/good practices are not being adequately validated or promoted.

At this stage, the high hopes of UNICEF for many of the models/best practices hinge on proving that these bring substantial benefit, are affordable, and absorbable capacity wise. Many of the initiatives have been piloted without the intent to rigorously assess their cost/benefit. They do not have a proper baseline, and have not been closely monitored.

---

40 Although some cases have now been reported in 2014.
There is little evidence that they have been properly scrutinized. Even those that can prove that they are “low cost/high impact” (such as the midwife-traditional healer partnership) have not seen the replication that might be expected.

There is a great need to reduce the number of models/good practices that are the focus of replication, and to get behind these in a more intensive and creative way. The choice must be carefully to reflect the proven benefits to be derived, the relevance of the issues, and the capabilities of UNICEF and their partners. Criteria on costs and benefits and reach need to be agreed to assist in setting priorities. Other factors beyond these will be relevant, but an informed estimate of impact needs to be a key consideration. How the anticipated impact relates to the larger principle of achieving equity also needs to be considered at this stage, notwithstanding the difficulties encountered in operationalizing this principle in the context of the dynamics at work in selecting partner regions.

As well recognized in UNICEF Indonesia, the upstream effort needs to be undertaken at both national and regional level. This can take several forms; issue awareness based on evidence, policy development, regulatory improvement, programmatic initiatives (e.g., approaches, funding, and training). UNICEF may need to sharpen its approach to upstream work, blending information, advocacy and framework development skills as the occasion requires. The “institutionalization” is too often not completed in the UNICEF support “cycle,” and there is not sufficient monitoring of “what happened afterwards” to feed back into UNICEF efforts and approaches to institutionalization. Some of this comes as self-criticism, where FO/Jakarta office staff acknowledge UNICEF could do better to complete the cycle. Some of it comes from regional NGOs who lament that the support ends when a regional regulation is issued, and UNICEF is satisfied – regardless of the vagaries of implementation that follows. Tightening up on institutionalization may call for the identification of government institutions and other actors who can get behind the final steps, whether this is a government good practice document, or integration of UNICEF practices in standardized/regularly delivered training offerings. There are some good examples of this kind of effort. The malaria/maternal child health technical manuals have been introduced in NTT’s medical training programs. This might have found an even broader audience. There are other efforts that have not gotten as far, institutionally. The ASIA approach has a BANGDA stamp of approval but has not been mainstreamed into any of the country’s planning education and training offerings.

In addition, a common language that allows UNICEF to converge on what are the concepts and pathways to replication is needed. What makes a model, a good practice, or innovation needs some systematizing. The practical aspects of packaging these also need to be

---

41 The evaluation team did not review these but a quick read of some revealed some concern, in relation to the governance processes they seek to demonstrate. For instance, the village Musrenbang desa that was the site of the Children Forum integration into Musrenbang desa resulted in only proposals that were directed to higher levels, with no discussion on what the village itself could do to address children’s concerns. Another doubtful model is the UNICEF supported integrated service centre for women and children (P2TPA) at provincial level, apparently coexisting with city and district level centres with the same function; this appears to be counter to the principle of subsidiarity if not the actual regulations on the assignment of functions.

agreed; the approach being taken by the Knowledge Management and Innovation Specialist is promising in this regard. Not all “products” will need the same treatment, but there should be some consensus on what is a minimum set of elements (some possible elements are indicated in the box at right).

The dissemination of the replication package could entail several kinds of activities, some of which have already been undertaken by UNICEF; web sites, workshops, and orientation/training. As yet not attempted have been efforts to insert the core elements into existing training offerings of relevant institutions (government training bodies) or consultants/NGO networks, or local government associations (which are entirely absent from UNICEF efforts to date). It may also be helpful to bring particularly successful examples to the attention of organizations that seek to recognize innovation, such as the JPIP in Java, or Fajar in Eastern Indonesia.

For both successful efforts, and those less so, there is value in capturing lessons learned. UNICEF falls short in many documented models/good practices in explaining its success and failures (in contrast, in interviews with the evaluation team UNICEF staff were able to convey many vivid explanations). Manuals can be rather dry in this regard. Other elements of replication packages – where success has been achieved – could better capture the dynamics of the “Change Process”; interviews, testimonials, contextual additions to manuals. These can indicate why an initiative was successful, and what impediments were met and how they were overcome. This can serve as useful added guidance in adapting the initiative to the local context, particularly if several approaches or flavours are explained, relating to the different sites/contexts where success was achieved.

The evaluation team has also noted that many of the UNICEF models/good practices stress the supply side; the duty-bearers rather than rights-holders to put in in the terminology of UNICEF around the human rights based approach to programming. This is understandable in view of the entry points and close relationships with provincial and district/city government. There is some movement toward a broader set of actors recently (such as the church groups in NTT) but the role of these actors is still as duty-bearers in service delivery. What is less visible are the demand side activities/organizations that have been credited with generating government responsiveness and the sustainability of innovations/improvements in service delivery. Approaches seen in Indonesia include providing citizens with access to government information centers; citizen access to information through the new law on freedom of information; access to the offices of the ombudsman; citizen journalism; the role of the formal media; multi-stakeholder forums on health and education; NGO networks/coalitions, complaint mechanisms in service delivery units; participatory service charter/improvement plans. There are of course some directly relevant examples in UNICEF’s work, such as

---

44 See http://www.fipo-fajar.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=frontpage&Itemid=1
assisting children forums in voicing their views in the Musrenbang desa. Some elements of demand are no doubt embedded in some initiatives. School Based Management, where parents participate in pursuing improvements in the quality of their children’s education would be one example. Even so, it may be useful for UNICEF to review its models/good practices to see if they are making the best use of the emerging participatory/demand side practices in Indonesia.

To get behind the development of suitable models/good practices, and particularly to support their replication, UNICEF should consider striking task forces combining JKT and FO members that will have a budget, time frame and a plan for their work. Combining the centre with the regions in this way may be helpful, building on their complementary vantage points and access to national and SNG. Defining the budget and time provided will focus energies. This approach will need to go in lock step with reducing the number of SNG reached to the number that is strictly required to develop models/good practices, allowing for a greater intensity on a smaller number of efforts/relationships. The current CPAP number of 64 regions appears to be unwieldy, even if was pared down from over a hundred in the previous CPAP. Some efforts have been made to reduce these further, but the current list of IPs provided to the evaluation team shows 33 specific IPs in provincial government and 58 in district/city government. Please refer to Appendix 9, Table 10 for the list. The number of implementing partners actually in the books for 2014, taking SNG and third parties into account, is 44. The table below is accurate as of December 9, 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Small Scale Funding Agreements (SSFA)</th>
<th># of Primary Cooperation Agreements (PCA)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total USD for SSFA</th>
<th>Total USD for PCA</th>
<th>Total USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75,517</td>
<td>680,350</td>
<td>755,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123,011</td>
<td>806,744</td>
<td>929,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>401,107</td>
<td>520,911</td>
<td>922,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.4 Efficiency

“Efficiency measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs. It is an economic term, which signifies that the aid uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to see whether the most efficient process has been adopted. When evaluating the efficiency of a programme or a project, it is useful to consider the following questions:

- Were activities cost-efficient?
- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?”

45 There may be more than one implementing partner in a given regional government.

46 http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm
1. To what extent has UNICEF established meaningful partnerships/mechanisms with other key actors at sub-national level to avoid duplication of effort or miscommunication?

The formal coordination mechanism for UNICEF’s engagement with the government is the coordination forum Maternal and Child Survival, Development, and Protection (KHPPIA), established at national, provincial and district levels in all areas where UNICEF is working. These appear to have functioned well initially in terms of establishing provincial and district priorities for the 2011-25 CPAP. However, with the emergence of fund channeling through the Ministry of Finance, Jakarta, these have ceased to function provincially and at the district level. Nationally, BANGDA acted as the host for this secretariat and they have reported as well that in 2013-14 there has been little activity.

Coordination between UNICEF and provincial and district government agencies has been negatively affected by this. To compensate, UNICEF has proceeded to contract directly with other local agencies and NGOs. It appears that no overall coordination body exists in the provinces at this point. Bappenas remains active as a centralized lead agency for UNICEF national programming.

It appears as if decentralized structures have been weakened in the process as central agencies (Ministry of Finance, Bappenas) attempt to exercise greater control.

2. Were programs implemented with least cost question in mind and on time?

In developing models for subsequent replication, UNICEF is keenly aware that most of the regional government will have limited resources to undertake the replication, and so they aim for a low cost approach.

The midwife traditional birth attendant model in Takalar was well received by the District Head precisely because it was low cost and high impact. Other examples were similar.

In some cases, the costs associated with scaling up may not have been fully calculated. There may be some overlap in coverage between the various survey activities being undertaken and/or supported (MICS, Susenas, IDHS, comprehensive student database).

The timely implementation is not always evident. Some early successes can be seen in some initiatives (e.g. working with churches in Kupang) but producing deep and lasting impacts depends on institutionalizing and scaling up innovations. One CFO argued that this can take time, and it is not always possible to abide by the Jakarta Office set timetable.

There were reports that the centralization of selected financial and administrative functions to Jakarta was affecting the efficiency of FOs.

In most cases, the control of implementation and timing is beyond the control of UNICEF and its partners. Funding dispersal would be a case in point. In virtually all cases there are a wide variety of stakeholders making coordination difficult.

Efficiency is also pursued in UNICEF through the continued reliance on cooperation with districts/cities that are known to UNICEF making it easier for UNICEF to engage. This
pragmatic approach does veer from the formal explanation of what guides the choice of district/city partners.

3. What efficiency and effectiveness lessons could be learned from past experience with closing/ moving UNICEF offices at sub-national level?

The perception of the past subnational organizational changes in UNICEF, in the FOs, is that:
- These have been made by the Jakarta office – with little consultation with staff in FOs;
- They may not have saved any money – due to increased travel costs; and,
- They have reduced the capabilities of UNICEF to pursue its mandate.

These sentiments are closely tied to the views expressed by UNICEF staff in FOs, regarding the regional structures, paraphrased below:
- The CFOs believe that FOs are functioning quite well as they are – the staff in FO themselves are not pushing for major organizational changes;
- The existence of FOs attract donor funding as they believe this gives UNICEF an advantage, and it facilitates donors’ monitoring; UNICEF is very reliant on this funding;
- The FOs allow national/UNICEF programs to be tailored to the regional conditions;
- With the FOs, UNICEF is well placed to generate evidence based models that can be fed to higher levels of government for institutionalization/replication;
- Cooperation with SNG/local stakeholders is more intensive and productive with FOs; and,
- Compared to other development partners who spend more money, but do not have the same regional structures, UNICEF “punches above its weight.”

There is much informal discussion within UNICEF on the organizational structure that would best serve UNICEF. There is value in making this discussion more systematic and formalized within UNICEF, using agreed criteria and analysis. The analysis will need to refer to the strategic aims of UNICEF, and seek to address the following:
- Possible ways that acknowledged benefits of FO can be maintained while adjusting the number of FOs, the resources placed in these FOs, and the flexibility/movement between HQs and FOs;
- The desirability of shifting to a more demand oriented model to selecting SNG partners;
- The need to become more focused on selected innovations, and see these through to their maximum impact; and,
- The changed funding mechanism, where UNICEF works more through third parties located in the regions, and has a reduced interaction with the SNG partners.

In the survey of UNICEF staff, UNICEF’s Field Office structure received the strongest support for its ability to and support of and “alignment with decentralization policies/initiatives of the government”, “undertaking effective advocacy”, and “forging effective partnerships with subnational government”. In these three areas, 85-90% of staff saw the FOs as supportive to highly supportive of the stated characteristic. This is supportive of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Field Offices.
5.2.5 Equity

1. Does UNICEF’s current engagement with decentralization maximize its opportunities for equitable development for children?

For UNICEF, “Equity means that all children have an opportunity to survive, develop, and reach their full potential, without discrimination, bias or favoritism”.\(^{47}\) UNICEF Indonesia certainly is driven by this principle.

*It tries to reach the “worst off”\(^{48}\) first and foremost by being disproportionately present in Eastern Indonesia compared to its total population.*

Eastern Indonesia (Makassar/Ambon, Jayapura/Manokwari, Kupang) covers a vast area, with parts that have suffered from neglect as centripetal forces favoured development in Java.

Some parts of Eastern Indonesia have relatively few resources (e.g. NTT). Others have been dogged by conflict (Maluku). Some are blessed with natural resources (Papua, parts of Sulawesi) but have been isolated or have been largely denied the benefits of resource extraction in the past. Papua and West Papua are a particular case, where per capita transfers in recent years have been relatively high compared to other provinces, but governance capacity is low and holding the provinces back from maximizing their financial means.

2. How has UNICEF’s current and past engagement in the decentralization process addressed non-geographical disparities in child rights such as by gender, socio-economic status, local (urban/ rural) or ethnicity?

The country context has to be appreciated. The equity principle of UNICEF is highly relevant to Indonesia in view of this country’s increasing inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient. In 2010 this was 0.365 (WB), and in 2012 (0.37), rising to 0.41 by 2013.\(^{49}\) The World Bank agrees that income inequality is rising and adds that “poverty reduction in Indonesia continues to slow down, with only a reduction of 0.7 percentage points over the last two years, or the smallest decline in the last decade.” It sees inequality as “potentially disrupting social cohesion and hence jeopardizing the gains from solid economic growth”.

With a large group, about 68 million, living just above the poverty line and thus vulnerable to falling into poverty in times of shocks, the poverty situation is still rather bleak.

*The models seek to be replicable across all jurisdictions.*

UNICEF works in districts (with a rural character) and in cities (urban character). The models seek to be replicable across all jurisdictions, by aiming to have low cost-high impact solutions (e.g. the midwife-traditional birth attendant partnership) that are affordable for all districts/cities, even those with fewer resources.
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\(^{48}\) In line with the equity focused we cover the terminology such as excluded, disadvantaged, marginalized or vulnerable populations, with the term “worst-off groups”.

UNICEF has been keen to allay concerns that it favours a particular ethnic group over others although in a country as diverse as Indonesia this is virtually impossible. While there are good reasons to limit the number of district/cities as its partners, it is sensitive to perceptions of ethnic favouritism. In South Sulawesi, this prompted UNICEF to add districts to ensure that the main ethnic groups were covered (Bugis, Mandar, Makassarese).

**In terms of geographic and socio-economic disparities, those that arose as a result of the tsunami and earthquake disaster in Aceh are particularly notable.**

In the recovery period following the disaster, UNICEF supported basic health care for children, many of them living in temporary shelters. Over 1 million children under 15 were immunized against measles, nearly 0.5 million received vitamin A supplements; over 26,000 pregnant women were supplied with iron tablets, and nearly 200,000 women and children received insecticide-treated bed nets to protect them against malaria. UNICEF subsequently helped to construct new village health posts.\(^5^0\)

**In working with REACH, a child survival project funded also by the Canadian government, high mortality and morbidity of children under 5 years in the poorest quintile districts of Indonesia were targeted (in Papua, Maluku, Central Java and NTT).\(^5^1\)**

However, it has to be acknowledged that UNICEF’s interventions are not generally focused on reducing disparities in a direct sense. This observation is not in itself a judgment. It has to be appreciated that UNICEF works by developing tools and supporting systems. These in turn, if properly spread and applied across all parts of Indonesia will result in greater success/efficiency in achieving welfare and rights protection for children. Actions to lessen disparities are many, and must be taken by the various levels of government.

**An intervention of UNICEF that is helpful is its stress on data gathering, which occurs at all level with varying intensity and coverage.**

At the village level, models for collecting education and health data are being piloted. At the district/city level ASIA is being used and at provincial level – Papua specifically – MICS 2013. At the national level the Child Poverty and Disparities in Indonesia: Challenges for Inclusive Growth, by SMERU in 2013. All of these can potentially allow SNG to undertake planning that is targeted to the worst off groups/settlements.

3. **Are the most marginalized children in Indonesia reached through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?**

**There is no doubt that UNICEF wishes to reach the worst off (most marginalized) children in Indonesia. There is some slippage however between the UNICEF intent and reality in the field.**

For instance, the successful midwife-traditional birth attendant partnership model in Takalar, fully scaled-up and institutionalized at district level, reaches a population that is relatively better off than some in the geographic region covered by the FO Makassar.

On the other hand, the model promises to enable far-flung populations, served only by a traditional birth attendant in the immediate area, to be identified, supported, and
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transported to a health care worker/facility, if and when the model is applied in these more remote areas. However, evidence from the international context shows that for this type of program to reach the needy, its implementation must be consciously pro-poor.

Similar arguments can be made for other models promoted by UNICEF. The ECE (a pillar in ECD) shows a high potential to close gaps. In 2003 the ECE enrollment rate overall was 23.8% for children, while that for the poorest households was only 15%, much lower than the 44% for those from the richest households. This gap narrowed in 2009, as the enrollment rate reached 50% overall. By approaching 100% coverage, a goal still rather far off, it is inevitable that the poorest will gain the most proportionally. In Aceh, the poorest villages are being targeted by this program in order to close this gap. Hence UNICEF can feel fairly sure that a determined effort to close the overall gap will work to disproportionally benefit the worst off.

The above case of ECE does raise the question of what is meant by reaching the worst off. UNICEF does not always target only the worst off. It is not clear if the UNICEF Indonesia stance of “reaching” the worst off is intended to be stringent, requiring that only the worst off be explicitly targeted, or if a “bias” toward the worst off is sufficient. If the latter, then UNICEF appears to be reaching the worst off. UNICEF will have to remain vigilant in its advocacy for scaling up these approaches to ensure that they are pro-poor.

It should also be noted that targeting is always joint with many other GOI and civil society participants. GOI had targeted Sabang District in Aceh for special malaria programming starting some 20 years ago. UNICEF subsequently joined with many other stakeholders to push the eradicate Malaria agenda. All the stakeholders have “contributed” (in the sense of contribution analysis) to the agenda.

It should be recognized that if the UNICEF meaning of reaching the poor is to be stringent, it would be necessary to operationalize the principle, in either relative or absolute terms. A relative definition would allow UNICEF to aim for the lowest quintile in a particular partner district, even if in absolute terms this group may be better off than the second or third quintile elsewhere. Taking an absolute measure also does not neatly solve everything. UNICEF has made decisions with Bappenas on which provinces it will operate in. Focusing strictly on the worst-off in absolute terms (such as the extreme poverty cut off of below $1.25/day used by UNICEF in some contexts) would limit UNICEF to only one or a handful of provinces at best. Reaching the worst off in Papua, with spread out and very poor populations (in absolute terms) would likely more than soak up UNICEF’s resources. If reaching the worst off includes giving attention to the large group of vulnerable people just above the poverty line, then UNICEF can justify being in the regions it now deems its implementing partners – or practically any region in Indonesia for that matter. Perhaps the UNPDF encouragement to address regional disparity should also be weighed in any deliberation; a combination of regional disparity, and within regions focus on the worst-off in that region may be the best that UNICEF can work towards. In this discussion the modus operandi of UNICEF also need to be injected. Even if the initial work is in a “middle income”

type region, UNICEF can find ways of calibrating the models/good practices to a range of situations that could facilitate replication widely. In summary, UNICEF may wish to provide some clarity on where it stands when it uses principles such as “reaching the most marginalized.”

It may be beneficial for UNICEF to revisit its programmatic portfolio (of models/good practices) to see if its interventions are the most relevant to close the service gaps that are crucial to women/children. For instance, school attendance and quality are heavily influenced by the distribution and quality of teachers. The past School Based Management effort of UNICEF speaks to this issue, but there are even more direct interventions that could close the rural-urban gap (associated also with poverty distribution). The USAID –KINERJA promoted “Proportional Teacher Distribution” (Penyebaran Guru secara Proporsional) model indicates the analysis and institutional efforts required to achieve a better distribution of teachers at district level.\(^{54}\) This could go some way to close the gaps noted by UNICEF.

Another example of where UNICEF may get more equity bang for its buck could be the judicious promotion of health minimum service standards. These were developed in the context of decentralization, to ensure that regional governments would heed national imperatives, such as service rights embedded in the constitution and international conventions (e.g., MDGs). UNICEF has given attention to MDGs, in line with UNDP and Bappenas efforts. It has done less in working with the Directorate General of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the Sectoral Ministries to find ways of effectively incorporating the more operational (input/output oriented service indicators) in regional policies, plans and budgets. The work of BASICS in this regard could provide some inspiration,\(^ {55}\) particularly if joined with the uncertain, but tantalizing, role of the village government, a so far neglected level of government when it comes to service delivery/protection of rights.

Ultimately, UNICEF’s contribution to more equitable development for women/children will always be modest compared to the other fiscal and policy levers available to government. Cutting fuel subsidies for instance has a large effect in increasing efficiency and equity, by reducing subsidies to rich regions and channeling these through transfers disproportionately to poor regions.\(^ {56}\) Directing well-targeted household transfers, with meaningful conditionalities, tying these to support health and education services, could also have large effects. UNICEF’s contributions will be modest compared to these large impact policies, unless of course UNICEF has the ability to influence these policies.

5.3 Gender
The consultants integrated gender concerns in all aspects of the review. This meant that the online survey, the interviews, the meetings and the document review all had a gender lens.

\(^{54}\) See USAID KINERJA http://www.kinerja.or.id/sector.asp?sector=1
An example would be in our review of UNICEF’s education sector initiatives. First of all, Indonesia, in all provinces does very well when comparing primary school enrollments between males and females. In most cases male enrollment rates are only 1 or 2 percentage higher than females. In Aceh and Gorantalo and Central Java for example, gender parity has been achieved. However in other areas like South Sulawesi, Papua and Central Sumatra girls remain disadvantaged.57

UNICEF’s investment in all aspects of early childhood education has a gender lens. The consultants observed this in the efforts to prepare a comprehensive census of children and their school attendance status in several provinces where they were active. In addition the UNICEF focus on the poorest households and the poorest villages in education helps to target girls, since female headed households are also associated with poverty.

Other programming initiatives also have a gender lens including maternal mortality, HIV/AIDS and malaria.

The survey of UNICEF staff 58 indicated that females are more likely to rate their knowledge of decentralization as very good, compared to male respondents. Results also showed that females are more likely than males to comment positivity on the cost efficiency of national and subnational offices.

---

57 UNICEF East Asia and Pacific Regional Office, 2009; Gender Equality in Education.
58 Approximately 63% of the survey respondents were female.
6.0 Personnel

Organizational structure and SNG reach.
Following some retrenchment in recent years, in part guided by a shift in strategy toward upstream interventions, UNICEF now has the following organizational structure and reach:

Table 5: Organizational Structure and SNG Reach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FO and Satellite</th>
<th>Provinces</th>
<th>Districts (if city, this is indicated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makassar</td>
<td>South Sulawesi</td>
<td>Bone, Takalar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Sulawesi</td>
<td>Poliwali Mandar, Mamuju</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambon</td>
<td>Maluku</td>
<td>Maluku Tenggara Barat (MTB), Buru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kupang</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Cities: Kupang, Districts: Kupang, TTS, Belu, Alor, Sikka, Sumba Timur, Sumba Tengah, Sumba Barat Daya (three additional obtain support via province: Ende, Sumba Barat, Rote Ndao)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surabaya</td>
<td>Central Java, Eastern Java</td>
<td>Kota Surakarta, Pemalong, Brebes and Klaten district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayapura</td>
<td>Papua</td>
<td>Jayapura city and Jayapura district, Jayawijaya, Mimika, Biak Numfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manokwari</td>
<td>West Papua</td>
<td>Manokwari and Sorong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banda Aceh</td>
<td>Aceh</td>
<td>East Aceh, Aceh Jaya and Aceh Besar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above reach of UNICEF is in flux at the district/city level. The Kupang FO in particular shows how the shift toward the new corporate strategy is proceeding at a rather slow pace. The count of district/city partners provided by the FO staff in Kupang varies widely from the account given by the Bappeda, and both of these differed substantially from the Monitoring presentation given by the Kupang FO to the UNICEF office monitoring team on the 20 October, 2014 (in Kupang). This reflects the efforts to contain the number of districts/cities, as well as the desire of the province (and interested districts/cities) to expand UNICEF’s reach. The small number offered initially by the FO (4 districts/cities) likely reflects a future scenario, as some relationships likely cannot be dropped abruptly.

As of 2013 about 40 districts/cities had direct transfers made to them. In mid-2013, the Ministry of Finance insisted on any future funding of government to be channeled through Ministries/agencies. This is expected to have an effect on the future involvement of regional government, though the effect is hard to gauge, and other strategic considerations will also come into play to shape the SNG reach of UNICEF.

Overview of Human Resources
The organizational structure of UNICEF Indonesia adapts a hierarchical approach, with the senior level staff overseeing the work of mid-level staff and so on. The country representative is at the top of the hierarchy, followed by the senior executive assistant.

Country Office
In the national office in Jakarta, the senior level positions include: The Deputy Representative, Chief of Operations, Emergency Specialist and the Chief of Communications. Individuals holding these positions report directly to the Country Representative. Other
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positions in this office include: Programme Assistant, Operations Assistant, Programme Officer, Digital Communications Officer, Administration and Finance Specialist, ICT Officer, HR Manager, Supply Specialist and a Communications Specialist, Chief of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation, Chief CSD, Health Specialist, Chief of Nutrition, Education Specialist, etc. There are approximately 84 employees working at the national office, with 6 vacancies.

Field Offices
The Deputy Representative oversees the staff and operations at the FOs.

Makassar
In addition to the Deputy Representative, the Kupang/ Makassar Chief Field Officer is responsible for overseeing employees at the Makassar FO (including the antenna office in Ambon). The following employment positions are evident: WASH Specialist, CP Specialist, Operations Assistant, Health Specialist, Health Officers (2), a Senior Programme Assistant and a Driver. There are a total of 8 employees, with 0 vacant positions.

Ambon (Antenna Office)
This sub office includes the following employees: Operations, Assistant, Health Officers (2) and a Driver. There are a total of 4 employees, with 0 unfilled positions.

Kupang
The Kupang/ Makassar Chief Field Officer is responsible for overseeing employees at the Kupang FO, which includes the following employment positions: Nutrition Specialist, Y&A Development Specialist, Health Officer, WASH Officer, Senior Programme Assistant, Operations Assistant and Drivers (2). There are a total of 8 personnel, with 0 unfilled positions.

Surabaya
This FO includes the following employment positions: Y&A Development Specialist, CP Specialist, CSD Specialist, Senior Programme Assistant, Operations Assistant, and a Driver. The total number of personnel at this office amounts to 6, with 0 vacancies.

Banda Aceh
The Education Specialist Coordinator oversees all of the employees and operations at this FO. It includes 2 other professionals in the health sector at the time of the field visit.

Jayapura
The head of this FO is the Chief Field Officer for Papua, yet this post remains vacant. This FO exceeds all other FOs in terms of the number of employees, and the complexity of the FO organizational structure. It also experienced the largest number of vacancies (10) compared to the national office and other FOs. The employees hold the following positions: Senior Programme Assistant, CSD Specialist, HIV/ AIDS Specialist, Operations Officers (20), Health Officers (2), Education Specialist, HIV/ AIDS Officer, Programme Assistant (2) and an Administrative Assistant. Currently, there are a total of 14 employees.
10 positions in this FO remain vacant, these are: Chief Field Officer (Papua), Education Specialist (senior level), Education Officers (2), Child Protection Officer, M&E Specialist, Operations Officer, WASH Officer, Nutrition Officer and a Driver.

*Manokwari*
This sub office includes the following personnel: Health Officer, HIV/ AIDS Specialist, HIV/ AIDS Officer, Programme Assistant and a Driver. There are a total of 5 employees at this location, with 2 vacancies (2 Education Officers).
7.0 Conclusions & Recommendations

RELEVANCE: Following the decentralization reforms of the last decade or more, UNICEF has been able to stay relevant to Indonesia’s efforts to further the rights and welfare of children. It has done so by making its presence felt at the regional level, working closely with regional governments and stakeholders. UNICEF has responded to both national and regional needs, with a particular focus on Eastern Indonesia. It has helped to forge stronger vertical linkages between national and subnational levels of government, as well as between agencies relevant to UNICEF’s mandate within each level of government. By increasingly working upstream, a shift from service delivery that is well underway, UNICEF has been able to tune into the national and regional policies and plans, helping to bring into sharper relief issues pertaining to women and children.

Partners hold UNICEF in high regard, for their technical expertise and ability to address issues based on strong evidence and effective advocacy.

The evidence based approach that is a hallmark of UNICEF highlights the important role that is played by the Field Offices, as these offices enable UNICEF to work closely with regional/local stakeholders to identify needs and capture experiences that feed back to higher levels of government.

Its direct and flexible fund channeling (prior to 2014) at the regional level has been highly valued. The ability to support coordination, and to facilitate and convene actors are seen as other important attributes of UNICEF. The dedication of UNICEF staff is notable to national and regional counterparts, and is offered as one reason why it is worth struggling through some tough spots – such as the new funds channeling challenge met in 2013/2014. UNICEF staff knowledge of decentralization varies considerably, and this may affect their ability to identify risks and opportunities.

UNICEF does not adequately scan the decentralization scene/aid effectiveness arenas to anticipate risks and opportunities arising from changing government policies. It could have been more proactive in fashioning a response to the funds channeling changes that were signaled as early as 2011. UNICEF also does not have a decentralization strategy as such. It may not need a full-fledged strategy, but the lack of clear principles keep it from making faster progress in shifting towards its avowed strategy of a greater upstream emphasis. Areas in need of review are its linkages to relevant national ministries, the selection of SNG partners, and how it can become more focused on model building/good practices and replication.

EFFECTIVENESS: UNICEF is largely effective in its work in Indonesia, in large part due to its decentralized organizational structure. FOs, working closely with regional governments and other stakeholders have been able to adapt national/global programs to the local conditions. FOs and their partners also initiate some programs or new approaches toward program implementation.
UNICEF has influenced policies, regulations, technical approaches, programs, plans and budgets of national and regional units concerned with women and children. As a result, there is now a greater focus on women/children issues and more resources applied toward them. The models/good practices/innovations supported by UNICEF have in many cases seen considerable institutionalization and replication. Some have been assessed rigorously, while others rely on less formal assessments and are not as convincing. At times UNICEF does not fully close the “innovation cycle”; some partners believe that UNICEF moves on too quickly to the next hot topic, or gives scant attention to the quality of implementation. The spread of some innovations on paper may not be substantiated by scrutiny on the ground in some cases. Some erosion in the capacity of networks established early in the millennium may have taken place as well. The higher reliance on third parties in 2014 may not have worked to revive all of these as new/non-traditional partners have been enlisted. The latter may however provide new vigor.

UNICEF may not be making full use of its FOs in fund raising. The ability to fundraise at this level varies widely (e.g. Surabaya and Makassar are well placed) but there is not clear plan, incentives, and responsibilities to move this forward. Links with SNG are not evident.

**EFFICIENCY:** The evaluation team could not determine definitively if UNICEF is efficient in the way it carries out its work. A deeper assessment, with more time and access to detailed costs, would be required. UNICEF’s staffing does not seem out of line with that of other donors serving similar numbers of provinces and districts (USAID KINERJA for instance). There is no indication of waste in UNICEF’s operations. The Papua office may be more expensive to run, but there are obvious reasons for that, particularly the travel costs of flights within Papua/West Papua, and from Papua to Jakarta.

UNICEF keeps its overhead costs in check in part by limiting its reach of provinces and districts/cities. It also does not work in the most remote regions of the country. This efficiency may have its downside however in relation to other important principles of UNICEF; on equity in particular.

Recently, the KHPPIA structures have stopped working or are moribund. This is due largely to the funds channeling change which has reduced the sense of ownership of the regional government. However, it needs to be noted that it was already happening prior to that change in some regions.

The funds channeling change seen in 2014 has proven to be highly inefficient, with resources not been channeled from the ministries/agencies to the regional government, and not being spent in an efficient way when the Ministries/agencies did the spending themselves in the regions. That significant amounts of funds went unspent speaks to the challenge that this modality faces. It is of course more than a matter of efficiency when it goes this badly.
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The centralizing of certain administrative functions (expense reporting, sub-contracting) may have unwittingly saved some money but at the costs of inefficiencies and corresponding lower levels of effectiveness. This concept is drawn from the findings in this report.

**SUSTAINABILITY:** UNICEF’s results are likely to be sustainable in the main, but more could be done to ensure sustainability. The lack of an exit strategy is evident in the way local capacity is built up and then allowed to dissipate. It is not clear what the indicators for graduating out of a province might be. It is also not entirely clear what the channels for replication will be and how they will be primed for their role.

The satisfaction of the previous focus partners has dropped dramatically, and does not augur well for their commitment in 2015 or beyond. The collapse of the KHPPIA structures is just one indication of what is to come unless new ways are devised to select and forge relationships with regional government.

The highly regarded UNICEF role in supporting advocacy, facilitating, and convening is not being developed in other actors in any meaningful way. It is not unusual for government partners to make a plea for indefinite UNICEF presence, or at least for another 10-15 years. While this is possibly justified in some regions, it belies the emerging middle income status of Indonesia as a whole. There has not been a full exploration, assessment and strategy regarding the actors who might be more closely involved in taking over the roles now borne by UNICEF.

Some of the gains made in terms of policies and regulations may prove to be partial and prone to erosion through a lack of follow up – hence they may not be adequately translated into action and changes on the ground.

Finally, one of the areas of need appears to be the collection of reliable monitoring and evaluation data in support of UNICEF and GOI programming on children, mothers and youth. The increasingly decentralized function of government in Indonesia demands improved capacity for monitoring and evaluation. Districts and provinces have to do a better job at collecting reliable data or information that influences children, youth and others.

**EQUITY:** UNICEF’s equity agenda is being pursed in several ways: emphasizing Eastern Indonesia; selecting some regions based on their low performance on key indicators; giving attention to absorption capacity in modelling so that regions with low capacity/finances can take up innovations. UNICEF’s overall modus operandi is to generate innovations (changes in policies, regulations, models) and to see these replicated as far as they have relevance; if this replication happens widely it is likely that the worst off will be reached, albeit indirectly and with a time lag. More could be done to lend clarity as to how the equity principle is to be understood and operationalized.

---
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Recommendations

Relevance: Finding #1.
1. It is recommended that UNICEF maintain the broad features of the current organizational articulation of UNICEF in the regions for the 2016-2020 CPAP. However, there is room for some changes in the short term, and for preparing the ground for potentially more fundamental changes. The latter would need to be based on a deeper and more comprehensive assessment and internal and external dialogue. Hence, the following actions are recommended:
   a. Undertake a cost analysis of the overhead costs of the field offices in Indonesia, to be prepared by 2017, focusing on the 2011-2015 period; and,
   b. Review of the structures and modalities of UNICEF, by 2018, possibly as part of the MTR of the new CPAP, giving attention to the following
      i. Modalities mix (direct implementation, third parties, APBN/APBD)
      ii. Selection criteria and use of MOU to shape roles and responsibilities between ministers and regional government, and UNICEF and regional government (assuming the Prodoc is retained for UNICEF – ministry linkages)
      iii. Field offices placement in view of the selection approach.

Efficiency: Finding #3.
2. It is recommended that UNICEF broaden the UNICEF cooperation funding, exploring the potential and mix of the following:
   a. Reversing/revising the Government Regulation #10 through a discussion between the development partner community (e.g. Decentralization Working Group if it can be revived and be drawn into this issue). This likely will entail a long term dialogue with an uncertain outcome;
   b. Ministries/agencies employing their own mechanisms to transfer funds to regional government (deconcentration, assistance tasks) for UNICEF related initiatives that are truly of the ministries/agencies but can benefit from regional government involvement;
   c. Enhanced fundraising, with Field Offices given a larger responsibility and role where there is potential for regional level linkages;
   d. Greater funding by partner regional government – reducing UNICEF to a provider of technical support. This could mean a larger APBD contribution, provincial grants to district/city and village government, and district/city grants to village government; and,
   e. Tapping into village government funding – once this is enhanced as promised in the new law on villages (Law 6, 2014).

Relevance: Findings #4 and #5.
3. It is recommended that UNICEF revisit the selection criteria for provinces and district/cities, making more explicit the criteria that needs to be considered, and revising the procedures and agreement documents to be used. The considerations to be given attention include:
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a. UNICEF’s effort to complete the shift to a more strategic focus on upstream work (model building, advocacy and replication), likely requiring fewer regions but more purposefully chosen to reflect the focus of the cooperation (no permanent “focus districts” as such);

b. The need to be more intensive and complete in supporting the innovation cycle for selected innovations;

c. The ability to ensure there is demand and understanding of the scope and purpose of UNICEF support;

d. The need to maintain the ability to also respond flexibly to emergencies that lend themselves to a UNICEF role; and,

e. The needs and opportunities presented by regional splitting, at provincial and district/city level. In particular, the possibility of more provinces in Papua – and subsequent requests for UNICEF support - need to be anticipated.

Relevance: Finding #1.
4. It is recommended that UNICEF examine the current involvement of the village government in UNICEF efforts, and reposition this level of government to take advantage of the stronger role of village government as a service provider and as a significant source of development funds. This should emphasize:

a. The functions assigned to village government (likely in need of clarification) pertaining to women and children;

b. Additional functions that can be delegated from the district;

c. The support of the district to village government, and linkages between these two levels; and,

d. The possible transition of the PNPM Mandiri/Generasi programs that may involve their closer integration/incorporation into district/village government systems.

5. It is recommended that UNICEF review the 2014 use of third parties prior to making additional commitments, to ensure that their use is aligned with the UNICEF upstream strategy. This may require attention to:

a. The focus of their activities – whether they are emphasizing service delivery and ad hoc capacity development, or contributions to upstream activities;

b. Whether they are maintaining or building on prior investments in networking/capacity around women/children issues; and,

c. Whether they are sufficiently able and willing to engage with regional government.

Sustainability: Finding #2.
6. It is recommended that UNICEF revisit the coordination mechanism for projects, in light of the different approaches to partnerships with SNG, dropping the rigid use of the KHPPIA teams, with their tight multi-level construction, allowing instead:

a. Coordination structures in the SNG that are focused on the specific MOU forged between UNICEF and the SNG, and if applicable other vertical agreements; and,

b. Making use of existing children related coordination mechanisms where these exist, or allowing the Bappeda to simply play its role in whichever way it sees fit to be effective.
Finding: Efficiency #3.
7. It is recommended that UNICEF prepares a revised Pedum for the CPAP 2015-2020 that provides the greater possibilities for the financial basis for cooperation, and for coordination as indicated above.

8. It is recommended that UNICEF consider the possibility of attaining greater efficiency and effectiveness in the FOs by
   a. Nationalizing CFO and other positions in the Papua office;
   b. Having greater exchanges of staff between offices;
   c. Using task forces that cut across Jakarta and field offices, for instance in the development of specific “products”;
   d. Removing some minor impediments, such as cumbersome approvals for travel logistics; and,
   e. Ensuring FOs are thoroughly involved in selection of contracted third parties (or at least fully informed in a timely way if these are entirely Jakarta office driven).

Sustainability: Finding #2.
9. It is recommended that UNICEF complete the shift to the new upstream strategy, by
   a. Taking stock of the status of the models/GP/innovations supported to date;
   b. Judiciously selecting those that are to be given additional support;
   c. Striking “product” based teams with clear, timed limited objectives for further work on these products or new initiatives;
   d. Emphasizing issues of cost-benefits, institutionalization and replication strategies, and internal/external quality check/validation; and,
   e. Developing a clear requirement/template for the documentation of successful innovations as a basis for replication/ scaling up in other regions.

Relevance: Finding #3.
10. It is recommended that UNICEF engage more closely with the decentralization process, including
    a. Prepare new staff with a better orientation to the government system and issues of decentralization;
    b. Make relevant decentralization issues part of the discussion in retreats – before the issues blindside UNICEF;
    c. Engage with the decentralization working group, or receive regular updates from UNDP;
    d. Work out a division of labour and synergy between UNICEF and UNDP, with both benefitting from the exchanges. UNDP may be most helpful on national to provincial level, while UNICEF may be better placed to provide feedback on the district/city and village level;
    e. Undertake some selected efforts in improving the decentralization framework where a large payoff for children is evident. The clarification of the village role, with viable examples on the ground, may be an example of where the payoff may well be worth the investment; and,
    f. Adopt a set of good practices that can lend greater coherence to UNICEF’s
engagement with Indonesia’s decentralized system of government. This could be facilitated by assigning a decentralization lead (could be a cross cutting theme for one of the sector leads) and developing a clearer Theory.

Efficiency: Finding #2.
11. It is recommended that UNICEF clarify what it means to drive for equity in the context of the limited resources and upstream strategy pursued by UNICEF.

12. It is recommended that UNICEF develop a closer communication with the MoF, as this might have alerted UNICEF to the end of the exception period ahead of time, and might have allowed for a discussion of alternatives that would have given more strategic room to UNICEF in its response.
8.0 Lessons Learned

1. The capturing of effective results for UNICEF requires a formal strategy that is promoted and known agency wide. UNICEF has seen successful projects that have been promulgated at the district, provincial and national level. However, the information on these successful projects has not always been widely known or widely distributed. Examples for this evaluation would be the Sabang malaria eradication effort or the Sulawesi (Takalar) midwife assistance program.

2. Where UNICEF proclaims a principle such as decentralization as central to its programme, it is useful to identify a set of actions which will support the strategy. In this case, we had decentralization as a principle for engagement, but no defined actions designed to promote decentralization.

3. Clear expertise is required to deal with what are perhaps perceived as technically “soft” topics like decentralization. While it is not science based—its knowledge base is relatively precise and technical. Therefore, it requires some investment in the specialized knowledge associated with it.

4. The internal organizational style of UNICEF needs to reflect the main principles of the organization such as gender, equity, reach and decentralization. Organizational management strategies related to central controls of administrative functions need to be filtered through the principles of UNICEF programming such as decentralization.

5. UNICEF needs to invest continuously in relationships with it partners. This includes assessing the potential benefits and liabilities associated with the partnership and continuously monitoring the quality of the relationships. One possible format is a routine review of the major partnerships using a “risk register.”

6. UNICEF needs to plan for evaluation as a routine part of its five year Country Programme. This would include planning for evaluation at the time the Country Programme is developed. The Country Programme evaluation plan should go beyond indicators to data collection and evaluation design strategies.
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1. Title of the assignment: Equity-focused formative evaluation of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process in Indonesia

2. Background and Justification:
The 2011-2015 Country Programme of Cooperation between the GOI and UNICEF is the 10th such country programme. The country programme is operationalized through the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). Since the CPAP was developed Indonesia has continued its impressive economic progress, and generally maintained social and political security. Impressive gains have been made in reducing the size of the population living in poverty, due in part to the Government’s multi-pronged poverty reduction strategy as well as the overall benefits of economic progress. However, the opportunities presented by this socio-economic development have not translated into sustainable human development for all, particularly for children. A large proportion of the population live in poverty and many more are in situations of high vulnerability, where small external shocks can push them into poverty.

Data on children in Indonesia shows that significant disparities exist in the situation of children across geographic regions, by residence (urban/rural), gender and, to some extent, wealth quintile. With its highly decentralized governance system, overcoming these disparities depends on the commitment and priorities of local government, and to the extent to which local economic growth is promoted and sustained. The reality is that successful implementation of decentralization remains varied, with challenges in many provinces and districts in coordination and harmonization, knowledge and capacity, and participation in the development planning process.

Decentralization in Indonesia
Decentralization, first introduced in Indonesia in 1999, signaled a radical departure from the previous centralized model of governance that was characterized by asymmetric and dependent power relations between the center and periphery, long distance decision making, and the formulation of homogenous policies that were often insensitive to the vast diversity of the archipelago.

In contrast, the 1999 decentralization laws drastically devolved functions of the central government to local government (mainly to the district/municipal levels which became autonomous), granting them decision-making powers that were equal to those exercised by the provincial governments (except in the two special autonomy provinces of Papua and Aceh where provincial power is substantial).

Decentralization as conceived in Indonesia incorporates strong participatory dimensions in sub-national policy making, enabled through the Musrenbang system (consultative development planning forums), where practitioners, local leaders, community members, youth and children can be involved in priority-setting and development planning. These consultative forums have the potential to shape local development and, ideally, inform and promote pro-child policies.
The rationale of a decentralized environment is to enable local governments to identify, prioritize and respond creatively and appropriately to the specific characteristics, issues and constraints of each locality. In theory, therefore, local knowledge combined with the legislative authority and discretion of district/provincial governments on planning and resource allocation processes can be a strong basis for innovations that enhance child welfare and realize child rights at the sub-national level. Localized approaches for instance can be crucial when local cultural practices and behaviors add to the challenges of improving the situation of women and children.

Unfortunately, despite this rationale, decentralization is blamed for the lack of progress on many key indicators, and in fact may be a significant contributing factor. Capacities of key institutions at decentralized levels are highly variable, leading to huge inequities in social services across the country. Building the capacities of these decentralized units across all sectors is critical in improving equity and quality of services. In addition to ensuring availability of services, monitoring the quality of services also needs to be improved and systematized.

The implementation of the UNICEF country programme and engagement with the decentralization process is being led and coordinated by the country office, based in Jakarta, which has four main programme streams: child survival and development, education and adolescent development, child protection, and social policy and monitoring. This work is supported by five field offices: Banda Aceh, Surabaya, Makassar, Kupang and Jayapura, and two sub-offices (Ambon – linked to Makassar, Manokwari – linked to Jayapura). Making decentralization work for children is one of seven major programme strategies defined in the current country programme. This entails supporting a systems-building approach to sub-national institutional capacity development to provide quality basic services for children and their families.

UNICEF Indonesia field offices, some of which have existed since before the period of decentralization began in 1999, have multiple technical, advocacy and managerial roles supporting child rights within the country programme, including:

- Facilitation of and building evidence from model/pilot interventions;
- Representation and advocacy with provincial and district leadership, including thorough leveraging both national and local resources;
- Project implementation support including regular liaison with counterparts; and,
- Technical advice and capacity development.

The Mid Term Review (MTR) of the current Country Programme, conducted in 2013, found that in order to achieve the country programme results the sub-national presence of UNICEF remained essential and that the field offices were generally able to fulfil their major roles. The MTR also noted that with the changed staffing profile necessary to maintain the shift of UNICEF programme approach to more upstream work, the organization’s emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness, plus the increasing costs of maintaining multiple offices, a systematic review and analysis of the roles and functions of the field offices should be undertaken to inform the next country programme. This recommendation follows on the heels of a field office review, conducted in 2008, which found that UNICEF needs to adjust
its staffing profile across different sub-national areas, depending on the socio-economic development status of the region.

An important regional evaluation was conducted in 2013 on UNICEF’s response to decentralization in Asia and the Pacific over the 2006-2012 period. The evaluation made the important point, relevant for Indonesia that UNICEF needs to identify rationale and strategy for working on decentralization rather than just working in decentralized contexts. It is out of these observations that the present evaluation is commissioned, to assess the strategies of the country programme with respect to supporting equitable realization of child rights in the overall decentralization process of Indonesia.

3. Purpose and objectives of the assignment:

**Purpose:** The purpose of the evaluation is to inform development of the new 2016-2020 UNICEF country programme of cooperation with the GOI, and specifically to identify the best options for UNICEF’s engagement in Indonesia’s decentralization process, in order to more effectively contribute to equitable achievement of results for children. It will assess UNICEF Indonesia’s capacity and strategies to deliver results for children in line with the key priorities of Indonesia’s decentralization process and UNICEF’s global equity focus. Findings, recommendations and lessons will also be applied to current programming (pre-2016), especially for the design or adjustment of activities and work plans at decentralized levels.

The primary users of this evaluation will be UNICEF Indonesia, GOI and other key partners who engage in promoting child rights in the decentralized context of Indonesia. Given Indonesia’s size, middle-income status and growing position on the world stage, the evaluation also has potential to inform equity-focused programmes for children in other large, diverse countries across the globe.

**Objectives:** The evaluation has three primary objectives.

1. To obtain key findings based on analysis of UNICEF’s current and past engagement in the decentralization process, related to how the country programme has or has not been successfully meeting expectations of the organization’s equity agenda.
2. To prepare evidence-based recommendations that will advise UNICEF and GOI on the most equitable and innovative approaches for efficient and effective UNICEF engagement in decentralization for children in Indonesia.
3. To guide UNICEF and GOI in decision-making related to sub-national presence (engagement at decentralized levels) for the 2016-2020 country programme.

**Scope:** The evaluation will assess strategies employed to engage in decentralization in the current country programme (2011-2015), through an equity lens, yet should also reflect on UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization dating back to 1999. It will cover all components of the country programme, identify areas for prioritization, and recommend appropriate strategies for the effective, efficient and equitable realization of child rights.

Geographically the evaluation will cover UNICEF’s work at national level, in Jakarta, as well as sub-national work conducted through field offices identified above. The evaluation should
also consider sub-national areas where UNICEF has not had any direct implementation, for comparison purposes.

The evaluation is expected to take a big-picture approach to UNICEF’s engagement in the ongoing decentralization process, asking whether the programme is well positioned to further strategies to address international and national priorities for children, whether those strategies are being implemented appropriately, and if there are areas for improvement. The reference of analysis for the evaluation is the 2011-2015 country programme and specifically its core strategy to make decentralization work for children (as elaborated in the CPAP).

4. Evaluation Questions
Key evaluation questions clustered according to the international evaluation criteria that will be used are provided below. This initial list will be further refined by the selected institution and included in the inception report following desk review and preliminary interviews with relevant stakeholders.

Relevance:
- How relevant is UNICEF’s programme strategy to make decentralization work for children in Indonesia, considering the organization’s global equity focus and the government’s development priorities as outlined in the RPJMN and other national strategies?
- To what extent is UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process aligned with UNICEF’s global equity focus for addressing the needs of the most marginal and vulnerable children?

Effectiveness:
- Has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process helped the organization contribute to the equitable fulfillment of child rights in Indonesia?
- Has UNICEF’s engagement at decentralized levels helped or hindered the effective and equitable fulfillment of child rights for all children in Indonesia?
- What unintended outcomes have resulted from UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process?

Sustainability:
- To what extent have the results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been replicable to parts of the country where there is no UNICEF presence?
- What are the enabling or constraining factors that influence the long-term sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization?

Efficiency:
- How cost effective has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been as a means to promote equitable realization of child rights in Indonesia?
- To what extent has UNICEF established meaningful partnerships/mechanisms with other key actors at sub-national level to avoid duplication of effort or miscommunication?
- How cost effective is the current office structure at national and sub-national levels for promoting child rights across the country?
• What efficiency and effectiveness lessons could be learned from past experience with closing/moving UNICEF offices at sub-national level?

**Equity:**
• Are the most marginalized children in Indonesia reached through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?
• How has UNICEF’s current and past engagement in the decentralization process addressed non-geographical disparities in child rights such as by gender, socio-economic status, location (urban/rural), or ethnicity?

5. **Methodology**
In consultation with the contract supervisor, relevant UNICEF and GoI staff, and based on the initial desk review, the selected institution will develop a plan for the methodological approach to this assignment, including data collection instruments. Qualitative methods of data collection and analysis should be favored, including individual (key informant) interviews and focus group discussions with UNICEF staff, GoI counterparts and civil society actors at national and sub-national level.

More detailed methodology for the assignment should be proposed in the RFP response, addressing the evaluation questions outlined above. It is foreseen that the assignment would entail the following broad phases:

*Phase 1 (Inception)* – desk review of key documents and interviews with UNICEF management and staff, leading to the delivery of an inception report detailing, among other things, the methodology and work plan of the assignment.

*Phase 2 (Data collection)* – field visits, analysis and draft report preparation.

*Phase 3 (Report)* – sharing of draft findings with UNICEF and stakeholders in a validation workshop, and subsequent finalization of the evaluation report.

**Reference Documents**
The following linked documents are provided for reference and to assist interested firms in preparing detailed proposals for this work.
https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/19219321/Decentralisation%20evaluation%20reference%20docs.zip

1. UNICEF Indonesia CPD 2011-2015
2. UNICEF Indonesia CPAP 2011-2015
3. UNICEF Indonesia MTR 2013
4. UNICEF Indonesia Field Office Review 2008
5. Government of Indonesia RPJMN 2010-2014
7. UNEG evaluation report standards, as adapted by UNICEF in 2010
8. UNICEF GEROS Methodology 2013
9. UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy 2013
10. UNICEF Indonesia Issue Briefs 2013 (Equity and Decentralization)
11. Thematic Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to Decentralization in East Asia and Pacific 2013
12. UNEG norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system 2005
13. UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluations 2008
6. **Deliverables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Desk review</td>
<td>Inception report with methodological approach, work plan</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Data collection and analysis</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>45 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Finalization</td>
<td>Validation workshop and Final report</td>
<td>10 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institutions responding to the RFP are requested to indicate in their proposals where the three phases of work should be carried out (i.e. Jakarta, provinces or home-based). Financial proposals should be all-inclusive, including costs for fees, travel, sub-contracts and other necessary expenses.

Note that the final report is expected to align with the format outlined in the UNICEF-adapted UNEG evaluation reports standards.

**Phase I:**
- Inception report: including further development of the evaluation scope; refinement of evaluation questions, the implementation plan, methodology, work plan of the assignment (further refined from the initial proposal).
- No more than 20 pages in length, excluding annexes.

**Phase II:**
- Data collection, field work, analysis
- Draft evaluation report, in line with UNEG report standards
- No more than 45 pages in length, excluding annexes.

**Phase III:**
- Delivery of ½ day validation workshop to deliver draft findings
- Final evaluation report, to be assessed by UNICEF using the GEROS methodology.
- No more than 45 pages in length, excluding annexes
- An executive summary of the final evaluation report (per UNICEF report standards). No more than 3 pages in length.

7. **Duration of contract:**

The expected duration of the assignment is 65 working days (3 working months), in the period September-November 2014. The final report is expected by the end of November 2014, at the latest, to enable timely contribution to the forthcoming country programme 2016-2020 preparation process.

The assignment will be primarily based in Jakarta, although travel will be required to field locations within Indonesia. UNICEF will reimburse for airfare in economy class; applicable DSA (Daily Subsistence Allowance) will be paid for all required travel away from the contractor’s home base, as per UNICEF policy on travel for institutional contractors. Some of the assignment may be conducted from the contractor’s home-base, subject to discussion with the contract supervisor.

Payment of fees is proposed in no more than the three phases described above, linked with key deliverables: 30% upon submission and approval of inception report; 40% upon submission and approval of draft report; and 30% upon submission and approval of the final report. Specific payment schedule will be discussed with the selected institution.
8. **Qualifications Required:**
For this assignment, UNICEF and GOI seek an institution with team members that have the following qualifications:

- Experience in conducting and leading evaluations of programme strategies for decentralized/local governance for children;
- Experience in developing and applying methodological tools for programme evaluations, notably qualitative and participatory methods;
- Experience in engaging in dialogue with senior UN and Government officials on programme strategies for children;
- Ability to analyze and synthesize information from a broad range of sources;
- Good understanding of the rights-based programming environment for children, and their guiding international frameworks (especially the CRC);
- Good understanding of the strategic relevance for children of upstream work and decentralization;
- Ability to work in diverse and multi-cultural environments;
- Excellent and proven English communication skills;
- Ability of at least one team member to speak and read Bahasa Indonesia; and,
- Individual may be sub-contracted by the selected firm, as necessary. As the selected institution is expected to operate with a high degree of independence, UNICEF will be able to provide only limited support to translation and interpretation services.
Appendix 2: Literature Review

Education

Education is a powerful tool because it equips children with knowledge and life skills which are essential to overcome barriers and recognize opportunities. It is important that education be seen as a basic right for all children, eliminating any disparities that exist in its attainment. According to the Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015, one of the desired outcomes to be achieved by 2015 is to ensure that all children, especially the most vulnerable have sufficient knowledge, basic education and life skills to live a successful life.\(^{63}\) Unfortunately, there are still minimal disparities that exist in the enrollment rates based on gender and income status, despite there being an overall increase in the rates of primary education.\(^{64}\) According to the Country Programme Document 2011-2015, the primary school attendance for males in 2006 was is 86\%, compared to the 84\% for females.\(^{65}\) Raw data from the World Bank reveals that in 2012,\(^{66}\) the primary school completion rate for females (% of relevant age group) was 107\%\(^{67}\) compared to 103\% for males. This discloses that though the primary school attendance rate is lower for females, their completion rate is higher. Yet, data from the World Bank shows that males are more likely to progress to secondary schools (97\%) compared to females (96\%).\(^{68}\) It is evident that the disparities relating the gender are marginal however, these inequalities intensify for factors such as age, income status and urban versus rural dwellers.

It is commendable that the school participation rate for children has increased over the years, for instance, the school participation rate for those aged 7-12 years was 96.42\% in 2003, compared to 98.42\% in 2013.\(^{69}\) A similar pattern was apparent for the other age groups: 13-15 and 16-18 years of age. However, despite the overall increase, a large discrepancy exists between the age groups. The school participation rates are very good for those aged 7-12, yet as the children get older and closer to the ages of 16-18, the participation rates begin to decline. For instance, in 2011, the participation rate for those aged 7-12 was 97.62\%, 13-15 was 87.99\% and 16-18 was 57.95\%. In 2013, the rates were 94.42\%, 90.81\%, 63.84\% respectively.\(^{70}\)

Differences in the school enrollment rates are also obvious for children from urban versus rural areas though the variances for children 5-9 years is very slight, the inequalities become very apparent for those between the ages of 15-19. This pattern has remained valid throughout the years, for an example in 2012, the participation rate for children aged 5-9 years was 70.01\% in urban areas compared to 70.26\% in rural areas. The figures for those aged 10-14 years were 97.44\% and 95.12\% respectively while the figures for those aged 15-19 was 66.41\% and 55.72\%.

\(^{66}\) Information was not available from 2013 or 2014.
\(^{67}\) The ratio can exceed 100\% due to over-aged and under-aged children who enter primary school late/early and/or repeat grades.
\(^{69}\) BPS-RI, Susenas 2003-2013.
\(^{70}\) BPS-RI, Susenas 2003-2013.
respectively. The increase in the disparity gap between urban and rural enrollment rates is evident as the age of children increases.\textsuperscript{71}

In addition to age and the location (urban versus rural) of households, differences also exist for those on the two extremes of the economic and social spectrum. Literature reveals that only half of the children from low income households are enrolled in primary schools.\textsuperscript{72} This is confirmed by the World Bank, which states the enrollment rates for primary schools is below 60\% in poorer areas, compared to well-off regions, which have universal enrollment.\textsuperscript{73} Overall, data from the World Bank portrays that enrollment rates for primary school is quite low in Indonesia when compared to other developing countries in East Asia and Pacific, while the enrollment rates for secondary schools are on par.\textsuperscript{74}

According to the Country Programme Document 2011-2015, a good proportion of the budget was allocated to the \textit{Education and Adolescent Development} Programme.\textsuperscript{75} This program is focused on evidence based policy creation that would aid the progression of the education system and increase enrollment and ensure that children complete their primary and secondary schooling successfully.\textsuperscript{77} According to the World Bank, while the funding for education has increased in the country, Indonesia is still underinvesting, especially in junior secondary education.\textsuperscript{78}

\textit{Poverty}

\textit{Income Levels}

While the poverty level has reduced from 24.2\% in 1998 to 13.3\% in 2010, the national poverty line is still $1.55 USD per day\textsuperscript{79} and more than forty million people live on less than $2 USD per day.\textsuperscript{80} Significant disparities exist in poverty levels between regions. For instance, the poverty rate in Papua is almost forty percent, even though it is home to only 3\% of the nation’s poor whereas the poverty rate in Java and Bali is 15.7\% even though it encompasses almost 60\% of the country’s poor.\textsuperscript{81} Failure to address these inequities could lead to millions of children being disadvantaged as poverty levels impact health, education and access to basic necessities.

\textsuperscript{71} BPS-RI, Susenas 2003-2013.
\textsuperscript{73} "Indonesia." \textit{World Bank and Education in Indonesia}. N.p., 1 Sept. 2014. Web. 06 Nov. 2014.
\textsuperscript{74} "Indicators." \textit{Data}. N.p., n.d. Web. 04 Nov. 2014.
\textsuperscript{76} There is a lot of emphasis on evidence based planning and policy creation. One of the desired outcomes (by 2015) in the Country Programme 2011- 2015 is to use evidence based planning and resource allocation at the national level to reduce disparities between children (p.12).
\textsuperscript{78} "Indonesia." \textit{World Bank and Education in Indonesia}. N.p., 1 Sept. 2014. Web. 06 Nov. 2014.
Access to Basic Services

One of the anticipated outcomes (by 2015) stated in UNICEF Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015 is to benefit the most vulnerable children and women by providing them with access to and delivery of basic services such as water, sanitation, hygiene and nutrition.\(^{82}\) Regardless of there being an 80% improvement in drinking water sources\(^{83}\), only half of the households in rural, poor areas have access to water sources compared to 80% of the poor households in urban areas.\(^{84}\) Similarly, 66% of the poor households in Java and Bali have access to improved water sources compared to 35% in Kalimantan and 9% in Papua.\(^{85}\) The inequalities in access to services between the urban and rural residents is also evident in other areas. For an example, 80% of low income households in rural areas lack septic tanks, compared to 59% of low income households in urban areas. Similarly, when compared to similar countries, Indonesia has the lowest number of households that are connected to piped sewage services.\(^{86}\) Access to health centres is also weak in poor rural areas, literature indicates that in Java, the average distance from a household to a health centre is four kilometers while the average distance in Papua is thirty-two kilometers.\(^{87}\)

Research specifies that since 2008, there has been a 52% improvement in the access to sanitation facilities\(^{88}\) yet, less than thirty-five percent of households in rural regions have access to sanitation facilities.\(^{89}\) Almost 70 million people in these regions still excrete in open spaces and despite the associated environmental and health costs of poor sanitation, Indonesia’s policy on sanitation states that households are responsible for their basic cleanliness.\(^{90}\) On a more positive note, there have been initiatives aimed at addressing the concerns relating to the lack of access to water, sanitation and hygiene. One such initiative is the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) program, which played a significant role in educating people about the importance of hygiene and sanitation. This was achieved with through encouraging behavior change through awareness, providing access to affordable water supplies, involving both men and women in the planning, supervising and maintaining water supply and sanitation systems, encouraging local schools to change the habits of children and finally better organizing the local government to promote better planning and monitoring.\(^{91}\)

Early Childhood Development Services

One of the anticipated outcomes (by 2015) specified in the UNICEF’s Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015 is to prepare children less than 7 years of age for school by improving the capacities of local governments and community organizations so that they could implement well-


rounded early childhood development programmes. Literature suggests that there has been some improvement in this area, in the UNICEF Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015, it was stated that one of the key results achieved from Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010 was that 22,000 children aged 0-6 years, in twenty three target areas, now have improved access to early childhood development services, however, more than three-fifths of the children still do not. Since these services are provided by the community, children from poor households can often get overlooked from the initiatives.

Health
Over the years, there has been a genuine effort to improve the health of Indonesian citizens, especially the most susceptible. For instance, a particular number of praiseworthy results were achieved from the Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010 such as Indonesia becoming a polio free country in 2008. Within a span of nine years (2000-2009), the country also managed to reduce measles related mortality rates by 66%. As well, the UNICEF supported malaria integrated programme in South Halmahera District, North Maluku achieved a 50% decline in malaria related incidences in the area. UNICEF and its partners also played an important role in protecting children against measles, in 2006, more than five million children were immunized in Yogyakarta. Clean and safe water, along with hygiene kits were also provided to those affected. Finally, the Improving Maternal Health in Indonesia and Making Pregnancy Safer program, helped hospitals build their capacity to better deal with emergency obstetric and neonatal complications.

HIV
Despite the positive changes in some areas of the health sector, HIV remains a serious threat to parts of the country, affecting thousands of children. There has been an increase in the number of HIV positive pregnant women, this has raised the number of children living with HIV to more than 14,000 and this number is expected to increase by 41% by 2014. In 2008, HIV and AIDS affected approximately 200,000 children across the country. The situation is especially of concern in Papua and West Papua, where nearly seven children catch HIV infections every day. However, funding from the Government of the Netherlands has allowed to strengthen local knowledge and awareness of HIV through various programmes, especially in areas such as Papua, where HIV rates are very high.

Malnutrition
Malnutrition continues to affect children and mothers, especially the most vulnerable. Young children remain very prone because almost 14% of mothers suffer from undernutrition (the rate...
of undernutrition is higher in rural areas and especially in poor households\(^{100}\) and 44% of expecting mothers are anaemic, in this case, breast milk provides very few nutrients to infants.\(^{101}\) This acts as a barrier to the healthy growth of children since 18% of them are moderately to severely underweight.\(^{102}\) Exclusive breastfeeding continues to remain an area of improvement because despite the recognition of it being the best form of nutrition for infants of 0-6 months, only 42% (as of 2012) of babies receive it.\(^{103}\) This can lead to other health problems such as diarrhoea, asphyxia and respiratory problems.\(^{104}\) To address this issue, in 2009, the national GOI passed a law that required every baby to be breastfed (either directly from the mother or from donors and milk banks), unless there were medical reasons preventing them from doing so. However, according to the Indonesian Demographic Health Survey, this law is implemented very poorly and young mothers are convinced by formula companies to consider substitutes to breast milk.\(^{105}\) Yet, out of all the areas of health coverage, ‘exclusive breastfeeding’ has the lowest coverage at 32%.\(^{106}\) A lot of disparities continue to exist in this area and these conditions are very common in Eastern Indonesia.

\textbf{Mortality Rates}

Although the overall Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR) has declined from 390 per 100,000 live births in 1991 to 228 per 100,000 live births in 2007 at the national level, Indonesia continues to face a serious concern relating to MMR. MMR is triple the rate of Vietnam and six times the rate of countries such as China or Malaysia.\(^{107}\) Great disparities continue to exist based on the urban versus rural criteria, for instance, the MMR in Papua is 1161 per 100,000 live births, well above the national average.\(^{108}\) This could be linked to the fact that skilled health workers only attended approximately 80% of the live births as of 2010.\(^{109}\) Considering there are more hospital and health clinics in urban areas, it is a safe assumption that most of the live births attended by these skilled workers were likely in urban regions. However, efforts are being made to bring improvements in this area because areas such as first antenatal care, complete antenatal care and skilled attendant at birth have satisfactory health coverages at 90%, 81%, and 79% respectively. As of 2008, this health insurance programme now covers more than three-quarters of the poor in the country.\(^{110}\)

Although the Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) and Under Give mortality Rate (U5MR) have decreased over the last fourteen years in majority of the provinces, disparities among provinces have increased for IMR within the span of 5 years from 2002-2007 and U5MR remains much higher

---


than the national average of 34 per 1000 live births. The higher number of deaths could be traced back to neonatal problems, diarrhoea and pneumonia, most of these could be caused by the lack of exclusive breastfeeding and low nutritional status of pregnant women.

There are a lot of inequalities between regions with respect to mortality rates. For instance, IMR ranges are 45 per 1000 live births in Aceh and East Java and 74 per 1000 live births in West Sulawesi (newly formed province). Research also indicates that IMR is close to 77 per 1000 live births in the poorest households compared to 32 per 1000 live births in the wealthiest households. Similarly, under five mortality rates are doubled in poor households and in rural areas compared to middle- high income households and urban areas. The U5MR in Yogyakarta is 22 per 1000 live births compared to West Sulawesi, at 96 per 1000 live births. Lastly, studies indicates that IMR and U5MR is now decreasing at a lower rate compared to the last twenty years. The current rate of decline is at 1%, compared to the 3% before decentralization.

Also, as aforementioned, while the overall rate of IMR and U5MR has decreased, disparities between provinces has increased for IMR from 2002-2007. The rates are significantly higher in poorer, rural regions compared to well- off urban areas. For instance, the lowest wealth quintile experience more than double IMR and U5MR compared to the wealthiest quintile of the population.

Improving the health arena of the country remains a priority of UNICEF and its supporters. This is evident because a good portion of the budget was allotted to Child Survival and Development Programme. This programme aims to address disparities in health and nutrition, developing the capacity of health sectors (especially in rural and poor areas), documenting lessons that can be used to improve governance, services and resource allocation, improving health information systems and monitoring. The programme will give priority to Aceh, NTT and Papua. The main anticipated results from the programme is to ensure that children and women benefit from the improved access to and delivery of basic services such as nutrition and hygiene and secondly, to ensure that families and communities adhere to positive behaviors in order to ensure the well-being of children.

Child Protection
Child protection remains of importance of UNICEF and its supporters, this is obvious from budget allocations. A fair amount of the budget is allocated to the Child Protection Programme which aims to promote child protection nationally and sub-nationally. The expected results from this programme can be summarized as a) A holistic community based child protection system in the
5 MTSP focus provinces b) Strengthening systems of data collection related to child protection to create better policies, plans and budgets and c) Protect children from natural disasters and conflicts and the associated immediate to long term consequences. These three areas are also the intended outcomes (by 2015) as stated in the UNICEF Country Programme Action Plan 2011-2015.

Notable accomplishments in this area include these specific legislations: the Juvenile Justice Bill, 33 subnational regulations related to Justice for Children, Alternative Care, Foster Care and Social Work. All of these have been drafted amidst the Country Programme Action Plan 2006-2010.

UNICEF efforts are evident during disasters such as the 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami, which left thousands vulnerable. It was during this time that with the support of UNICEF, it became possible to amalgamate 159 health service units, ensuring that all those affected, especially children received immediate care. Such an elaborate system of care led to zero records of disease during the time. Post Tsunami, UNICEF had also supported the construction of 300 earthquake resistant schools and also took the initiative to address workforce gaps by training close to 9000 teachers and principals, ensuring that children continued to receive quality education. In addition to guaranteeing quality health and education services, UNICEF also played a role in helping reunite 2500 children with their families, extended families or communities. No child was trafficked and more than 14000 children attended the 21 children centres in Aceh and Nias. These centres provided holistic child services including psychological and legal.

Development Partners

One of the focus areas of UNICEF has been to develop partnerships in order to achieve outcomes for children and one of the desired outcomes (by 2015) is for UNICEF to form partnerships to attain results for children and women. To date, UNICEF has achieved several successes as a result of forming partnerships for instance, as aforesaid, UNICEF and its partnerships led the immunization of almost five million children against measles in 2006 in Yogyakarta, along with the distribution of clean water and hygiene kits.

Creating partnerships remains a priority for UNICEF as the Policy and Partnerships for Children programme constitutes a large portion of the budget, as stated in the Indonesia Country Programme Document 2011-2015. The main goals of the programme are to progress the rights of children and women and to involve children in public consultation. The desired results from the programme (by 2015) are a) To reduce child disparity in all areas and at all levels, this is to be achieved through evidence based planning, policy and resource allocation at the national level in five MTSP focus provinces b) Use strong partnerships to make the rights of children and women
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124 This is a major accomplishment as girls under the age of 18 make up more than 30% of the women trafficked for sex work.
a priority in policies, programmes and budget allocations and c) Allow children and young people to voice their opinions on practices that affect their lives and influence policies.

**Participatory Planning**

The importance of participatory planning and community involvement has been recognized in the legal context in Indonesia for instance, Government Regulation No. 40/2006 requires the use of community participation amidst the process of formulating government work plans. This is often supported by the Musrenbang, a technique that allows for public consultation. However, even Musrenbangs fail to fairly involve children and women to shape development planning; there is little room for children and women to highlight problems, needs and priorities. Women and children are often ignored among proceedings, mostly because those with authority dominate the discussion. This contradicts the idea of initiating decentralized public policies, where the inclusion of the civil society in planning is key. Literature also indicated that child focused practitioners expressed frustration because those who hold authority in the districts are usually the ones who are head of the agenda, these individuals often outplay front line service priorities. In the 2010 GOI/UNICEF Situation Analysis of Children and Women showed that during a focus group discussion (which included government workers and NGO activists) in Papua, participants stated that feedback from the community makes little difference in the decision making process because at the sub district level, inputs from the community are rarely included into the municipal plans or the budget. There have been efforts to improve the participation of children and women, as one of the desired outcomes (by 2015) is to increase the level of participation of children (both girls and boys) and allow them to voice their opinion when it comes to policy planning, as stated in the UNICEF Country Programme 2011-2015.

**Data Management**

Literature indicates that the management of data has remained very poor across the country, especially in the health sector. For instance, due to the lack of information one would find it difficult to compare the MMR rates of provinces, in this case, the disparities that exist between provinces cannot be accounted for. It was noted that although there were written guidelines on how to manage data in health centres, these were only being used partially, this was evident in the level of fragmented data found in numerous health programmes. There is also a lack of an integrated data system (from all sectors) at the national level; there is a data dictionary available at the national level (for population based surveys), yet it is not available at the subnational
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level. Scholars have suggested that decentralization can be blamed for the poor management and flow of data. Apart from the health sector, it is very common for the data collection and monitoring systems relating to child rights, protection and welfare at the local level to be very weak/ inaccessible if not absent.

It was suggested in *Making Decentralization Work for Children in Indonesia* that in order to strengthen the capacity of subnational and district level governments, these governments and citizens need to have access to up to date information about national laws and regulations. Research conducted for the *Thematic Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to Decentralization in East Asia and the Pacific 2006-2012* showed that the use of good quality data was seen to have a good effect on the overall well-being of children and women and that it was necessary to improve data systems to achieve this, since the implementation of policy is often weak with inefficient with partial data systems. Most importantly, accumulating quality data by regions and communities on child related indicators was seen to have a direct positive impact on monitoring and evaluation, improving community planning. Strengthening data systems will also allow for evidence informed advocacy at the national and subnational/ district levels, improving synergy and good governance.

**Barriers to Capacity Building and Well-being of Children and Women**

The nature of the barriers to the well-being of children and women could be summarized into four main themes: the lack of fluid relationships between the national, provincial and district level governments (leading to a lack of harmonization of rules and regulations between the three levels of government); weak communication and coordination between parties involved in child welfare; weak knowledge and capacity at the district and municipal level; lack of participatory opportunities and methods for children and women in the local planning and budgetary decisions.

To elaborate further, the *Thematic Evaluation of UNICEF’s Response to Decentralization in East Asia and the Pacific 2006-2012* stated that UNICEF has largely not made much effort to strengthen institutional capacity and that the national governments in general hesitate in allotting responsibilities, authority and funds. Likewise, the evaluation showed that UNICEF has not used bottom-up planning enough hence many of the programmes and initiatives initiated by the national government do not adhere to the needs of children and women.
Appendix 3: Evaluation Matrix

The Log Frame is supported by the Evaluation Matrix, which is a tool for systematically identifying evaluation questions, indicators of success, and appropriate data sources and data collection methods. Whereas the Logical Framework gives a picture of UNICEF’s involvement at the general level, the matrix indicates the aspects of UNICEF’s participation that will be the focus of the evaluation. Some of the more common issues addressed in evaluations are relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and equity.

**Relevance** refers to the extent to which the strategy of dealing with decentralization contributes to the overall goal or strategic direction of the organization. The exploration of rationale considers questions such as: is this the most appropriate way to achieve the goal? Are there other ways to manage the resources that would improve on outcomes?

**Effectiveness** refers to the extent to which UNICEF’s involvement aided in achieving the objectives and thereby contributed towards the ultimate goal of improving the governance for children and promoting child rights. It records changes in the beneficiary group(s) that have happened as a result of the programme. It is the link between outputs and objectives in the Logical Framework. Effectiveness refers to outcomes or results achieved and the output-outcome relationship.

**Sustainability** refers to the maintenance of changes of child benefits by GOI agencies and partners over the long term. It refers to whether the changes promoted by UNICEF are sustained by GOI at all levels.

**Equity** is the achievement of outcomes and the participation of children and youth in all regions of all racial backgrounds, of all levels of income, of all ethnic groups, of all language categories.

**Efficiency** refers to the extent to which programme inputs were supplied and managed and activities were organized and outputs produced in the most appropriate manner at the least cost to produce the outputs. It is the link between the activities and outputs columns in the PLM. Efficiency questions usually refer to the timeliness, quality and quantity of the delivery of inputs, activities and outputs in relation to the programme plans and needs.

The Evaluation Matrix for UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process can be found in the Appendices. The matrix presents the key evaluation questions and the performance indicators, which are often the focus of monitoring and evaluation efforts. Indicators seek to measure results and to provide evidence that progress is being made toward the achievement of the goal. The **Data Required** column contains the information that is required to determine the indicator. The **Sources of Data** column contains the individuals, organizations, documents, or reports from which the data will be obtained. The **Method of Collection** column lists the
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methods and techniques that will be used to gather the data that will measure results. The Analysis column explains how the data will be analyzed. The last two columns of the matrix identify the individual responsible for data collection, reporting, analysis, etc. and the time frame in which they are expected to do it. The matrix is divided by relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, efficiency and equity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data required</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Method of collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How relevant is UNICEF’s programme strategy to make decentralization work for children in Indonesia, considering the organization’s global equity focus and the government’s development priorities as outlined in the RPJMN and other national strategies?</td>
<td>a. On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff rate 7 for the alignment of goals and objectives of UNICEF’s programme with UNICEF’s global strategy.</td>
<td>Project documents and research literature.</td>
<td>Stakeholder view/ opinions on the relevance of UNICEF’s programme strategy to making decentralization work for children in Indonesia.</td>
<td>Project documents including: CCA, CPD, CPAP, MTR, Programme documents.</td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff. GOI/Partner interviews</td>
<td>HCA will collect and review relevant documents and research literature. HCA will conduct key informant interviews and online surveys with the Country Representative and regional office staff.</td>
<td>Collect and review relevant documents and research literature by October 2014. Conduct key informant interviews and online surveys by beginning of November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. % of UNICEF staff reporting there is a conceptual framework.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GOI staff.</td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff. GOI/Partner interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. % of UNICEF staff reporting that the framework used by UNICEF corresponds to literature/ experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff. GOI/Partner interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Clarity and consistent pattern of action indicating UNICEF is purposefully positioning itself in terms of working in decentralized settings and working on decentralization itself (e.g. improving the framework that is relevant to children).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff. GOI/Partner interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What conceptual framework does UNICEF employ regarding the linkage between decentralization and its work with children and does this correspond to literature/ experience?</td>
<td>Emerging government project documents (e.g. draft RPJMN). Views of UNICEF “policy makers/planners” on need to link and how to link Documents on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff (UNICEF). GOI/Partner interviews</td>
<td>Assess stakeholder view/ opinions. Assess commitment to decentralization in government policies/plans, relevance to UNICEF aims, and how UNICEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Does UNICEF have staff that is sufficiently knowledgeable of decentralization issues relevant to UNICEF and able to incorporate this knowledge in programming?

4. How closely does UNICEF wish to link to the new government national policies and plans (post-election) particularly on issues of decentralization, and does it have a game plan for making this connection possible?

5. To what extent is UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process aligned with UNICEF’s global equity focus for addressing the needs of the most marginal and vulnerable children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>e. On a 10 point scale with 10 being very knowledgeable and 1 being not knowledgeable, UNICEF staff give themselves at least a 7/10.</th>
<th>UNICEF’s involvement in the decentralization process and research literature.</th>
<th>Surveys with UNICEF staff.</th>
<th>makes a link to its country strategy/plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff rate 7 for the level of effort exerted by UNICEF to expand the modalities that would allow for engagement with regional/local government and tapping their resources. Core programing.</td>
<td>Stakeholder view/opinions on the relevance of UNICEF’s knowledge of decentralization issues relevant to the work if UNICEF.</td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff (UNICEF). GOI/Partner interviews. Surveys with UNICEF staff.</td>
<td>Assess stakeholder feedback on the extent to which local governments had the opportunity to work with UNICEF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff rate 7 for the level of budget allocations that are linked in decentralization issues. Stakeholder view/opinions on UNICEF’s desire to link new government national policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key document review. Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff (UNICEF). GOI/Partner interviews. Surveys with UNICEF staff.</td>
<td>Review of budget proportions, and judgment on the centrality or peripheral nature of decentralization related “investments”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff rate 7 for the level of budget resources mobilized from government and other parties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is UNICEF maximizing the resources available at subnational level in furthering its work? What level of resources are being used/mobilized by UNICEF?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder view/opinions on the whether UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process is aligned with addressing the need for children.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder view/opinions on the whether UNICEF is maximizing resources available at a subnational level and the type of resources being used by UNICEF.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and regional office staff (UNICEF). GOI/Partner interviews. Surveys with UNICEF staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Informant Interviews with Country Representative and regional office staff (UNICEF). GOI/Partner interviews. Surveys with UNICEF staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Matrix - Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data required</th>
<th>Source of data</th>
<th>Method of collection</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Are UNICEF’s efforts linked to key government initiatives/programmes to improve services that are critical to children? (e.g. Minimum Service Standards, Public Service Standards, service complaint mechanisms, service charters, Ombudsman, freedom of information/government information centres).</td>
<td>On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff (Jakarta office and regional offices) and GOI (national, provincial and district) rate 7 for UNICEF’s ability to improve critical services by linking its efforts to key government initiatives.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. Stakeholder views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents. UNICEF staff, GOI staff and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has UNICEF’s engagement at decentralized levels helped or hindered the effective and equitable fulfillment of child rights for all children in Indonesia?</td>
<td>On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff (Jakarta office and regional offices) and GOI staff (national, provincial and district) rate 7 for UNICEF’s ability to help achieve equitable and effective child rights for all</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. Stakeholder views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents. UNICEF staff, GOI staff and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Source of data</td>
<td>Method of collection</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent have the results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been replicable to parts of the country where there is no UNICEF presence?</td>
<td>On a scale of 1 to 10 [UNICEF staff should rate a minimum of 7], how are the lives of children different in areas with UNICEF presence vs. areas with no UNICEF presence?</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents. UNICEF staff, GOI staff and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the enabling or constraining factors that influence the long-term sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization?</td>
<td>Positive or negative factors that help or threaten the sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents. UNICEF staff, GOI staff and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Source of data</td>
<td>Method of collection</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How has UNICEF’s current and past engagement in the decentralization process addressed non-geographical disparities in child rights such as by gender, socio-economic status, local (urban/ rural) or ethnicity?</td>
<td>The number of precautions taken by UNICEF to eliminate non-geographical disparities.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are the most marginalized children in Indonesia reached through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?</td>
<td>On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff rate 7 for the extent to which the most marginalized children are reach as a result of UNICEF’s approach to decentralization.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders. Surveys with UNICEF staff.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data required</td>
<td>Source of data</td>
<td>Method of collection</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How cost effective has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been as a means to promote equitable realization of child rights in Indonesia?</td>
<td>An increase over the years in the number of successful programme (child rights) that were developed and implemented within budget.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents. UNICEF staff, GOI staff and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, Government of Indonesia staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent has UNICEF established meaningful partnerships/mechanisms with other key actors at sub-national level to avoid duplication of effort or miscommunication?</td>
<td>On a scale of 1 to 10, UNICEF staff rate 7 for UNICEF’s success in establishing meaningful partnerships.</td>
<td>Programme documents and research literature. UNICEF staff and GOI staff’s views/ opinions.</td>
<td>Programme documents. UNICEF staff, Government of Indonesia staff and stakeholders.</td>
<td>Document review. Key informant interviews with UNICEF staff, GOI staff and other stakeholders.</td>
<td>Review of background documents. Assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>HCA will conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback.</td>
<td>Conduct a review of background documents and assess stakeholder feedback by mid-November 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: List of Documents Reviewed by HCA

- UNICEF Indonesia CPD 2011-2015
- UNICEF Indonesia MTR 2013
- UNICEF Indonesia Field Office Review 2008
- Government of Indonesia RPJMN 2010-2014
- UNPDF 2011-2015
- UNEG Evaluation Report Standards, as adapted by UNICEF in 2010
- UNICEF GEROS Methodology 2013
- UNICEF Revised Evaluation Policy 2013
- UNICEF Indonesia Issue Briefs 2013 (Equity and Decentralization)
- UNEG norms and standards for evaluation in the UN system 2005
- UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation 2008
- Road Map towards the UNICEF medium-term Strategic Plan for 2014-2017
- ROSA and EAPRO Office Management Plans and Integrated Budgets 2010-2011
- EAPRO Office Management Plans and Integrated Budgets 2012-2013
- UNICEF Annual Report 2013-Indonesia
- The Situation of Children and Women in Indonesia 2000-2010. Working Towards Progress With Equity Under Decentralization
- Decentralization: Equity and Sectoral Policy Implications for UNICEF in E. Asia and the Pacific
- Social Policy Study-Input to Mid Term Review 2008-UNICEF Indonesia, April 2008
- Can Fiscal Decentralization Mitigate Child Poverty and Inequality in Indonesia?, Mizuho Okimoto, UNICEF Indonesia, December 2007
- UNICEF GEROS Methodology 2013
- Decentralized Governance for Development: A Combined Practice Note on Decentralization, Local Governance and Urban/ Rural Development, UNDP. April 2004
- The Role of Participating and Partnership in Decentralized Governance: A Brief Synthesis of Policy Lesson and Recommendations of Nine County case Studies on Service Delivery for the Poor, UNDP
- Decentralization: A sample of definition, 1999
- Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations, August 2014
- Mid-term Performance Evaluation of the USAID- Funded UNICEF Maternal and Child Health Integrated Malaria Control Programme in Eastern Indonesia
Appendix 5: Data Collection Tools

KII Key Questions

RELEVANCE

- How relevant is UNICEF’s programme strategy to make decentralization work for children in Indonesia, considering the organization’s global equity focus and the government’s development priorities as outlined in the RPJMN and other national strategies?
- How closely does UNICEF wish to link to the new government national policies and plans (post-election) particularly on issues of decentralization, and does it have a game plan for making this connection possible?
- What conceptual framework does UNICEF employ regarding the linkage between decentralization and its work with children and does this correspond to literature/experience?
- UNICEF Makassar appears to have moved away from education, focusing more on health, child rights protection and Early Child Development; what has shaped this orientation? Is the programme considered very broad still or well-focused and feasible? (e.g., in terms of skill available, resources, challenges being able to design well, establish needed relationships, seek ownership from govt. counterparts etc.)
- How does the village leadership and service delivery units view the relevance and effectiveness of UNICEF engagement in its area? What specific achievements linked to UNICEF’s support are notable? What are the UNICEF advantages in relation to the work undertaken, as compared to other providers of similar support?
- What are the UNICEF advantages in relation to the work undertaken, as compared to other providers of similar support?

EFFECTIVENESS

- How has UNICEF’s zonal structure, authority delegation, and resource deployment supported i) Alignment with decentralization polices/initiatives of the government ii) Conducting Piloting/innovating iii) Scaling/up, replicating, and institutionalizing models iv) Achieving evidence based programming v) Undertaking effective advocacy vi) Forge effective partnerships with subnational government vii) Forge effective partnerships with other development partners (donors, NGOs)?
- How cost effective has UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been as a means to promote equitable realization of child rights in Indonesia?
- Do the counterpart agencies (e.g. SKPD) and the coordination team (KHPPIA) do good monitoring? Do they improve their efforts based on monitoring results? How does UNICEF fit in the M&E of the counterparts? Or does it do its own monitoring/reporting to UNICEF?
- Does it engage with other relevant partners? With what results? What engagement has been seen with your organization and with what results?
- Have there been incidents of duplication or unhealthy competition in the region between your organization and UNICEF?
- Does UNICEF work well with the decentralized system of governance in Indonesia? What works well? What does not?
• What could make UNICEF more effective in its work with its target groups (structure, resources, focus, piloting, replication/scaling-up strategies...)?
• If village project staff is available – what do they see as the modalities and results of UNICEF engagement with village government and service delivery units (of any government level)? Do they believe the engagement at this level is appropriate?
• Has UNICEF’s engagement at decentralized levels helped or hindered the effective and equitable fulfillment of child rights for all children in Indonesia?
• What unintended outcomes have resulted from UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process?

EFFICIENCY
• Are your authority, responsibility, resources, planning process, and engagement with partners clear – in terms of the division of labour between national and regional?
• What level of resources are being used/ mobilized by UNICEF?
• How cost efficient is the current office structure at national and sub-national levels for promoting child rights across the country?
• What efficiency and effectiveness lessons could be learned from past experience with closing/moving UNICEF offices at sub-national level?
• What engagement with SNG has been made from this Zonal Office/National Office (purpose, modality, focus, resources)? Results?
• Are there regional committees dealing with children welfare issues that are operating in Sulawesi or other provinces served by the UNICEF regional office (e.g. KHPPIA teams)? How are they supported by UNICEF, and how are they functioning? What challenges are faced by UNICEF in providing support?
• How are the Coordination Teams at province and district/city levels operating? those formed by a Letter of Decision of the Head of Region (Governor/District Head/Mayor)
• How does the regional office engage with resources such as Universities, CSOs? Government training centres?
• Is the level of risk of counterparts in this region understood; are there spot-checks/external audits? Does UNICEF ever use the power to “at any time examine the implementation of activities or the documents and records of using the funds from UNICEF”?
• Is this office location difficult to staff? Which positions? Is turnover high in the office? Is the remuneration competitive to attract staff to the office/Ambon office?
• Does UNICEF cooperate with other development partners/CSOs in this area? How well is that cooperation going?

SUSTAINABILITY
• To what extent have the results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process been replicable to parts of the country where there is no UNICEF presence?
• What are the enabling or constraining factors that influence the long-term sustainability of results achieved through UNICEF’s engagement in decentralization?
EQUITY

- Does UNICEF’s current engagement with decentralization maximize its opportunities for equitable development for children?
- Are the most marginalized children in Indonesia reached through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?
- How has UNICEF’s current and past engagement in the decentralization process addressed non-geographical disparities in child rights such as by gender, socio-economic status, local (urban/ rural) or ethnicity?
- Do you have any additional comments regarding UNICEF’s decentralization efforts?
Online Survey

Harry Cummings and Associates have been engaged by UNICEF to carry out a formative evaluation of UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process in Indonesia. The focus of the evaluation is the 2011-15 country programme and the evaluation will inform the development of the new 2016-2020 UNICEF Country Program of Cooperation with the Government of Indonesia, and specifically to identify the best options for UNICEF’s form of engagement in Indonesia’s decentralization effort to more effectively contribute to equitable achievement of results for children.

As part of the evaluation, we would like to invite UNICEF staff to share their opinions on UNICEF’s engagement in the decentralization process. Non-UNICEF stakeholders are not being surveyed. Participation is completely voluntary but we hope you see the benefit of participating. This survey is anonymous and it should take 10-15 minutes to complete.

Please answer all questions, some questions are unavoidably ambiguous, but you should answer as best as you can, making whatever assumptions are necessary. The comment sections provided for some questions may help to express your thoughts more fully.

All information provided will be kept confidential. Findings will be presented in aggregate form and attributed to stakeholders as a group, not to any one individual.

This survey should be completed by November 13th, 2014.

To validate the survey at UNICEF, please contact Peter Leth at pleth@unicef.org or +62 21 2996 8130.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Harry Cummings (harry@hcaconsulting.ca), Dr. Gabriele Ferrazzi (gabaferrazzi@rogers.com) or Inem Chaahal (inem@hcaconsulting.ca).

Thank you.
1. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is non-existent and 5 is very good, how would you rate your knowledge of decentralization in Indonesia (generally speaking).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain

2. I would rate my knowledge of Indonesia’ decentralization issues (e.g., political/election issues, assignment of functions between levels of government, how subnational government is structured and operates) as:

- More than adequate for my position in UNICEF
- Adequate for my position in UNICEF
- Adequate in some respects but not others for my position in UNICEF
- Insufficient for my position in UNICEF
- Very insufficient for my position in UNICEF
- Don't Know

3. UNICEF has engaged in decentralization with the belief that this approach will contribute to more equitable child development. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very unclear and 5 is very clear, in your opinion, this is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. very unclear</th>
<th>2. unclear</th>
<th>3. reasonable</th>
<th>4. clear</th>
<th>5. very clear</th>
<th>6. don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please specify

4. In UNICEF programming in Indonesia, which of the following levels receives relatively more attention? (check one only)

- National government
- Provincial government
- District/city government
- Village government
- Other
- Don't Know

If other checked, please specify


5. If you are able to, please specify the degree to which UNICEF programming in Indonesia is:

(if you prefer not to rank, simply provide some open comments in the "please expand" box below)

- Well aligned with government decentralization policy and initiatives?
- Somewhat aligned with government decentralization policies and initiatives?
- Not well aligned with government decentralization policies and initiatives?
- Don't Know

Please expand on the above as needed

6. In its future programming in Indonesia, UNICEF should give more attention to which level? (choose one or more):

- National government
- Provincial government
- District/city government
- Village government
- Other
- Don't Know

If other, please specify
7. In your view, UNICEF’s work in Indonesia tends to emphasize (check those that apply):

- Evidence-informed advocacy to ensure the rights of the most vulnerable children are addressed in policy formulation and budget allocation in all sectors;
- Development of collaborative relationships and partnerships to increase dialogue on children’s rights
- Leveraging models for policy formulation
- Strategic targeting to address disparities among children
- Making decentralization work for children through support of technical capacity development for evidence-based planning and budgeting, management and monitoring of quality basic social services
- Utilisation of C4I for sustainable achievements across the programmes
- Supporting national efforts to achieve the MDGs with equity by linking the programmes with the government programmes under the RPJMN 2010-2014 and strategic plan (Renstra) of related government ministries
- Strengthening government capacity for disaster risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response
- Don’t Know

8. In its future programming in Indonesia, UNICEF should give more attention to which aspect? (choose one or more):

- Evidence-informed advocacy to ensure the rights of the most vulnerable children are addressed in policy formulation and budget allocation in all sectors;
- Development of collaborative relationships and partnerships to increase dialogue on children’s rights
- Leveraging models for policy formulation
- Strategic targeting to address disparities among children
- Making decentralization work for children through support of technical capacity development for evidence-based planning and budgeting, management and monitoring of quality basic social services
- Utilisation of C4I for sustainable achievements across the programmes
- Supporting national efforts to achieve the MDGs with equity by linking the programmes with the government programmes under the RPJMN 2010-2014 and strategic plan (Renstra) of related government ministries
- Strengthening government capacity for disaster risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response
- Don’t Know

Please specify

9. In its future programming in Indonesia, in which way could UNICEF improve its alignment with government policies and initiatives relating to decentralization? Please list one or more items.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with decentralization policies/initiatives of the government.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting/innovating</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling/up, replicating, and institutionalizing models.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving evidence based programming.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking effective advocacy.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge effective partnerships with subnational government.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge effective partnerships with other development partners (donors, NGOs).</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment.
11. To what degree is UNICEF’s delegation of authority supportive of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment with decentralization policies/initiatives of the government.</th>
<th>Highly supportive</th>
<th>Supportive in some respects, not in others</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Not supportive at all</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Piloting/innovating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaling up, replicating, and institutionalizing models.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving evidence based programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking effective advocacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge effective partnerships with subnational government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge effective partnerships with other development partners (donors, NGOs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment.
12. To what degree is UNICEF’s resource deployment (at the national and subnational level) supportive of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Piloting/innovating Scaling/up, replicating, and institutionalizing models.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving evidence based programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking effective advocacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge effective partnerships with subnational government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forge effective partnerships with other development partners (donors, NGOs).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please comment.

13. Is the fact that UNICEF uses its field offices to work in a decentralized environment: ?

1. A very positive feature?
2. A positive feature?
3. Occasionally evident/felt?
4. Rarely in evidence?
5. Not at all in evidence?
6. Don’t Know

Please explain
14. In the future, UNICEF support the decentralization policies/initiatives of the government should:

- 1. Increase substantially
- 2. Increase somewhat
- 3. Stay about the same
- 4. Decrease somewhat
- 5. Decrease substantially
- 6. Don't Know

Please explain

15. The challenges UNICEF will face (internal or external) in harnessing decentralization to further its aims in Indonesia in the future will likely be (list one or more items):

Please explain

16. Do you feel that UNICEF is maximizing the use of its resources available at the subnational level in order to further its work?

- Yes, resources available are maximized
- There is room for improvement
- Not at all
- Don't Know

Please explain
17. How cost efficient is the current office structure at national and sub-national levels for promoting child rights across the country?

- Very cost efficient
- Cost efficient
- Neutral Not really cost efficient
- Cost inefficient
- Very Cost inefficient
- Don’t Know

Please explain

18. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is not at all and 5 is a significant amount, to what extent are the most marginalized children in Indonesia likely to be reached in the long run through the current UNICEF approach to decentralization?


Please explain

19. The current field office location and structure is helping us to:

- Develop sustainable models for replication across the country
- Improve capacity in selected provinces
- Improve capacity in selected districts
- Keep in touch with child and youth related issues across the country
- Develop replicable pilot projects efficiently and effectively
- Meet the needs of children and youth with the greatest need
20. Personal Characteristics

The following questions are personal but will only be used to provide information on the summary characteristics of respondents. You are encouraged to respond and are guaranteed that individual information will remain confidential.

Which office do you work in?
- [ ] Jakarta
- [ ] Banda Aceh
- [ ] Surabaya
- [ ] Makassar including Ambon
- [ ] Kupang
- [ ] Jayapura including Manokwari

21. How long have you been employed with UNICEF?
Number of years: [___]

22. What is your staff type?
- [ ] IP
- [ ] NO
- [ ] GS
- [ ] Other (please specify): [___]

23. Which gender do you identify with?
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Male
- [ ] Other
That concludes the survey, we appreciate your comments and feedback. Thank You!
Appendix 6: Individuals Interviewed/ Individuals (and Organizations) Present at HCA Meetings

Jakarta

UNICEF Jakarta
- M&E Specialist
- Deputy Representative
- Chief WASH
- Chief CSD
- Immunization Specialist
- Health Specialist
- Budget Specialist
- Knowledge Management Specialist
- Education Specialist
- Child Protection Specialist
- Chief of Education
- Chief of Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

Ministry of Education
- Staff (1)

Bappenas
- Secretariat (Secretary)

Child Fund Indonesia
- National director
- Programme director

Ministry of Health
- Director
- Child Protection Kasubdit
- Child Survival Kasubdit

Programme Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PNPM) Mandiri (National Program for Community Empowerment)
- Coordinator
- Staff (1)

Bangda Ministry of Home Affairs
- Staff (2)

HIV/AIDS Program
- Staff (3)

Ministry of Women Empowerment and Child Protection (5 individuals)

Ministry of Home Affairs
- Staff (2)

Banda Aceh

UNICEF
- Deputy Representative
- Health Specialist
- Education specialist/ Coordinator
Early Childhood Development Center (PAUD)
- Staff (1)
- Teachers (2)

Education Department of Aceh Basar
- Staff
- Village leader

TeacherDinas Pendidikan
- Staff (2)
- Secretary of Dinas
- Head of Section of Curriculum

Kata Hati Institute
- Director

RJWG
- Coordinator

Bappeda
- Head of section of Bappeda
- Head of section of for social and culture
- Head of section of communicable diseases
- Bappeda Health

Kupang

UNICEF
- Chief Field Officer
- Malaria Specialist
- Finance Officer and acting CP Specialist (since no CP Specialist proper)
- Health Specialist
- Health Officer
- Education/Youth Specialist
- WASH Officer
- Deputy Representative

CIS Timur
- Director

SKPD Province Level
- KHPPIA, member
- BP. Alfonse

BPMPD (Community Empowerment Board and Village Government)
- Kepala Bidang Sosial Budaya (Head of Social and Culture)
- Staff (1)

SINODE GMIT
- Wakil Ketua Sinode, GMIT (Vice Chairman)
- Kepala Seksi, UPP Kategorial (Head of Section, UPP Categorical)
- Sekretaris Bidang Pelayanan Anak dan Remaja (Secretary for Child and Youth Services)
CIS (Timor – province)
- Board Director
Bappeda Provinsi NTT Office
- Head of Social and Culture
Jawa Pos Institute Pro-otonomi (JPIP) (Jawa Pos Institute Pro- Autonomy)
- Researcher
SKPD Province level
- Finance manager
- KHPPIA, Member
- Head of Section Curriculum
Department of Education
- Staff (1)

Jayapura
UNICEF Jayapura
- Project Officer Malaria/ EPI
- Programme Officer Child Protection
- Program Assistant
- Education Specialist
- Operations Officer
- CSD Specialist
- Programme Assistant
- Administrative Assistant
- Programme Officer Education
- Operations Assistant
- Deputy Representative
Bappeda (Health and Education)
- Staff (2)
Education Department
- Head of Section
Komisi Penanggulangan AIDS (Provincial Aids Commission)
- Staff (1)
Kinerja Office
- Staff (1)
Kantor Keagamaan (Religious Office)
- Staff (2)
Department of Health
- Head of the provincial health body called UP2KP (Percepatan Pembangunan Kesehatan Papua- Acceleration of Development in Papua Health)

Sulawesi
Badan Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Keluarga Berencana (Agency for Womens Empowerment and Family Planning)
- Staff (1)
SKPD Province Level
• Welfare Department (Staff:1)
• PUMK (Financial Manager)
Dinas Kesehatan Kabupaten Takalar (District of Takalar)
  • Kepala Bidang Kesehatan Masyarakat danPembiayaan (Head of Public Health)
  • Sekretaris Dinas (Secretary)
Health Department
  • Staff (2)
Department of Education
  • Staff (2)
Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat PNPM (National Program for Community Empowerment)
  • Coordinator
Lembaga Perlindungan Anak (Child Protection Agency)
  • Chairman

**Makassar**

UNICEF Makassar
  • CP Specialist
  • WASH Specialist
  • Deputy Representative
  • Health Specialist
Lembaga Perlindungan Anak (Child Protection Agency)
  • Staff (2)
  • Staff (2) of Lembaga Bantuan Hukum (Legal Aid)
BAKTI
  • Partnership Manager
  • Communication Manager
Lembaga Pemberdayaan dan Pengembangan Masyarakat (Lembara)
  • Director
Puskesmas
  • Staff (2)
Badan Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Keluarga Berencana (Agency for Women’s Empowerment and Family Planning)
  • Kepala Bidang Kualitas Hidup Perlindungan Perempuan dan anak (Head of Quality of Life Protection of Women and Children)
  • 2 visitors (2 women sitting in the waiting room)
Health Department
  • Kepala Bidang Kesehatan Masyarakat danPembiayaan (Head of Public Health)
  • Sekretaris Dinas (Secretary Office)

**Surabaya**

UNICEF Surabaya
  • Chief Field Officer
  • CP Specialist
  • CSD Specialist
• Deputy Representative
Lembaga Perlindungan Anak Surabaya
USAID KINERJA
• Provincial Coordinator
Bappeda
• Acting Head of Bappeda
• Head of Economic and Social/ Cultural Section
• Head
Appendix 7: Selection of UNICEF Partner Regional Governments in Relation to the Equity Goal of UNICEF

Official and actual criteria used to select regions.
The Bappenas-UNICEF manual (*Pedum*) sets out two criteria for the selection of provinces; MDG achievement and fiscal capacity of the region. These two also apply to the district/city, taking into account however prior commitment for funding from the 2006–2010 period, and the possibility to expand reach in response to disasters.

A brief analysis conducted by HCA on the current set of regional governments covered by UNICEF – using the HDI as a proxy for the MDG attainment and revenues/transfers as a measure of fiscal capacity indicates there is no clear link between the data and the choices of provinces made. Provincial fiscal capacity, as reported in a 2012 ARC/World Bank study\(^{140}\) suggests that per capita revenues/transfers are highest for some of the focus provinces (Papua, Papua Barat, Maluku Utara, Maluku, Aceh) or middle of the road for others (West Sulawesi, South Sulawesi, NTT). Only West and Central Java fall in the relatively low fiscal capacity group.

How the above provinces are then reordered, based on the MDGs achievements, is not clear. The HDI ranking over time are shown in the table below.\(^{141}\) NTB, with a lower fiscal capacity and HDI score should have been favoured over NTT. Similarly, Banten is a non-focus province, but has lower fiscal capacity and HDI scores than both West and Central Java. Examining children living in poverty Gorontalo might have been a better choice than West Sulawesi. Other such examples no doubt exist. For some other provinces, relative fiscal capacity and HDI or poverty levels are not neatly aligned, calling for a prioritization of the indicators used, or additional criteria. No doubt the UNICEF-Bappenas discussions were richer than the Pedum indicates, but those discussions are not transparent, and that tends to deny the cooperation a clear purpose, and frustrates discussion on graduation/exit strategies.

Within each province, the situation is similarly complex, with the added challenge that data is less available or reliable. Examining just one example – that of Aceh - in terms of children poverty (similar to the measure raised above for provinces), Table 6 shows that the choices made in Aceh do not correspond with the data; Simaelue, Aceh Tenggarra, and Aceh Utara would have been more consistent choices if children poverty (monetary) is a suitable measure, or proxy for MDG attainment (the *Pedum* indicator).

\(^{140}\) Cut Dian Agustina, Ehtisham Ahmad, Dhanie Nugroho and Herbert Siagian (2012). Political economy of natural resource revenue sharing in Indonesia, Asia Research Centre Working Paper 55, World Bank, LSE, ARC, March, pg. 27.

Revenue sharing oil and gas, other transfers, and GRDP per capita, 2010

Figure 4: Revenue Sharing Oil and Gas, Other Transfers and GRDP per Capita (2010).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aceh</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatera Utara</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatera Barat</td>
<td>12.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riau</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambi</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatera Selatan</td>
<td>19.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengkulu</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampung</td>
<td>24.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepulauan Bangka Belitung</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepulauan Riau</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Barat</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Tengah</td>
<td>14.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogyakarta</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawa Timur</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banten</td>
<td>19.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bali</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusa Tenggara Barat</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nusa Tenggara Timur</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Barat</td>
<td>27.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Tengah</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Selatan</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Timur</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimantan Utara</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Utara</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Tengah</td>
<td>23.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Selatan</td>
<td>15.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Tenggara</td>
<td>23.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorontalo</td>
<td>30.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulawesi Barat</td>
<td>19.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku</td>
<td>32.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maluku Utara</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua Barat</td>
<td>43.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua</td>
<td>42.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Proportion of Children Below Provincial Poverty Line in Aceh Districts/Cities (2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District/City</th>
<th>% Children Under Provincial Poverty Line (Monetary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simeulue</td>
<td>76.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Singkil</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Selatan</td>
<td>22.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Tenggara</td>
<td>64.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Timur</td>
<td>45.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Tengah</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Barat</td>
<td>17.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Besar</td>
<td>7.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidie</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bireuen</td>
<td>30.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Utara</td>
<td>59.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Barat Daya</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayo Lues</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Tamiang</td>
<td>25.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagan Raya</td>
<td>18.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aceh Jaya</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bener Meriah</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidie Jaya</td>
<td>16.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Banda Aceh</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Sabang</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Langsa</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Lhoksumawe</td>
<td>25.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kota Subulussalam</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Bappenas-UNICEF steering Committee meeting in November 2010 stipulated that the provinces should select around 4 districts/cities each. That would mean that for the 14 provinces there would be 56 districts/cities as implementation partners. Provincial team were to perform the selection, with facilitation from the National team and “using the agreed criteria.” However, the numbers (if not the locations) at least seem to have been predetermined in the SC meeting. These numbers show a significant slimming down of districts/cities from the previous CPAP period:

Table 8: A Comparison of Districts/ Cities from CPAP 2006- 2010 and 2011- 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Total Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Aceh</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Sumut</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Banten</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jabar</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jateng</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jatim</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sulsel</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Sulbar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Maluku</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Maluku Utara</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Papua</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Papua Barat</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>NTB</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the interviews with the Evaluation Team, UNICEF respondents (and selected provincial government officials) pointed to several additional, or alternative, criteria employed to select districts/ cities. These included:

- Specific indicators that happen to be of interest of a given programme
- Legacy of previous engagements – which could only slowly be wound down,
- Relationships (good will) that have been built over time and continue to be attractive to build on for new initiatives
- Leadership, interest and commitment (e.g., APBD) offered by the regional government
- Accessibility at reasonable cost (the hard to reach districts of Papua were not reached in the CPAP 2011-2015; after 2012 the Governor has made other donors go to the more remote districts!)

The above criteria is however not well articulated or consistently applied. It has led to a persistent engagement beyond the focus districts initially selected in the UNICEF Project document; this is particularly evident in the work covered under the Kupang FO, despite the new CFO’s efforts to
reduce the number of district/city government IPs. Despite the streamlining effort, UNICEF has been very flexible, even allowing its GMIT partner to work with Sumbawa Barat, in NTB.

As there may be a shaking out process in the partnerships with SNG, precipitated by the rather unworkable funds channeling, the current “crisis” may offer an opportunity to formalize and more carefully apply the very sensible criteria that are actually at work, as indicated above. This may be done with an approach characterized as follows:

- Continued FO presence strategically situated to cover main island – located on efficiency ground to allow maximum reach at reasonable cost
- Demand/competitive based relationships with provincial, district/city and village governments based on the following main considerations:
  - Exhibit a need (objective data) that reflects UNICEF strategic interventions (these may have arisen from a bottom-up perspective or top-down)
  - Express interest and commitment, including financial (APBD, APB Desa)
  - Do not a priori exclude new regions as these may be fertile soil for change (needy and eager to engage)
  - Understand and support the scope and time limited nature of the collaboration: model building and replication focus of the support provided – including obligations to play roles required in scaling-up and institutionalizing in their jurisdictions, and involvement in broader dissemination of lessons and successes.
  - Recognize that the key role of UNICEF will be in technical assistance, facilitation, and advocacy.
## Appendix 8: List of Innovations

### Table 9: List of Innovations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. CBIES (Community Based Information Education System)</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2011</td>
<td>Started in Klaten and then expanded in 2011 in Brebes (CJ) and Situbondo (EJ) in 2 Villages in each district</td>
<td>1. Evidence advocacy to Bupati to allocate budget for replication to all sub districts</td>
<td>1. Situbondo District allocated budget for additional CBIES in 2 sub districts/year. 2. Brebes District; Expanded in one sub - district.</td>
<td>Programme sustainability since the CBIES is very costly and labour intensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Holistic Integrated Early Child Development (HI ECD) for urban poor children/Taman Posyandu</td>
<td>2009 &amp; 2011</td>
<td>Started in two districts in EJ (Bondowoso and Tulung Agung).</td>
<td>Evidence advocacy- Governor’s decree on HI ECD in 2011. The implementation with close collaboration with PKK (Women empowerment organization)</td>
<td>1. Province level (EJ) established the 10,000 Taman Posyandu Movement, to date has reached 12,000. 2. Provincial and district budget allocated for Taman Posyandu (every relevant line ministry allocated budget for Taman Posyandu) 3. Become evidence for National Government to issue the Presidential Decree on HI-ECD in 2013.</td>
<td>Quality of cadres/teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sport for Development for Basic Education.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Started with 5 school</td>
<td>Evidence based advocacy through Field Visit of Mayor and Vice Mayor.</td>
<td>Mayor’s decree on sport for development, and All schools, Include Early Child Education, implement sport for development</td>
<td>Involvement of other stakeholders like MORA, since there are many Islamic schools in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Iodine Deficiency Disorders</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Since 2004 in 5 red districts (Rembang, Pati, Grobogan, Jepara, Demak)</td>
<td>1. Evidence advocacy to Bupati/Mayor and Parliament Member. 2. Advocacy to local police at province Central Java and 35 district. 3. Evidence advocacy to Governor at Central Java.</td>
<td>1. National: Become National Policy under MoH Decree. 2. Province Level and District: Governor / Bupati/ Mayor Decree CI= 27 out of 35 districts/Cities. EJ= 4 out of 38 District/Cities. Since 2007 in CJ (Semarang, Brebes, Wonosobo, Banjarnegara, Banyumas, and Surakarta) Since 2014 in East Java (Pasuruan, Gresik, Blitar and Ngawi)</td>
<td>Policy and priority of new minister of health because the IDD intervention only using the iodine salt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Early Initiation and Breastfeeding</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Since 2006 in Klaten district</td>
<td>1. Evidence advocacy to Bupati/Mayor and Parliament Member. 2. Advocacy Meeting to Bupati/Mayor at 35 district. 3. Evidence advocacy to Governor at Central Java.</td>
<td>1. National: Become National Policy under MoH Decree on the Movement of Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) through the first 1000 life of Children. 2. Province Governor / Bupati/Mayor Decree on Exclusive Breastfeeding. Since 2008 in CJ expanded to (Rembang, Brebes, Wonosobo, Banjarnegara, and Surakarta). To date in CJ = 8 out of 35 districts/Cities.</td>
<td>Continuity subject to the priority of new health minister to take breastfeeding is part of national programme of SUN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supporting Family Based Care for Children/Alternative Care</td>
<td>2010 in Surabaya and Central Java</td>
<td>East Java: Surabaya (through partnership with Muhamadyah) Central Java: Provincial Level with Social Affair.</td>
<td>1. Evidence Based Advocacy to Ministry of Social Affair 2. Advocacy to Social Affair at Province and Districts</td>
<td>1. National: become National Policy under Social Affair Ministerial Decree 2. East Java/Central Java: Capacity Building for Implementation National standard of Child Care (official accreditation for child care institution)</td>
<td>Difficulties for replication to all provinces and districts due to lack of capacity Social Affair Human Resources and limited number of social workers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District/City: District Regulation in Klaten and Brebes/City Regulation in Surakarta | Advocacy to Bupati/Mayor and Parliament Advocacy to Bappeda and Women Empowerment-Child Protection Office at Province/District | National: (a) Child Protection System will be integrated into Mid-Term National Development Planning (b) National Guideline on how to develop Local Law (PERDA) on Child Protection.  
Central Java Province: Child Protection is included in one of programme priorities of Mid-Term Provincial Development Planning  
East Java; Child Protection System Local law as well as Central Java. | Difficulties for replication to all provinces and districts due to lack of capacity of Women Empowerment and Child Protection Office to advocate CP  
Opportunity: Child protection become one of quick win of President Jokowi and CP System will be included in the RPJMN |}

| 12. Child Friendly School/End Violence Against Children in Education Setting | 2013 in East Java and Central Java | Province: Central Java  
District/City: Klaten and Surakarta (Mayor Decree) | Evidence Advocacy to Bupati / Mayor and Parliament Advocacy to Provincial and District Education office | National: become Ministerial Decree on Child Friendly school  
Provincial: Budget allocation for VAC prevention in education setting in 2015  
Klaten District/ Surakarta City: budget allocation for additional schools and training for teachers and principals on child friendly schools | Difficulties for replication to all provinces and districts due to lack of capacity of Women Empowerment and Child Protection Office to advocate CP  
Opportunity: President Instruction on Elimination Sexual Violence Against Children and National Plan of Action on Elimination VAC will be drafted included Ministerial Decree on Child Friendly School |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence based advocacy to Governor, Parliament and Water and Sanitation Province Team.</td>
<td>1. Governor Decree and Apply to all 10 District.</td>
<td>Province Budget support to stimulate Village 50 million and 100 million for sub district if they can achieved ODF.</td>
<td>Province Budget support to stimulate Village 50 million and 100 million for sub district if they can achieved ODF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence based advocacy to Governor, Parliament and Water and Sanitation Province Team.</td>
<td>1. Governor Decree and Apply to all 10 District.</td>
<td>The Governor Decree is being change to be Local Law.</td>
<td>The Governor Decree is being change to be Local Law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence based advocacy to Governor, Parliament and Water and Sanitation Province Team.</td>
<td>1. Governor Decree and Apply to all 10 District.</td>
<td>ODF is become the Governor five years priority 2013 -2018</td>
<td>ODF is become the Governor five years priority 2013 -2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


16. Child Friendly Cities (Law 35/ 2014) 2014 | This was an amendment to the national Child Protection Law Number 23 of 2002. |

Described in http://www.kemenpppa.go.id/dlh/peraturan/UU%20Nomor%2035%20Tahun%202014.pdf |

Started in 2014, there was an amendment to the Child Protection Law (35/ 2014). This amendment is applicable to the Republic of Indonesia. | The provincial government may have limited authority, for instance in areas like Central Java. This may result in an unequitable implementation of the child friendly cities programme. |
### Appendix 9: UNICEF’s List of Implementing Partners

#### Table 10: List of Implementing Partners (As of 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of implementing partner</th>
<th>National level</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aliansi Jurnalis Independen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asian Sport Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BAPPEDA Provinsi Jawa Barat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bendahara BLN UNICEF Dit Sepim - Kesma (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bendahara Pengeluaran Hibah Lemdikpol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CARE INDONESIA (WASH)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ChildFund Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dana Bantuan UNICEF Dit Binkes Anak (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dana Bantuan UNICEF Dit Bina Kes.Ibu (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dana Bantuan UNICEF Dit. Gizi Masyarakat (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dinas Kesehatan Program KHPPIA (Provinsi Sumbar)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Direktorat PPBB Ditjen PP &amp; PL/UNICEF (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Forum Parlemen Indonesia (IFPPD) - PCA with Nutrition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ikatan Bidan Indonesia (IBI) - (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ikatan Dokter Anak Indonesia (IDAI) - (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ikatan Dokter Indonesia (IDI) - (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kejaksaan Agung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kementerian Agama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kementerian Dalam Negeri (Adminduk)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kerjasama Meneg PP - UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Kerjasama Pusat Statistik Pendidikan dan UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kerjasama RI(Bappenas) -UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Komisi Penanggulangan AIDS Bekerjasama Dengan UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>KPAI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mahkamah Agung</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mercy Corps (Health)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Oxfam GB (WASH)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PERADI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Perkumpulan Obstetri dan Ginekologi Indonesia (POGI) - (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Perkumpulan Obstetri Ginekologi Sosial Indonesia (HOGSI) - (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pimpinan Pusat Muhammadiyah KHPPIA - UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PROG KHPPIA Kjsma Bappeda Sbg-UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Program Dikdas Darurat dari UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Program Kerjasama Promkes UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Program Kerjasama World Vision (HN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Program Kerjasama Ys. Bakti-UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Dinas Peternakan Prop.Sumatera Barat-UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Ditjen Bina Bangda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Ditjen Permasyarakat-UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA KOMINFO-UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Proyek Bantuan Pengemb Anak usia Dini dari UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Proyek Kerjasama Kementerian Sosial RI - UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Proyek Kerjasama RI-UNICEF Bid.Pddkan Anak Usia Dini (PAUD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>PT. ELSAF Dasamasa - UNICEF (Previous name: Lembaga Studi Agama dan Filsafat (LSAF))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sekretariat Kerjasama Depdiknas dengan International Agency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Smeru QQ Program KHPPIA UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>TPKS BPS - UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pusat Biomedis dan Teknologi Dasar Kesehatan KHPPIA UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Bendahara Pengeluaran BLN - SubDit AIDS Direktorat PPLH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Program kerjasama KHPPIA BKKBN - UNICEF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Java

1. Bapeda Kab. Klaten-UNICEF/KHPPIA                                                                 | 1     |
2. Program KHPPIA Bappeda Kabupaten Pemalang                                                      | 1     |
3. Program KHPPIA Kerjasama Bappeda Prop. Jateng                                                | 1     |
4. Program KHPPIA Kerjasama Dinas P Dan K dengan UNICEF, Jateng                                 | 1     |
5. Proyek Kelangsungan Hidup Pengembangan Perlind. (KHPPIA) (Previous name: Proyek KHPPIA Dinas Kesehatan Jateng) | 1     |
6. Proyek KHPPIA Bappeda Kab. Brebes                                                             | 1     |
7. Proyek KHPPIA Bappeda Kab. Wonosobo                                                          | 1     |
8. Proyek KHPPIA Kerjasama Pemkot Dengan UNICEF, Surakarta                                      | 1     |

East Java

1. Bappeda Kab. Bondowoso (New IP) 90%                                                           | 1     |
2. KHPPIA Bappeda Kota Pasuruan-UNICEF                                                          | 1     |
3. Program KHPPIA Bappeda Kab. Situbondo UNICEF                                                  | 1     |
4. UNICEF-Pemprov Jatim Co Bappeda (Previous name: UNICEF/KHPPIA’96-00 Dana Bantuan (Kota Sby)) | 1     |
   West Nusa Tenggara                                                                            |
5. Bappeda Lobar-KHPPIA UNICEF                                                                  | 1     |
6. Dikes NTB Bantuan UNICEF                                                                     | 1     |
7. Program KHPPIA Kerjasama dengan UNICEF Bappeda Kab.Bima                                      | 1     |
8. Program Pengembangan Sosial Area                                                              | 1     |

East Nusa Tenggara
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bappeda Kab. Kupang (Program UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bappeda Tk.II Alor cq Program KHPPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bendahara Ktr. Bappeda/ KHPPIA Bappeda Kab.Ende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KHPPIA Bantuan UNICEF, Sumba Timur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prog. KHPPIA Bappeda Sumba Tengah - UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program, KHPPIA Bappeda Kab. TTS-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Bappeda Kabupaten Sumba Barat Daya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA, Rote Ndao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Proy. Prog. KHPPIA Bantuan UNICEF (Sumba Barat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proyek Kerjasama UNICEF Bappeda Kab. Belu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Proyek Kerjasama Unicef, Sikka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Proyek Pelayanan Kesehatan Ibu dan Anak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Proyek Pelayanan Sosial Dasar (Previous name: Proy.Sosial Dasar/KHPPIA Bappeda Kodya Kupang )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South Sulawesi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bappeda Provinsi Sulsel Kerjasama UNICEF (KHPPIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bappeda Tk.II Bone - Program KHPPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kelangsungan Hidup Ibu dan Anak (KHPPIA), Takalar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>KHPPIA Bappeda Kab. Selayar-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>KHPPIA Bappeda Lutra-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KHPPIA RSIA Siti Fatima-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1) Program Kerjasama KHPPIA Pemda Provinsi Sulsel-UNICEF and (2) Prog.Malaria Dinkes Sulsel-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Bappeda Kota Makassar-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Kab. Soppeng-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tim KHPPIA Kab. Barru</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West Sulawesi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KHPPIA Kelangsungan Hidup PP Ibu &amp; Anak Polewali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Kerjasama Pemprop Sulbar-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program Kerjasama UNICEF dan Diknas Prov. Sulbar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Bappeda, Mamuju</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maluku**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prg.Krjsm UNICEF - PEMDA Kab. Buru (KHPPIA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prg.KS Bappeda Kota Ambon UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Bappeda SBB-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Kerjasama Bappeda Kab.MTB dengan UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Proyek KS Dengan UNICEF, Maluku (Previous name: Proyek KS RI-UNICEF/Bappeda Provinsi Maluku)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proyek PKT PL Kesmas Bantuan UNICEF, Ambon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prog KHPPIA Bappeda SBT – UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Maluku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prog.Bantuan Kerjasama UNICEF-Bappeda Kota Tidore Kepulauan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program Bantuan Kerjasama UNICEF-Bappeda Prop.Maluku Utara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) Program Kerjasama Dinkes Maluku Utara UNICEF and (2) Program Kesehatan Keluarga Dinkes Malut - UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Halsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kabupaten Morotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bantuan UNICEF Kerjasama BP3D Kabupaten Biak Numfor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dana Bant, UNICEF Program KHPPIA Bappeda Tk.II Jayapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dana Bantuan UNICEF Program KHPPIA Bappeda TkII KotaJayapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dinas P &amp; P Prop.Papua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ikatan Bidan Indonesia Cabang Jayawijaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kerjasama Pemda Irja UNICEF Komp. Kanwil DepKes Irja (Dinas Kesehatan Prov. Papua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kerjasama Pemda Irja-UNICEF Komponen Bappeda Tk.I Irja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Komisi Penanggulangan AIDS Prov. Papua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Prog KHPPIA Kerjasama Dekenat Jyw-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Proyek Bantuan UNICEF-Jayawijaya Program KHPPIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tim Pengelola KHPPIA dan PJOK Kantor Bappeda Mimika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>BMPK Prov. Papua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Keuskupan Papua洋</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Poltekkes Jayapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bappeda Kabupaten Keerom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UNCEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Papua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>KHPPIA Bappeda Tk.II Manokwari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>KHPPIA BP3D Papua Barat-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>KHPPIA Kota Sorong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Komisi Penanggulangan AIDS Prov. Papua Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PJOK dan PUMK UNICEF - Dinkes Prop. Papua barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PJOK Institutional MBS STKIP MM-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Dinas Pendidikan Provinsi Papua Barat-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pry Kel Hdp Perk/Perl Ibu/Anak Ktr Bappeda Tk.II Sorong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tim Koordinasi KHPPIA Kab. Fakfak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>YSA - UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UNIPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Program Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Keuskupan Papua Barat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Badan PP dan PA Prov Aceh - UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bantuan UNICEF Bappeda Kab. Aceh Jaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bend.Program KHPPIA Kerjasama Pemerintah RI-UNICEF,NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bend. Tim Vocal Point Perlindungan Anak Dinas Sosial Prov.NAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BPM Prov.NAD-KHPPIA-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kerjasama MPD-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kerjasama UNICEF-Disdik Aceh (Previous name: Prog KhPPIA Disdik Provinsi NAD-UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kerjasama UNICEF dengan DITRESPRIMUM QQ Mapolda Aceh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>KHPPIA UNICEF - Bappeda Aceh Besar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prog. KHPPIA Dinkes Aceh-UNICEF (Previous name: Dinas Kesehatan Prov.NAD Bantuan UNICEF Untuk Kesga dan Gizi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prog.KHPPIA Poltekkes NAD-Hibah UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Bappeda Aceh Timur- UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Program KHPPIA Bappeda Sabang-UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>UPTD Balai Laboratorium Kesehatan Aceh Program KHPPIA BLK Aceh - UNICEF (Previous name: Program KHPPIA BLK Aceh - UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL IP</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Government Partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Partners</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total IP Gov</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Challenges and Opportunities of Decentralization for UNICEF

This relates to Indonesia, and is slanted toward UNICEF’s perspective. UNICEF could probably elaborate and refine the issues by devoting some reflection and discussion internally. These could be used as reminders that help UNICEF to scan the decentralization environment and position itself.

**Table 11: Challenges and Opportunities of Decentralization for UNICEF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue noted in Indonesia</th>
<th>Challenges/risks relevant to UNICEF programming</th>
<th>Opportunities to counter negative aspects or seize advantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transfer of functions and resources to lower levels | • Increased number of jurisdictions that need to be addressed/engaged, while UNICEF resources are limited  
• Different development trajectories of regional governments based on endowments, capacity etc. leading potentially to growing inequalities | • More chance for experimentation in different jurisdictions  
• Possibility to scale-up based on promising/tested models  
• Selecting interested or “affected” regions,  
• More manageable scale to understanding the local context, and deploy resources for deeper local impact and hence successful models  
• Opportunity to focus on interventions/models that can address inequality – e.g., minimum service standards |
| Territorial splitting | • Service is initially neglected as capital infrastructure and governance set up takes precedence  
• Capacity of new staff/organizations is weak  
• Scale of service area may be too small for efficiency | • New split regions can serve as impetus for redoubling efforts in service delivery or governance  
• Politics of identity may be harnessed in taking pride for achievements in regulatory and service innovation |
| Increased power/responsibilities, without sufficient accountability | • Increased corruption in many parts of the system  
• Corruption becomes a drag on service delivery (quantity and quality); self-serving allocation patterns, leakages, punitive illegal charges on poorest of users  
• Lack of demand or commitment in change that is disruptive or threatening to narrow interests | • Provides opening for introduction of social accountability tools and networks, and combining supply with demand approaches  
• Gives boost to investigative journalism and anti-corruption movements that are sustainable brakes on corruption and incentives for improvements. |
| New and unstable legal/policy framework, e.g. functional assignment | • New regulations can be a burden to absorb at local level  
• Fear of running afoul of regulation, and inviting prosecution  
• Poor quality/overlapping regulations create confusion or uncertainty Attempts to take back through sectoral regulation gains seen in basic law on subnational government creates cynicism and tensions  
• Burdensome standards imposed on regional governments but with not enough resources or teeth | • New regulations can serve to embed new approaches or make room for experimentation and new fields of activity (e.g., new law on the village)  
• Efforts to guide implementation of new instruments can reveal where adjustments need to be made in the framework; this may create more changes but can make the system more robust  
• Potential to piggyback on government efforts that seek to increase reach, quality and accountability (e.g. Minimum Service |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaps in the policy framework</th>
<th>Standards, Public Service Standards).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pace and scope of change cannot address all issues, some fall by the wayside or a not given enough attention (e.g. on village government role for many years)</td>
<td>• Provides entry points if the gaps are significant to some interest groups/DPs (e.g. on village government contribution to children’s health, nutrition and immunization for instance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Partner driven schemes to support decentralization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pace and scope of change cannot address all issues, some fall by the wayside or a not given enough attention (e.g. on village government role for many years)</td>
<td>• Provides entry points if the gaps are significant to some interest groups/DPs (e.g. on village government contribution to children’s health, nutrition and immunization for instance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is often not in line with core elements of the system, and diverts attention from system needs</td>
<td>• Can show the potential for different approaches when freed from rigidities of government system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Do not address exit and sustainability issues</td>
<td>• Places pressure at a later point on the actual regular system to absorb the parallel structures/activities/lessons (e.g., PNPM transition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continues the old and criticized pattern of DP need centred design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large need to develop capacities in SNG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can be drawn in many directions in view of numerous gaps and requests to provide assistance</td>
<td>• Openness to accept new content, and to build rigor in capacity development approaches (the latter in the later stages of decentralization at least)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ad hoc approaches tend to dominate in view of urgency and limited resources spread over many needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decay in vertical data systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governments lose sight of how they are performing</td>
<td>• Reinvigorating data systems provides an entry point for making policy and planning more evidence based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investments in new data systems are isolated, leading to fragmentation and a lack of aggregation at higher levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investments in data are overdone in terms of technology and costs and are not replicable or sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elements in government subvert decentralization for narrow institutional gains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For lack of analysis, development partner are drawn into supporting recentralization regulations/measures that conflict with or reduce autonomy, not realizing what is at stake</td>
<td>• Each setback can be a moment for reengagement and dialogue, or a chance to demonstrate what could be more consistent with the core laws/regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development partners withdraw to not lend legitimacy – but vacating the field does not help the cause</td>
<td>• Stakeholders can be support to react positively to resist and restore autonomy; leading to greater cohesion and capacity in the governance system and a more contested arena that is not as subject to government fiat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and staff turnover in the regional government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tendency for new political leaders (Governor, Bupati/Mayor especially) to put their own stamp on operations, neglecting past innovations.</td>
<td>• New leadership opens up opportunities for fresh beginnings and cooperation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Units involved in supporting innovations change and capacity drops off and becomes insufficient to keep up the momentum or replicate.</td>
<td>• Places emphasis on developing models that institutionalize changes (e.g., in government regulations, sufficient refreshing events, local resources and citizens that keep up the pressure, information that tracks performance and keeps politician/bureaucrats focused)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>