



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EVALUATION

MIDTERM EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM REPRESENTASI (PROREP) PROJECT

MIDTERM EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM REPRESENTASI (PROREP) PROJECT

April 2013

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

Acronyms	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Executive Summary	1
Evaluation Purpose and Evaluation Questions	7
Project Background.....	9
Evaluation Methods and Limitations	13
Findings and Conclusions	15
Findings and Conclusions for Component 1: Civil Society.....	15
Findings and Conclusions for Component 2: Support to Research Institutions	19
Findings and Conclusions for Component 3: Legislative Bodies	24
Findings and Conclusions for the Strategic Activities Fund.....	27
Findings and Conclusions for Project Impacts.....	28
Findings and Conclusions Related to Local Partners.....	30
Findings and Conclusions Related to Gender	32
Recommendations.....	33
Annexes	35
Annex I: Evaluation Statement of Work.....	35
Annex II: Evaluation Methods and Limitations.....	41
Annex III: Data Collection Instruments.....	44
Annex IV: Sources Consulted.....	47
Annex V: CSO Grants and Training Matrices	50
Annex VI: Civil Society Objective Indicators.....	51
Annex VII: Research Institution Objective Indicators.....	52
Annex VIII: Legislative Bodies Objective Indicators.....	53
Annex IX: Summary of Constituency Outreach Activities by MPs from the First Two Recess Visits	54

ACRONYMS

ACYPL	American Council of Young Political Leaders
BAKN	Badan Akuntabilitas Keuangan Negara (State Finance Accountability Committee of the DPR)
BALEG	Badan Legislasi (Legislation Committee of the DPR)
BPK	Supreme Audit Agency
BURT DPR)	Badan Urusan Rumah Tangga (Household Affairs Committee of the
COP	Chief of Party
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCOP	Deputy Chief of Party
DPD	Dewan Perwakilan Daerah (Regional Representative Council)
DPR	Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (House of Representatives)
DRSP	Democratic Reform Support Program
GOI	Government of Indonesia
JABAT	Jangkau dan Libatkan
KRA	Key Result Area
LSI	Indonesian Survey Institute
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Member of Parliament
MP3	<i>Masyarakat Peduli Pelayanan Publik</i>
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PBB	Performance-Based Budgeting
PIR	Program Intermediate Result
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PPPI	Paramadina Public Policy Institute
ProRep	Program Representasi
RPJMN	Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (National Long Term Development Plan)
SAF	Special Activity Fund
SOW	Scope of Work
SP	Service Provider
TA	Technical Assistance
UKP4	Presidential Working Unit for Development Oversight and Control
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
WRI	Women's Research Institute

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The team wishes to thank USAID/Indonesia and ProRep for their assistance with arranging meetings with Indonesian government officials and for providing critical background materials for review. The team also would like to thank Mr. James Fremming from Social Impact for his advice and support both in Jakarta and in Washington in the preparation of this document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The purpose of this evaluation is to conduct an independent mid-term review of the Program Representasi (ProRep) project. The evaluation focuses on identifying which elements are or are not having an impact and which aspects of project design need to be adjusted for the remaining three years of the project (one remaining base year and two option years). The evaluators sought to identify lessons learned and best practices to help determine if current activities planned in each of ProRep's component areas are likely to achieve project objectives.

The evaluation of ProRep's performance covers the period from program initiation to date (April 2011 to March 2013). The evaluators reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated ProRep to determine:

1. To what extent has ProRep, including work through all of its partners, been successful in achieving the program objectives?
2. How well did the activities of each of ProRep's three components contribute, in a coordinated way, to achieving program objectives?
3. What factors, including external factors, are contributing to or inhibiting the achievement of program objectives?
4. What have been the project impacts (at least qualitatively)?
5. To what extent has ProRep's work with local partners strengthened local capacity to represent membership and constituent interest, develop and disseminate evidence-based public policy research, and engage in the legislative process?
6. How well have gender issues been addressed by ProRep?

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Government of Indonesia (GOI) articulated a comprehensive new vision of a more peaceful, modern, and prosperous Indonesia in a national plan of action called the Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN), the National Long Term Development Plan (2005-2025). The RPJMN articulates specific timetables for the accomplishment of national goals. The plan pays particular attention to consolidating democratic norms through five national development agendas for the period covering 2009-2014, namely:

- Economic Development and Increased Welfare of the People
- Enhancement of Good Governance
- Strengthening of the Pillars of Democracy
- Enforcement of the Law and Eradication of Corruption
- Development that is Inclusive and Just

It is within this evolving political context that the ProRep initiative seeks to contribute to USAID/Indonesia's Development Objective of "making democratic governance deliver" and supporting Indonesia's consolidation of democracy. ProRep's central theory is that better policy-making and stronger democracy will be advanced by strengthening the representational capacity of membership and constituency-based civil society organizations (CSOs); building the capacity of selected universities, think tanks, and CSOs to conduct and

disseminate policy-relevant research and analysis on key policy and governance issues; supporting a more effective, responsive, and transparent legislative process; and by providing timely resources designed to respond to opportunities or events not anticipated in the other three components but with the potential to build relationships with key Indonesian officials. ProRep distinguishes itself from other initiatives because it seeks to leverage synergy among reform-oriented legislators, elite think tanks, and national advocacy CSOs that are prepared to work on national policy and ultimately may influence the behavior and practice of a newly-democratic national legislature that is still maturing as an institution. ProRep promotes “representation” as both a vehicle for change as well as a goal in itself. Like democracy itself, representation is a process to be valued in the public sphere, and thus a goal. At the same time, however, representation is expected to causally contribute to other desired ends, such as more responsive, effective, and efficient public policies. In this way representation serves as both a vehicle for change and a goal in itself.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS, DESIGN, METHODS, AND LIMITATIONS

The evaluation was conducted by team leader, Mr. Patrick Fn’Piere, an expert on governance and legislative bodies; Mr. Richard Holloway, an expert on civil society; and Mr. Irfani Darma, an Indonesian development practitioner on governance and civil society programming. The evaluation team undertook a three-phase approach to the evaluation. During Phase 1 (Desk Review), the evaluation team reviewed key documents, including relevant background documents, ProRep and grantee materials, and project monitoring data. During Phase 2 (Fieldwork), the evaluation team traveled to Jakarta, Yogyakarta, and Palembang to meet with individuals associated with ProRep and its partners, as well as outside experts with relevant expertise. The team asked a set of standard questions of all those interviewed along with varied questions targeted to those associated with the different components. Key informants included ProRep staff, members of Indonesia’s Parliament, ProRep program beneficiaries and grantees, USAID (including other relevant USAID implementers), U.S. Embassy staff, other donor representatives, civil society leaders, government officials, and representatives from academia, journalism, and other domestic and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Field research for the evaluation was carried out from March 9–22, 2013. Phase 3 (Analysis) consisted of synthesis and analysis of the compiled data to generate findings, conclusions, and recommendations for USAID/Indonesia, ProRep, and other relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation resources and timeframe allowed for interviews with a portion of the grantees in components 1 and 2 and with approximately six of the MPs and others supported through component 3 rather than discussions with all those supported. USAID and ProRep made recommendations regarding which partners to interview. Since the program has only been providing technical assistance (TA) and training to partners for about 18 months, experiencing impact will likely not be realized for three to five years or longer.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

ACHIEVING OBJECTIVES

ProRep met its contractual goals of developing an approved start-up plan and a grants manual, producing a life-of-project performance management plan (PMP), and submitting

first and second year work plans (which included the role of their sub-contractors: Kemitraan, Urban Institute, and Social Impact) on time.

The ProRep PMP contains 19 indicators. ProRep met or exceeded targets in 10 of the 11 indicators for which progress has been reported. ProRep achieved 70% of the target for the remaining indicator, "Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance." Sufficient time has not elapsed to measure progress on four indicators for which data are reported bi-annually. Two others are high-level and results for them are not anticipated until later in the program. Targets have not yet been set for the remaining two indicators. The information gained from the interviews by the evaluation team is consistent with the data reported by ProRep in their quarterly and annual reports.

COORDINATION TOWARD PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The lag time before ProRep could work directly with grantees and partners varied greatly among the components. In addition, the three ProRep components are on different schedules as per capacity building, grant award dates, and lengths of time required for product completion. As grant products were produced and policy papers completed, ProRep orchestrated events, (e.g., workshops, trainings, and hearings participation) that engaged component participants in increasingly shared activities. Early, purposeful coordination was difficult and these timing variances continue to present challenges in harmonizing across components.

CONSTRAINTS

Few membership civil society advocacy organizations that meet USAID criteria for membership exist in Indonesia; therefore, proxies for membership had to suffice to find organizations for ProRep to work with. All of the CSO and think tank grantees interviewed cited lack of support for core operations as a critical need for longer-term viability. They also noted that the initial ProRep grant award time period was too short to accomplish all of their agreed-upon goals. The schedules for both research and grant activities did not line up well with either the national legislative calendar nor with the reality of policy making in Indonesia, which can take years for the passage of laws and further years for actual implementation.

With regard to the national legislature, the absence of buy-in from the Indonesian House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, or DPR) Speaker is a significant factor that explains why ProRep has not been able to work more broadly and openly with the institution as a whole, including with the Badan Urusan Rumah Tangga (BURT), the DPR's domestic or household committee that the Speaker chairs, which is key to coordinating broad reforms within the House, or with committees that have authorization or appropriation responsibility within the DPR. The 2014 elections are on the horizon and likely to have an influence on the makeup and priorities of the new legislature. Members of Parliament (MPs) currently supported by the project may not be reelected.

ProRep took appropriate steps to respond to the paucity of grant applications from true membership organizations. They sought modification of the grant criteria and provided robust support in terms of increasing awareness of the importance of representation of membership and constituents and of operational requirements related to membership management. In addition, they encouraged non-membership CSO partners to involve membership/constituency-based organizations in implementing their grant programs.

Finding lack of support for ProRep by the Speaker, ProRep's engagement of the next level of leadership was a meritorious strategic move.

PROJECT IMPACTS

The first two years of the project were invested in starting up the in-country office and team, conducting assessments of each of the three sectors, overcoming constraints to identifying potential grantees that meet award requirements stated in the contract, building capacity, awarding grants, and providing assistance as appropriate to grantees to achieve the purposes of their grants. The first round of research grants through ProRep served to gauge the quality of research and research institutions in Indonesia and to identify specific areas of assistance from which the organizations could benefit. The first round of grants for CSOs provided support to the partners that advocated budget transparency and public access to information, thereby contributing to partner capacity. The second round of research grants will be longer than the first and are expected to start producing research results in late 2013. ProRep CSO partners are increasingly interacting on their issues with respective legislative committees or directly with MPs; they are largely at the beginning of the legislative process. Though the evaluation team observed evidence of progress, it is too early to judge impact. To date, ProRep has not had any "legislative victories," partly because most of partners' programs are focused on monitoring the implementation of already enacted laws – not advocating on new laws or regulations.

LOCAL CAPACITY STRENGTHENING

With respect to strengthening capacity of program partners and grantees to achieve program goals, the evaluation team found that ProRep provided robust training courses, mentoring relationships, tailored capacity building strategies, and improved financial management. The project also provided quality TA by both domestic and international experts. ProRep research organizations were provided advanced training to reinforce substantive research techniques and improved skills in policy analysis and monitoring and evaluating research. The CSO partners were trained on alternative approaches to advocacy, the essence of constituency building, and techniques of engagement with policy makers. Additionally, participants noted an increase in face-to-face meetings with MPs and participation in legislative hearings and other public hearings. It is too early to tell whether these new behaviors will be sustained over time.

GENDER TREATMENT

ProRep reports include high levels of gender-disaggregated data; these data indicate high levels of participation by women. Grantees selected are advocating and conducting research and advocacy on issues that address important gender disparities in rights and opportunities. Specific topics include migrant workers, maternal insurance, family planning, and agriculture. The training on legal drafting also includes topics of gender relevance and significance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Fund the membership function for CSOs in Component 1:** The membership function of any organization involves a significant operational and management cost, yet ProRep grants account for a small fraction of the core operational costs for their CSO grantees. Emphasis should be shifted from the number of CSOs ProRep engages over the life of

the project (indicated in the present contract) to capability for sustainability for a smaller number of CSOs, particularly current CSO grantees who have better incorporated representation into their operational mode. To perform a representational function well, the respective CSOs need to develop a more secure core membership base that is capable of sustaining the organization programmatically (e.g., to provide and attract resource support) and to better incorporate the membership function into their overall operating plans and budgets. With regard to critical mass, the evaluators were told that the target of 16 to 20 CSOs was based on early projections of what the budget was able to support. Additionally, ProRep found that fewer CSOs than anticipated met ProRep criteria as national membership organizations. Thus, more resources were required to build awareness of the importance of membership and management responsibility related to the representation function within such organizations than anticipated. Providing further support to the membership function of current ProRep CSOs will require more resources to the grantees than originally envisioned and expansion of CSO networks to include like-minded organizations (including other USAID/Indonesia CSO partners). Within present resource and time constraints, providing more intensive support to a smaller number of CSOs would prove more effective than extending thinner support to a larger number of CSOs.

- 2. Evaluate application of skills enhanced through ProRep assistance:** ProRep provided considerable TA to their 14 CSO grantees in the development of their proposals, the implementation of their respective projects, and facilitation of opportunities for engagement with think tanks and MPs. ProRep also offered training on how to deepen CSOs' utilization of their membership as a vehicle for knowledge building and a source of institutional legitimacy to the Parliament. As part of its third year activities, we encourage ProRep to investigate the depth of the skills strengthened and how much their use has been incorporated at this juncture. At present, ProRep does not have a performance measure that gauges the way CSOs "use" representation in their policy advocacy.
- 3. Expand partners and networks:** Many ProRep CSOs work on behalf of constituencies that are not typically well-represented in Parliament. One important service that ProRep CSOs may perform for their constituents is to increase support for issues important to them from organizations that may have direct or indirect interest in their issues. Advocacy carried out through partnerships with organizations/constituencies whose interests coincide, resulting in a larger and wider mix of proponents for an issue, may be more compelling to the DPR as a whole. It may also reinforce the status of the CSOs as national organizations to the extent they may be perceived to have broad support across diverse geographic and demographic populations.
- 4. Support research of topics salient to targeted audiences for increased use of research:** ProRep selection criteria for research grants have included sectors and topics that were relevant to other parts of the ProRep activities, i.e., access to information, gender, budget, etc. The evaluation team recommends that ProRep undertake its own research to determine which policy issues are the most salient for the largest number of Indonesians, government, and elected officials. It is likely that economic issues will register higher. If so, ProRep may, in response, include economic impact to the social agenda that it has already undertaken. Linking ProRep research to issues with economic impact (e.g., trade issues, investment, taxation, and licensing) may provide entry to larger budget allocation issues which has the potential for more direct impact, given that the

national budget is the most basic and perhaps the only legislative action that is assured to take place each year.

5. **Increase awareness of relevance of ProRep values and approaches to a broader array of organizations:** The role of national political parties in legislative affairs is ubiquitous. ProRep has assets that are of interest to political parties. While ProRep's JABAT program will go into hiatus during the 2014 elections, ProRep-supported CSOs can still contribute to advancing important policy and concurrently build credibility for independent non-partisan voices to engage. USAID, for example, works with many other Indonesian organizations involved in consolidating democracy. Other USAID-supported groups have sector-specific interests that may at some come before the Parliament. ProRep should look for opportunities to leverage the sharing of core ProRep values and approaches with other organizations.

EVALUATION PURPOSE & EVALUATION QUESTIONS

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this evaluation is to conduct an independent mid-term review of the Program Representasi (ProRep) project. ProRep, implemented by Chemonics International through Contract No-AID-497-C-11-00002, is a five-year initiative whose main objectives are to increase the effectiveness of representative groups and institutions in policy making and implementation specifically undertaken by the national legislature of Indonesia and, in doing so, bolster both democracy and good governance in the country.

The evaluation focused on identifying which elements are or are not having an impact and which aspects of project design need to be adjusted for the remaining three years of the project (one remaining base year and two option years). The evaluators sought to identify lessons learned and best practices to help determine if current activities planned in each of ProRep's program areas are likely to achieve project objectives.

Per the ProRep contract, the project will strengthen representation in three important areas:

- It will build the capacity of member- and constituency-based civil society organizations (CSOs) so that they can better represent the interests of their members and constituents at the national and/or local level.
- It will support independent analysis and public consideration of legislation and policies having a major impact on democratic governance.
- It will work with Indonesia's key representative bodies – primarily the House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, or DPR), but possibly also the Regional Representative Council (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah, or DPD) – to help them become more effective, responsive, and transparent.

The principal project results are expected to include: 1) membership-based CSOs will be better able to represent the interests of their members; 2) Indonesian universities, think tanks, and CSOs will be better able to produce and disseminate policy-relevant research and analysis; and 3) the legislative process in the DPR will be more effective, responsive, and transparent.

The project also will give the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) a mechanism to allow it to respond flexibly and rapidly to unanticipated needs and opportunities that USAID believes are important to protecting or advancing democratic governance in Indonesia.

"These results will contribute to the achievement of Intermediate Result (IR) 2 of USAID's 2009–2014 Democratic Governance (DG) strategy, which supports efforts at both the national and regional levels to make governance more representative, effective, and responsive to citizen's needs."¹

¹ USAID contract No-AID-497-C-11-00002

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation of ProRep's performance covers the period from program initiation in April 2011 to March 2013. The evaluators reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated ProRep at this mid-point to determine:

1. To what extent has ProRep, including work through all of its partners, been successful in achieving the program objectives?
2. How well did the activities of each of ProRep's three components contribute, in a coordinated way, to achieving program objectives?
3. What factors, including external factors, are contributing to or inhibiting the achievement of program objectives?
4. What have been the project impacts (at least qualitatively)?
5. To what extent has ProRep's work with local partners strengthened local capacity to represent membership and constituent's interest, develop and disseminate evidence-based public policy research, and engage in the legislative process?
6. How well have gender issues been addressed by ProRep?

PROJECT BACKGROUND

Indonesia has made considerable progress since the economic and political turmoil of the late 1990s that helped bring about the end of the authoritarian, military-backed regime of President Suharto in 1998. Indeed, Indonesia's economy has rebounded well from the Asian monetary crisis and is currently ranked 16th in size among world economies with GDP growing at more than 6 percent per year.² Politically, Indonesia has undertaken significant structural reforms with respect to conducting democratic elections, devolving central authority, advancing freedom of the press, increasing decision-making authority and responsibilities of its legislative bodies at both the national and local level, and enhancing judicial and executive programs to fight corruption. To many, Indonesia is "recognized as a shining example to the world that Islam, democracy, and modernity can actually be compatible and exist in harmony."³

The above examples are illustrative of an impressive set of economic and political accomplishments, hard won over a relatively brief period from 1998 to 2013. However, Indonesia is by no means assured of an equally optimistic future. Despite its top 20 GDP ranking, Indonesia's 2012 UN HDI rank was 121th out of 187 countries with more than 30 million of its citizens living below the poverty line. And, according to the *CIA World Fact Book*, of the 144 countries ranked, Indonesia occupies the 81st place on the 2010 Gini Index, a measure of income inequality. Equally concerning is the pace or effectiveness of the political reforms that have taken place since the end of authoritarianism. As Harold Crouch points out in his seminal work, *Political Reform in Indonesia after Suharto*, "post-crisis reform did not follow a standard democratic template in which freely elected legislators responded to popular pressures and bureaucrats followed the principles of good governance in pursuit of a perception of the long-term national interest. Rather, it was the product of protracted bargaining of largely self-serving parties both old and new."⁴ Many political experts interviewed for this evaluation cited rising Islamic fundamentalism, negative public perception of government performance (particularly with respect to the national legislature), political corruption, cronyism, patronage, and poor and unequal service delivery as among the many fault lines that continue to threaten Indonesia's stability and characterize the state of play of Indonesia's political landscape.

Cognizant of considerable political, social, and economic challenges that lay ahead, the Government of Indonesia (GOI) articulated a comprehensive new vision of a more peaceful, modern, and prosperous Indonesia in a national plan of action called the Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional (RPJMN), the National Long Term Development Plan (2005-2025). The RPJMN articulates specific timetables for the accomplishment of national goals. The plan pays particular attention to consolidating democratic norms through five national development agendas⁵ for the period covering 2009-2014, namely:

- Economic Development and Increased Welfare of the People;
- Enhancement of Good Governance;
- Strengthening of the Pillars of Democracy;

² World Bank Country Report, 2011.

³ *Democracy, Human Rights, and Governance Assessment of Indonesia*, Final Report 2013, USAID

⁴ *Political Reform in Indonesia after Suharto*, Harold A. Crouch

⁵ RPJMN

- Enforcement of the Law and Eradication of Corruption; and
- Development that is Inclusive and Just.

In keeping with the goals set by the RPJMN, the Indonesian House of Representatives, Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat (DPR), launched a multi-year initiative to reform the institution that among its reforms calls for “efficient and effective legislation function, transparent and accountable budgeting function, transparent and effective oversight to the government, and for the DPR to be strong, aspirative, responsive, and accommodative.”⁶

It is within this evolving political and economic context that the ProRep initiative seeks to contribute to USAID’s strategic goal of “making democracy work” and supporting Indonesia’s consolidation of democracy. ProRep’s central theory is that better policy making and stronger democracy will be advanced by strengthening the representational capacity of membership and constituency-based CSOs; building the capacity of selected universities, think tanks, and CSOs to conduct and disseminate policy-relevant research and analysis on key policy and governance issues; supporting a more effective, responsive, and transparent legislative process; and by providing timely resources designed to respond to unanticipated opportunities or events in the other three components which have the potential to build important relationships with key Indonesian officials. A fundamental tenet of ProRep is that representation by the country’s legislature is an essential element for sound, legitimate, and effective policy making and its subsequent implementation. At this juncture in Indonesia’s post-Suharto era, representation of the interests of ordinary citizens in Indonesia’s national legislature, i.e., the 560-member DPR and the 132-member Dewan Perwakilan (DPD), is weak. USAID’s 2008 assessment of the national legislature states: “With respect to representation, because of Indonesia’s party list electoral system, with its strong party discipline, DPR members have relatively little opportunity to represent their constituents in policy-making or in plenary and committee sessions. Members of the DPR seem to place relatively little emphasis on constituent relations. Members elected from party lists are more likely to represent ideological or minority interests than the interests of particular geographic areas.”⁷ The East Asia Forum noted in a 2011 article that perception of the DPR has not improved since 2008: “One year into their tenure, critics claim that the DPR is not performing well. Few bills have been passed (16 out of a target of 70), while its members continue to be defensive in the face of public outcry over allegedly luxurious facilities, overseas trips and corruption cases. It is no surprise that numerous polls suggest high public dissatisfaction with the DPR.”⁸

A second tenet of ProRep is that effective formulation and implementation of public policy is not solely the responsibility of elected officials but that non-governmental actors also have a critical role. Indeed, it is envisaged that if non-government actors engage more substantively with elected officials in Parliament, the governance of Indonesia – and perhaps even the reputation of the body – would improve.

Past USAID and other international donor (most notably AusAID and UNDP) programs have provided support to CSOs, think tanks, and to the GOI in support of activities directed at enhancing policy development. Indeed, USAID supported a partnership between the Center for Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector (IRIS) at the University of Maryland and the Institute for Economic and Social Research (LPEM) at the University of Indonesia (a ProRep

⁶ DPR’s Strategic Plan (2010-2014)

⁷ USAID, *Democracy and Governance Assessment*, 2008.

⁸ East Asia Forum, March 17, 2011.

grantee) to support and advise local policymakers on political, administrative, and fiscal decentralization issues (1998-2003). IRIS' regional university network stretches from one end of the archipelago to the other and includes members from Banda Aceh, Bandung, Banjarmasin, Denpasar, Jayapura, Manado, Manokwari, Medan, Padang, Surakarta, Palembang, Ujung Pandang, Semarang, Surabaya, and Yogyakarta, among others.⁹ The more recent UNDP effort through the Parliamentary Reform and Public Engagement Revitalization (PROPER) Parliamentary Reform Initiative and DPD sought to strengthen parliamentarians' capacities to consolidate democracy in Indonesia to better carry out key functions, including drafting and deliberating new legislation, review, and approval of state and local government budget and expenditures, as well as improved oversight to monitor and evaluate the implementation of laws and policies by the Government's executive branch. ProRep builds on these projects as well as ProRep's predecessor, the Democratic Reform Support Program (DRSP), which (among several areas) focused on capacity building of the national legislature.

ProRep distinguishes itself, however, from other initiatives because it seeks to leverage synergy among reform-oriented legislators, elite think tanks, and national advocacy CSOs that are prepared to work on national policy and ultimately may influence the behavior and practice of a newly-democratic national legislature that is still maturing as an institution. ProRep promotes "representation" as both a vehicle for change as well as a goal in itself. Representation is not an explicit constitutional responsibility of Members of Parliament (MPs) nor is it a standard operating protocol across civil society. Like democracy itself, representation is a process to be valued in the public sphere, and thus a goal. At the same time, however, representation is expected to causally contribute to other desired ends, such as more responsive, effective, and efficient public policies. In this way representation serves as both a vehicle for change and a goal in itself. ProRep seeks to increase representation in the national legislature, among CSOs, and in the development and execution of public policy emanating from the national legislature as a fundamental aspect of governance. A measurable increase in representation is the goal. The practice of representation, e.g., engagement and responsiveness to a variety of voices in deliberations and decision making, is necessary to reach the goal; it is a vehicle to create the change, institutionalizing representation as a valued behavior, i.e., the goal requires a long-term process. The process, i.e., the vehicle to achieve the goal, is the practice of the behavior combined with observation and accrual of benefits from that practice. The aim is to achieve a point at which MPs, civil society leaders, and public policy specialists perceive that it is deemed unacceptable to not formally employ inclusive behaviors that are grounded in fact-based analysis.

ProRep is a complex project comprised of three primary but very distinct objectives. Each objective supports different institutions, e.g., the national legislature, think tanks, and CSOs, all of which are independent entities with discrete histories, compositions, and institutional challenges requiring different strategies to achieve ProRep goals. Not accustomed to working together, each entity is supported by ProRep in capacity strengthening with the expectation that this will enhance the abilities and wills of these organizations to work more closely together in a common purpose. While all three types of institutions purport to act in the public interest, they do so in very different ways and with different incentives, resources, timetables, levels of accountability, and institutional frameworks guiding their everyday operations. This evaluation reviews ProRep's three program areas individually with their

⁹ IRIS/LPEM Peg Grant, "Strengthening Regional University Capacity to support Decentralization," Annual Report 2001

unique challenges (and contractual requirements) and also investigates the sum of the three parts.

EVALUATION METHODS & LIMITATIONS

METHODS

The evaluation was conducted by team leader, Mr. Patrick Fn'Piere, an expert on governance and legislative bodies; Mr. Richard Holloway, an expert on civil society; and Mr. Irfani Darma, an Indonesian development practitioner on governance and civil society programming. The evaluation team undertook a multi-method, 3-phase approach to the evaluation. During Phase 1 (Desk Review), the evaluation team reviewed key documents, including relevant background documents, ProRep and grantee materials, and project monitoring data. Chemonics/Washington and ProRep provided the team with copies of relevant project documents, including the ProRep scope of work (SOW), the Performance Management Plan (PMP), ProRep assessments, quarterly and annual reports, work plans, newsletters, and other project related documents.

During Phase 2 (Fieldwork), the evaluation team traveled to Jakarta, Yogyakarta, and Palembang to meet with individuals associated with ProRep and its partners, as well as outside experts with relevant expertise. An in-briefing with USAID/Indonesia detailing USAID's objectives and specific issues the team should address, was held on March 11 in Jakarta. From March 12–22, the team conducted key informant interviews with ProRep staff, ProRep supported CSOs, research organizations, DPR Members and staff, other international donors working with research and CSOs in Indonesia, and representatives from other USAID projects to gather information on ProRep, its development, and its impacts. The field investigation sought informed comment, data, and reflections from ProRep participants and grantees, government officials, domestic and international partners, local experts, USAID/Indonesia, the US Embassy, and ProRep staff on the extent to which ProRep was achieving its objectives. The team also evaluated how ProRep's fourth component, (i.e., the Strategic Activities Fund, or SAF) was providing USAID/Indonesia with an effective mechanism to respond rapidly to unanticipated needs and opportunities to advance democratic governance in Indonesia. Finally, the team considered whether the results to date were on course in contributing toward achievement of IR 2 of USAID's 2009–2014 Democratic Governance (DG) strategy, which supports efforts at both the national and regional levels to make governance more representative, effective, and responsive to citizen needs.

Phase 3 (Analysis) consisted of synthesis and analysis of the data to generate findings, conclusions, and recommendations for USAID/Indonesia, ProRep, and other relevant stakeholders.

The team conducted the evaluation in accordance with the approach described in USAID's *Evaluation Policy, Learning from Experience* (2011). The team asked a set of standard questions of all interviewed along with varied questions targeted to those associated with the different components. Examples of the interview protocols used can be found in Annex III. The evaluation team provided a brief report on its preliminary findings to USAID before departure from Indonesia.

LIMITATIONS

Given that much of the data is of a qualitative nature, the information presented herein is subject to the standard limitations of qualitative research. In other words, the evaluation team cannot generalize findings beyond direct respondents and the qualitative findings gathered from interviews are subject to various forms of bias (including recall bias). The evaluation team made every reasonable effort, within the constraints of time and other resources, to triangulate findings across data sources to strengthen reliability of findings.

The evaluation resources and timeframe allowed for interviews with a portion of the grantees in components 1 and 2 and with approximately six of the MPs and others supported through component 3 rather than discussions with all those supported. USAID and ProRep recommended the partners to interview. Since the program only has been providing technical assistance (TA) and training to partners for about 18 months, evidence of impact will likely not be realized for three to five years or longer.

This mid-term evaluation is not intended to attribute impact. Unlike an impact evaluation, the ProRep mid-term performance evaluation can identify some causal chains but cannot authoritatively ascribe impact or causal relationships between observed outcomes and the program.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings presented below are organized by ProRep component, followed by a discussion of the SAF. Each of the three component sections contains sub-sections for findings and conclusions for evaluation questions 1–3. The evaluation team then discusses evaluation questions 4–6 in aggregate.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR COMPONENT 1: CIVIL SOCIETY (QUESTIONS 1-3)

Component 1 Objective: To build the capacity of member- and constituency-based based civil society organizations (CSOs) so that they can better represent the interests of their members and constituents at the national and/or local level.

In its first 24 months, ProRep honed the grantee selection process and identified appropriate grant mechanisms to support 14 grantees in their pursuit of legislative remedies important to their mission by tailoring trainings and TA to meet the needs or gaps in representational and advocacy skills. At its core, Component 1 endeavors to first alter the relationship between CSO leadership with its members/constituency, giving priority to the members; then, using the collective strength and judgment of that membership, to develop and implement strategies to achieve the organization’s goals.

Evaluation Question 1: To what extent has ProRep, including work through all of its partners, been successful in achieving the program objectives?

Findings

ProRep provides assistance to membership and constituency-based CSOs¹⁰ with grants, TA, training, and other support for membership and network building, issue analysis, advocacy, and public outreach. ProRep also facilitates CSOs’ consultative processes and engagement with the DPR and/or DPRDs, and other branches of government, along with documenting and sharing of lessons learned and best practices.

In the first two years, ProRep has supported 14 CSOs. While ProRep’s contract stipulates that ProRep is to work with “membership and constituency based CSOs,” only 6 of the 14 CSOs which received grants are, in the opinion of the responsible ProRep staff, membership organizations in the customary sense of having listed members involved in the governing structure of the organization. Of the CSOs interviewed by the evaluation team, *Allians Aliansi Journalis Independen* and *Aisyiyah* fit this definition.

An early challenge for ProRep was that it had surprisingly few takers when it advertised its intentions and made a call for proposals. ProRep found few organizations that fit the strict definition of a “national membership organization” and were attracted by the conditions of the grant. In response, new guidelines were developed and discussed with USAID that modified the membership requirement and a training course on constituency building became part of the assistance provided to CSO grantees.

¹⁰ ProRep targets assistance to 16–20 CSOs over the five-year life of the project.

With this modification, ProRep was able to accept CSOs with proxies for membership, such as:

- CSOs which are linked to membership organizations, but are not themselves membership organizations – e.g., *Circle Indonesia* which is linked to *Alliansi Organisi Indonesia*;
- CSOs with beneficiaries and that represent the interests of these beneficiaries – e.g., *YSSK* in Solo which is, in effect, their constituency; and
- CSOs which are linked to other CSOs with beneficiaries – e.g., *Prakarsa*, which is linked to *PIAR* in East Nusa Tenggara (Nusa Tenggara Timur or NTT) province.

ProRep identified CSOs working in many areas of Indonesia with advocacy agendas important to the country (please see Annex V for locations). The grant proposal topics met the criteria required for receiving a grant. ProRep's Grants Data Summary (simplified) shows us:

1. *AJI* – improving journalists' knowledge of budgets
2. *Circle Indonesia* – clarifying budgets available for organic farmers
3. *HAPSARI* – clarifying government budgets available for women in accessing People's Business Credit (KUR)
4. *PRAKARSA* – understanding and implementing the budget allocations for maternity insurance
5. *YSSK* – understanding and implementing the primary school operational fund (BOS)
6. *ISAI* – agreeing what information is classified and what is not in the documents of the Ministry of Health
7. *Aisyiyah* – making sure that the budget for maternity insurance is used in accordance with the law
8. *ASPPUK* – making sure that the part of the budget available for microbusiness development of women is known to them
9. *Pergerakan* – making sure that the budget for fishermen's welfare (Program Kesejahteraan Nelayan or PKN) is known and implemented properly
10. *SEKNAS Fitra* – understanding and implementing the budget for maternity insurance and helping DPR members to understand and supervise the national budget
11. *LAKPESDAM NU* – improving the connection between religious groups and MPs
12. *Muslimat NU* – Representing constituents' needs in budgeting for flood management
13. *ICEL* - Improving oversight of the law on Protection and Management of the Environment
14. *INPROSULA* – helping farmers' networks to understand and monitor government budgets for sustainable livelihood

Conclusions

ProRep has laid a solid foundation with its support to the 14 national CSOs and the upcoming election could produce more constituent-indebted MPs. If that were to occur, ProRep will have a diverse group of national CSOs positioned to take advantage. If this does not happen, some of the efforts CSOs are engaged in may be better directed to political parties rather than just to the legislature.

In the next year, the final base year of the project, ProRep will have to weigh the comparative advantage of adding more CSOs to reach the program goals of 16–20 CSOs against deepening the experience and competency of the current ProRep CSOs (or even a smaller number) in determining strategic value and prudent use of remaining funds. ProRep experience to date suggests that the level and type of funding, i.e., project funds to build its representative capacity, are not sufficient to support the core cost associated with executing successful advocacy campaigns or to ensure permanent change in the management and operational culture of an organization. Furthermore, the additional funding sources for the critical core support will require new strategies to attract domestic and international funding if they are to develop and initiate longer sustainable development strategies and increase the probability of finding new sources of institutional financing to pursue their advocacy agenda to its conclusion.

Evaluation Question 2: How well did the activities of each of ProRep’s three program objectives contribute, in a coordinated way, to achieving program objectives?

Findings

We found increasing coordination between CSOs and think tanks/research organizations, partly facilitated through the ProRep Partners Reflection Workshops. Two of the workshop objectives were to “share experiences, achievements, and lessons learned in implementing ProRep grants” and “determine concrete methods for collaboration across program objectives, based on specific issues and/or key programmatic areas.” CSO respondents and post-workshop evaluations expressed satisfaction with the informal and valuable assistance given to the CSOs by ProRep staff and by people identified by ProRep staff to assist in training and provide TA.

There have been CSOs working at the national level on advocacy issues prior to ProRep (including ProRep grantees: *SEKNAS Fitra, ICEL, ISAI, AJI, PRAKARSA*), and ProRep is giving more CSOs the opportunity to bring their constituents’ interests to the national level. ProRep has encouraged the CSOs, in nearly all cases, to compile data and evidence, direct this information to MPs or to expert staff of the DPR, develop material for advocacy, and participate in hearings and communicate directly with MPs and the Executive. It is too early to ascertain whether these activities will result in the achievement of the different CSO objectives, as the legislative process is very long and the legislature is a complicated institution with complex structures and conflicting incentives. A 2011 ProRep Civil Society assessment asserted that:

Common challenges in engaging with the DPR for policy advocacy include the following: (a) public participation is hampered by the bureaucracy, with the Government and the DPR taking a passive approach to participation, (b) even when called for by DPR rules, public and CSO attendance at hearings or meetings is controlled by DPR officials through commissions or other bodies, (c) DPR members regularly prioritize political interest above those addressing economic or (even more so) social issues. This phenomenon is especially significant given the slowness of the legislative process in

Indonesia and the small number of laws considered and passed by Parliament in a given year.¹¹

Conclusions

ProRep has provided an opportunity for its partner CSOs to have a voice in Parliament in a way that has not been common for them in the past, although other CSOs have worked in this way (e.g., a CSO-led coalition which pushed the Freedom of Information Law, the Masyarakat Peduli Pelayanan Publik (MP3), and the Law on Public Services).¹² Indonesian CSOs have previously addressed Parliament using donor funds, but ProRep has considerably expanded the range of CSOs and issues addressed.

From conversations with CSOs interviewed, the evaluation team found that the concept of CSOs requiring legitimacy through a mandate from their constituents is being enthusiastically accepted. This increasingly allows them to put forward their constituents' interests and to relay information about the DPR to their constituents. ProRep's training courses in Constituency Building, Strengthening Relations with Policy Makers, and Creative Advocacy (see Annex IV) are helping CSOs that have not previously worked in this manner to build their capacity to represent their own membership and constituents' interests.

Evaluation Question 3: What factors, including external, are contributing to or inhibiting the achievement of program objectives?

Findings

The evaluation team found that there were significant variances between resources available through ProRep (generally under \$75,000) and needs of ProRep partners for implementing advocacy campaigns. The ProRep Civil Society Assessment, conducted in the spring of 2011, detailed the complicated and time consuming steps required by a CSO to implement advocacy campaigns. It cited common challenges, such as uncertain time frames, insufficient staff, and cost considerations. CSOs, helped by ProRep, have limited amounts of time and money to engage in these steps. While some of the CSOs have received assistance and may receive further support from ProRep, there remain significant gaps between the ProRep design for working with CSOs on advocacy to the DPR and on increasing their own representative capacity.

In interviews with several CSOs we found that, at this stage, their advocacy overtures to MPs were indeed based on their experience. For example, *Prakarsa*, working with *PIAR* on implementing the new law on maternity insurance (Jampersal), relied on data from NTT province; *Aisyiyah*, working on the same issue relied on data from one Kabupaten/district (Kendal) in Central Java; *Circle Indonesia*, working with *Alliansi Organik Indonesia* on the need to get clear subsidies for organic farmers, relied on data from one Kabupaten, Boyolali, in Central Java; and *YSKK*, working on the need to get reforms in the budgets for schools and how they are spent, relied on data from Surakarta, Central Java and Gunung Kidul (in DIY). ProRep's CSOs are a combination of local organizations (like *YSKK* in Solo), which have links to a larger network but feel that their experience is national in implication, as well as national organizations (like *Aisyiyah*) which have enthusiastic local chapters (in this case in Yogyakarta) that feel that their local data is relevant throughout Indonesia.

¹¹ *ProRep Civil Society Assessment*, 2011.

¹² *ProRep Civil Society Assessment*, 2011.

Social media is enormously popular in Indonesia. The evaluation noted that in a recent posting in the *Jakarta Post*, Indonesia ranked first in Southeast Asia among users of Facebook and Twitter. Recognizing the potential organizational and communication benefits of social media for fundraising, marketing, online-polling, and petition drives, linking like-minded organizations and affiliations to a common purpose, ProRep has provided a very popular social media training course. The evaluation did not see, however, an equal amount of training provided for the use of broadcast and print media, even though, as was noted in ProRep's own *Civil Society Assessment*, "Independent mass media such as newspapers, radio, and television networks have grown remarkably [in Indonesia]. There are now hundreds of new print media published in Jakarta and nationally, all providing relatively free press coverage of political and social affairs."¹³ However, in the record of activities planned by the ProRep CSOs, there were plans for use of more electronic, broadcast, and print media.¹⁴

Conclusions

CSOs, stimulated by increasing opportunities to work with the legislature and encouraged by ProRep, have started projects with insufficient funds to see their advocacy effort to fruition. The passage of the "Freedom of Information Act" is a pertinent case in that it took eight years to pass. ProRep found that there is a cost for CSOs developing and/or institutionalizing a membership function. It requires human resources and systems dedicated to this task that are often beyond that organization's capacity. Covering these costs is beyond ProRep's scope.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR COMPONENT 2: SUPPORT TO RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS (QUESTIONS 1-3)

Component 2 Objective: To support independent analysis and public consideration of legislation and policies having a major impact on democratic governance.

Evaluation Question 1: To what extent has ProRep, including work through all of its partners, been successful in achieving the program objectives?

Findings

At this mid-point in the project life, ProRep has selected eight research organizations and provided 12 grants in support of the program's support of independent analysis. Grants in this category stipulated that the topics of policy research should: (1) be relevant to the National Legislature (DPR) and the interests of supported CSOs and (2) involve monitoring or assessing the implementation of existing laws. The policies or laws could be on topics such as national budget, government accountability, corruption, access to information and regulatory bodies, and they needed to be of special import to women.

The initial seven "Quick Start" grants met those criteria and focused on:

- 1) Women and disadvantaged groups, including *adat* (indigenous) communities, affected by mining and the management of natural resources;

¹³ *ProRep Civil Society Assessment*, 2011.

¹⁴ ProRep assumed that partners had experience in print and broadcast media; therefore, it did not provide training.

- 2) Analyzing the effectiveness of a quota system for increasing the number of female DPR Members;
- 3) Research on the persistent backlog of bills awaiting action in the DPR;
- 4) Research on barriers in the way of public access to information on budget formulation and deliberation by the DPR;
- 5) Research on how to make the national budget process more transparent and less prone to inefficiencies;
- 6) Research on the process of development management and regulation from the local to the central level; and
- 7) Research on policies towards public access to information, especially law-making processes, with respect to the parliaments of three ASEAN member states – Indonesia, Singapore, and the Philippines.

Respondents uniformly concurred that the TA from ProRep staff and the Urban Institute has deepened their knowledge, acceptance, and experience with evidence-based analytic research and, through ever-expanding contact with CSOs, has facilitated more engagement on legislative issues. Respondents noted keen interest in policy identification and relevance of budget analysis in their operations – areas of interest or engagement that these organizations stated that they had rarely pursued in the past. While the first round of “quick-start grants” were meant (in part) to gauge public policy competencies of the selected research institutions, we found in reviewing ProRep reports (e.g., the December 2012 Newsletter) and in discussions with ProRep grantees that several government policy officials had positively responded to research products. This suggests that the second round of grants, designed to have significantly more policy substance and more strategic dissemination plans, already has made inroads on demand. For example, Dr. Marwanto Harjowiryo, one official from the Director General for Fiscal Balance at the Ministry of Finance, referred to the Institute for Economic and Social Research of the University of Indonesia (LPEM-UI) research on the impact of forestry extraction and the proposed amendment to Law No. 33/2004 on Fiscal Balance, commenting that “...Forestry Revenue Sharing Policy in essence is to control forest extraction, and therefore to conserve our forests. In this regard, I find this research important to check whether that purpose has been met. Furthermore, this research is strategic to see the impact of revenue sharing for social development and local communities.” Further notation of how ProRep research is being received comes from Mr. Hanif Ary, Deputy for Monitoring and Evaluation and a senior official of the government’s Presidential Working Unit for Development Oversight and Control (UKP4), cited Paramadina Public Policy Institute’s (PPPI) research on the implementation of performance-based budgeting (PBB) policies in Indonesia and commented that, “this research at 6 ministries may provide an important input for us in perfecting current ministerial/government agency performance indicators. We wait for your research findings...our [UKP4] support to this research is for PPPI to use our access with senior officials at the ministries when conducting field research...”

For many of the first tranche of ProRep research grantees, this was their first foray into policy research directed at the legislature. The “quick start” research products from the initial ProRep grants were generally well received by respective committees and policy staff of the DPR. All of the products were published and disseminated to appropriate media, and respondents from legislative CSOs and participating research organizations relayed an increased confidence in the quality of the public policy research they provided. Furthermore,

the engagement with both CSOs and parliamentarians in the research process opened lines of communication with new collaborators.

Conclusions

As in most countries, the legislative process in Indonesia is long and full of uncertainties. The brevity of the initial grants did not allow sufficient time to see end results that may be gained from the investment. We do, however, conclude that the relationships formed may prove to be more enduring with the DPR if the MPs and or committee chairs to which the research organizations have provided research remain in office after the next round of elections.

Evaluation Question 2: How well did the activities of each of ProRep's three program objectives contribute, in a coordinated way, to achieving program objectives?

Findings

While the selected research institutions met ProRep eligibility requirements related to the type of research to be done, ProRep found that they required supplementary assistance to enhance their internal operations as well as to improve their relationships as "knowledge suppliers" with advocacy CSOs and Parliament. ProRep and the Urban Institute provided targeted training through two Policy Fellows Workshops, two grant orientation workshops, and more than a dozen joint consultations and mentoring sessions (conducted in-person or electronically) with ProRep research institutions. Moreover, ProRep conducted a capacity assessment for ProRep's grantee think tanks that included an analysis of the market for policy research in Indonesia, organizational effectiveness, outreach, professional credentials, quality control, sustainability, and performance as well as providing specific recommendations for each ProRep research institution. In addition, a national public policy research network was launched with ProRep current research grantees as founding members.

As the "quick start" grants' period of performance came to a close, ProRep awarded a second round of grants with attendant technical pre-award support. Four of the original seven grants received longer term (17 month) Policy Research Grants. Maintaining the same eligibility requirements of the "quick start" grants, these longer term instruments provide ProRep more time to fully develop institutional capacity and include 30% of the total grant for core support to improve institutions' long-term viability.

The 17-month (up to \$120,000) policy research grants focus on:

1. The impact of forestry extraction and proposed amendment to Law No. 33/2004 on Fiscal Balance;
2. The implementation of performance-based budgeting;
3. The role of female MPs and the Gender Equity Bill;
4. Effective models of representative-constituency relations at the House of Regional Representatives (DPD); and,
5. Effective models of representative-constituent relations in the DPR.

Conclusions

The question of whether more demand for evidence-based public policy research was generated or will be generated remains. The research topics largely cover areas involving public access to information, the DPR budget process and internal procedures, and the

impact of legislative actions on women or marginalized groups.¹⁵ While the topics meet ProRep's selection criteria, one must ask whether these topics are the most likely subjects to more broadly increase the demand for independent policy research by the Parliament. The GOI has ambitious plans to address a range of broader economic issues concerning GDP growth, productivity, or its regional and global ascension that perhaps could create more demand for research by independent research institutions. Conditions for ProRep research grants narrowed the subjects allowed for the research but an important question for ProRep as it moves to its third year is whether the chosen subjects will create demand. The topics are important to the committees ProRep is working with, but those committees are not the appropriators, authorizers, or the ones who make sector related policies.

Evaluation Question 3: What factors, including external factors, are contributing to or inhibiting the achievement of program objectives?

Findings

ProRep and the Urban Institute cited serious weaknesses in the enabling environment as well as in the supply and demand for policy relevant research in the legislative process. Moreover, they found in their original assessment that addressing all of the issues related to the legislature's use of independent evidence-based research would require a number of reforms related to financing, political parties, and the functioning of the DPR itself – issues beyond the scope of ProRep. However, given the emergence of the policy making role of the DPR and the many challenges ahead for Indonesia, ProRep could take steps to alter the equilibrium by initiating and demonstrating processes and activities which will, over the course of the project and beyond, alter the structure and functioning of the market for policy relevant research and analysis. Given the range of research topics, the initial reception they have experienced from peers and MPs, along with the continuity of assistance provided by ProRep in support of their work, grantees interviewed were optimistic about the utility of their research providing more relevant information to policy makers. ProRep research organizations have provided some baseline information concerning other research activities they have conducted prior to their work with ProRep; however, for many, this represents the most concerted effort in working with the national legislature.

ProRep is designed to be an institutional development tool but one that is having an impact in real time. Each component has time constraints that make it difficult for harmonization. For example, research products take anywhere from 4 to 17 months to come to fruition and research institutions have other products in which they are simultaneously engaged that may take priority over ProRep. Coordinating schedules for group activities (e.g., trainings, workshops, etc.) among research organizations, CSOs, and MPs requires considerable forward planning and flexibility in participant schedules, particularly with the availability of outside experts' involvement brought in by ProRep. Finally, the vagaries of the legislative calendar of Parliament, timing of Committee hearings, and other institutional protocols are not in the Project's control, therefore making synchronization among all three components difficult.

¹⁵ Advocacy and research programs were selected in consultation with potential Component 1 and Component 2 grantees.

Conclusions

While policy research grantees clearly see value in the ProRep assistance they have received thus far, the context for producing efficacious policy research is daunting. Coordinating the timelines of assistance to institutions with the legislative and electoral calendar as well as with ProRep CSO assistance is a particularly substantial hindrance to achieving ProRep's intended outcomes.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR COMPONENT 3: LEGISLATIVE BODIES (QUESTIONS 1-3)

Component 3 Objective: To work with Indonesia’s key representative bodies – primarily the House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat or DPR) but possibly also the Regional Representative Council (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah or DPD) – to help them become more effective, responsive, and transparent.

Under Objective 3, ProRep provides direct institutional capacity-building support to:

- BAKN (Badan Akuntabilitas Keuangan Negara (State Finance Accountability Committee, or Public Accounts Committee) of the DPR;
- BALEG (Badan Legislasi) or Legislation Council of the DPR;
- The Secretariat General of DPR; and,
- The Upper House of the Parliament, the Dewan Perwakilan Daerah (DPD), or Regional Representative Council.

Additionally, ProRep works with selected MPs on a constituency outreach program called JABAT (Jangkau dan Libatkan).

In recent years, public opinion polls have consistently indicated that the Indonesian public does not have high opinions of Parliament. The Indonesian Survey Institute (LSI) found in an April 2012 survey that a majority of parents (56.4%) do not want their children to become members of DPR. This was a marked turnaround from the result of the same survey in 2009 where 59% of parents wanted their children to be members of the DPR. This perception of the DPR has many causes, including the sheer size, distance, and complexity of individual constituencies; the pervasive influence and role of political parties in the electoral process (party list systems); and the fact that many MPs live in Jakarta and West Java and therefore have little contact with the district they represent, either before or after the election.

Evaluation Question 1: To what extent has ProRep, including work through all of its partners, been successful in achieving the program objectives?

Findings

The evaluation team interviewed members and staff of BAKN, the State Finance Accountability Committee of the DPR. These respondents stated that ProRep has contributed to a higher level of functionality within their committees. In particular, they credited study visits to the UK and the Netherlands as important learning experiences.

A major milestone for BAKN and ProRep has been the production and dissemination of the first annual report to the DPR summarizing the work of the committee. A particularly important component of BAKN’s first annual report is the specific recommendations it makes for follow-up to its audit of the Supreme Audit Agency’s (BPK) government report. The findings of the audit of BPK’s report have implications for other standing committees in the DPR with regard to how budget allocations are being spent. The annual report also recommends important steps that the BAKN proposes to take to enhance its independent oversight responsibility and identifies additional resources that would be required to carry the steps out more effectively. These annual reports are an important indication of the

BAKN's growing confidence in their oversight function of government expenditures and performance.

ProRep's JABAT effort (funded through the SAF, discussed below) is another encouraging aspect of the project's efforts with the legislature. JABAT is an acronym for Jangkau and Libatkan – reach out and engage – and is designed to improve the way MPs interact and engage with the constituents in their electoral districts. JABAT is a pilot initiative that provides strategies, consultations, data, and district-level constituency outreach to selected MPs. Designed to roll out in three phases over four years, JABAT is slated to eventually engage 50 or more MPs (roughly 10% of the DPR). The evaluation team found that the number of constituency meetings per MP visit ranged from one to six meetings and the number of constituents met ranged from 39 to 523 persons, representing different backgrounds and groups including farmers, fishers, students, women's groups, migrant workers, and journalists (ProRep target groups) as well as volunteer family planning groups, midwives associations, and Islamic community groups. Issues covered included: maternal health, HIV and AIDS, seaside erosion, salt production, public participation in policy making, anti-corruption, and income-related issues. A summary of the activities during the constituency visits is in Annex IX. These interactions also opened up access for constituents to contact the MPs. The MPs interviewed by the evaluation team intend to run again and suggested that improved constituency relationships gained from program participation would help them to potentially be reelected in the upcoming election.

Conclusions

While the legislature-wide impacts are modest to date, ProRep's work with the DPR has been encouraging and positively received by those counterparts directly involved. ProRep directly engages a relatively modest number of MPs compared to the whole body of the Parliament (560 Members) and, as previously noted, ProRep has not benefited from the support of the Speaker during its first two years. However, with a new Parliament in 2014, the DPR leadership structure, at the top level and at the committee level, is likely to undergo changes. It is not possible for the evaluation team to predict the rate at which incumbent MPs will be returning to the new Parliament. We do note, however, that re-elected ProRep-affiliated MPs may be assigned to new committees or ascend to leadership posts, providing ProRep with an entry point that it did not have at its start. Moreover, the signing of a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Secretary General of the Parliament provides a solid base that may further strengthen institutional partnerships and open up work with other committees of Parliament.

Evaluation Question 2: How well did the activities of each of ProRep's three program objectives contribute, in a coordinated way, to achieving program objectives?

Findings

ProRep was designed with an optimistic view that the commitment for reform "... on the part of DPR members and leadership and in the DPR Secretariat" would continue and that foreign-funded training and TA would continue to be welcomed. The evaluation team interviewed three of the six currently participating MPs and one "prospective" member. The participating MPs highly regarded their involvement in the program. These individuals stated that although meeting constituents was not new to them, the MPs experienced well-structured and facilitated visits and events for the first time through ProRep. The program

demonstrated value in terms of preparing MPs for their outreach events and also facilitating their interactions with various segments of their constituents in different ways. The JABAT participation permitted MPs to meet and interact with citizen groups that are usually not on their schedules. In addition, these interactions were held at venues that were more conducive to exchanges, including: community meetings, seminars, radio and TV talk-shows, where they discussed bills being deliberated in the DPR or the delivery of public services to their locale. JABAT MPs also met with journalists from their districts and with local government officials. These activities were well planned with the MPs receiving considerable briefings in advance by ProRep. Kemitraan staff augmented respective MPs' staff in preparing for events in the field.

Conclusions

The DPR is supported by two kinds of staff: first, the civil service staff under the Secretary General's Office and, second, the expert (temporary) staff serving members, Committees, Fractions (parties in the DPR), and complementary bodies of the DPR, such as BALEG, BAKN, etc. Strengthening the capacity of the Secretary General's Office of the DPR and the expert staff, especially in committees and the complementary bodies, ultimately strengthens Parliament because they are the institutional memory of the body. Therefore, the recently expressed interest on the part of the Secretariat in MOU with ProRep is an important milestone.

Evaluation Question 3: What factors, including external factors, are contributing to or inhibiting the achievement of program objectives?

Findings

In 2011, the DPR terminated its relationship with a UNDP legislative strengthening program. Reports at that time attributed the dismissal as a result of media coverage criticizing the DPR leadership and the Secretariat General – including commentaries by politicians/parliamentarians – for allowing foreign interferences in parliamentary processes. Given these circumstances and DPR's sensitivity, ProRep's introduction to the Parliament took longer than anticipated and had to be discreetly managed as they sought commitments and partnerships within the institution at the outset.

The upcoming election and sitting of the new Parliament (particularly the committee chairs) will determine whether BAKN remains a standing committee. However, without pro-reform MPs remaining in office and the passage of recommended MD3 amendments before the conclusion of this Parliament, ProRep may find itself in the same place it was when it began in 2011. There is no indication that the role of political parties in the DPR will significantly diminish; therefore, political parties will play a decisive role directly or indirectly in ProRep's future programming. Likewise, JABAT holds great promise for ProRep to improve channels for MPs to reach out to their constituents by creating venues, forums, and opportunities for more meaningful engagement of MPs with their constituencies, both directly and through representative groups. While the program has been well-received by its participants, its ultimate impact on the institution will likely be determined by the acceptance of leadership in the political parties who make decisions regarding candidate selection, committee assignments, legislative priorities, and even how "consensus" is reached on individual policies before the DPR determines its relevance. Since members represent individual parties,

perhaps some of the efforts with JABAT should also include efforts to increase members' engagement with their own party regarding representation.

Each component has its own unique set of issues that do not easily lend themselves to quick solutions. For example, consensus guides the standing rules in Parliament. Voting and therefore MP accountability (and conversely recognition) are secondary in the course of legislative business. Consensus is arrived at through multiple levels of negotiations among political parties, party whips/*fraksi*, and committee chairs, leaving considerably less space for a transparent deliberative process where non-governmental actors may engage. Beyond historical or cultural bias, expanding representation within CSOs has economic, legal, and operational costs that must be borne by the organization; those costs are different for CSOs that may have dues-paying members in contrast to those that do not. International donors, by and large, have not prepared for the often significant funds necessary to successfully maintain a membership function with the CSO organization (AusAid's ongoing Knowledge Sector project is an exception). Finally, traditional funding sources for public policy research, such as government research grants, contracts, or private funding from foundations or private sector investment, are not robust in Indonesia.

With regard to the national legislature, the lack or absence of buy-in from the Speaker is a significant factor that explains why ProRep has not been able to work more broadly and openly with the institution as a whole. Other areas of difficulty within the legislature include the Badan Urusan Rumah Tangga (BURT), the DPR's domestic or household committee that the Speaker chairs are both key to coordinating broad reforms within the House. Ultimately, the prospects of broad, significant policy reforms within the DPR lie with these more powerful committees.

Conclusions

Despite reluctance on the part of leadership within Parliament to fully engage with the project, ProRep adapted its planned activities and realigned resources to the situation and demonstrated significant progress by achieving annual project targets. For example, after not garnering the support of the Speaker of the DPR (threatening to deny access to the body), ProRep worked to gain the trust of the four Deputy Speakers, chairs of two critical committees within Parliament, the Secretary General of the DPR, and the leaders of the BAKN, thus allowing its program and partners to work in and through the national legislature.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THE STRATEGIC ACTIVITIES FUND (SAF)

Findings

The "Strategic Activities Fund" (SAF) provides timely assistance for special initiatives not encompassed in other program activities. Its purpose is to take advantage of "windows of opportunity" to advance democratic governance. Activities from the fund have been used to support international visits, peer-to-peer actions, special survey research, pilot initiatives, and other special time-sensitive events that are determined to be critical for ProRep's success. In some instances, the SAF supported previously approved activities of Components 1, 2, or 3 when funding for that activity was not available in the component's budget. Use of the SAF has also been in direct response to requests from USAID, such as the US presidential

campaign observation visit managed by the American Council of Young Political Leaders (ACYPL) and support to the Myanmar Caucus of the DPR. In all cases, USAID is in agreement with funding the activity through SAF before proceeding.

As a principal focus of ProRep's work with the Parliament, SAF has seized opportunities to support rapid response for TA to BAKN and BALEG of the DPR for issues roundtables, oversight workshops, and expert consultations. Beyond TA, SAF provided funds for DPR visits to the US and for BAKN visits to the UK and Netherlands, as well as peer-to-peer consultations between American and Indonesian legislators and congressional aides.

The SAF currently underwrites the JABAT program and provided critical early resources to support that program's initial survey on the attitudes of constituents from the nine electoral districts of the DPR members who participated in the first round of JABAT activities. The survey provided insight into constituents' perspectives on the effectiveness of past and present constituent relations programs implemented by their respective DPR Members. A second SAF survey focused on constituent relations, services, and activities provided by the nine DPR Members participating in the JABAT initiative. Research conducted by Indonesian opinion research firms provided new and valuable data that helped guide ProRep Component 3 activities and provided valuable insights about home districts to participating MPs.

Conclusions

The fund has proven to be a timely and flexible vehicle for advancing program imperatives and responding to political opportunities to advance relations with the DPR. The fund's responsiveness contrasts with the longer lead times required by the other three components of ProRep.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR PROJECT IMPACTS (QUESTION 4)

Evaluation Question 4: What have been the project impacts (at least qualitatively)?

Findings

The training courses provided by ProRep have helped develop competence within CSOs to compile data and evidence, direct this information to MPs or to expert staff of the DPR, develop material for advocacy, participate in hearings, and communicate directly with MPs and the Executive. MPs have expressed the importance of constituency outreach, interaction, and understanding in possible re-election and see the value in ProRep's initiatives to this effect.

Officials and staff at the Secretariat General's Office of DPR highlighted their appreciation of ProRep's engagement, stating to the team that they wish to execute a formal MOU to continue building their partnership. The Secretary General stated that the MOU will promote more planning of program activities, is not based on the current "door-to-door" approach, and will ensure transparency of cooperation. Research organizations provided policy briefing or research studies to 75 Members of the DPR (15% of the body)¹⁶ and now more routinely

¹⁶ Reported to the evaluation team by grantees.

participate in public seminars, radio and online interviews, peer reviews, commission hearings, etc.

Interviews with staff from the Secretariat General Offices of DPR and DPD indicated significant regard for the legal drafting and budget analysis supported by ProRep. They indicated that the six trainings provided were responsive to their identified needs. The respondents indicated that the trainings were particularly useful as they were designed to be directly applicable to legal drafting assignments that were currently on their agenda. The Deputy Secretary General of DPR stated that the knowledge and skills gained from the budget impact analysis exercise will be applied immediately to two draft bills the Secretariat General identified as having significant fiscal implications. During the evaluation team's interview with the Secretary General of DPD, she suggested that legal drafting skills may be needed by the DPD in anticipation of the constitutional court ruling for DPD to gain the authority to propose legislation and submit draft bills that are of the interest to the regions. Under its existing legislation, the DPD has limited legislative authority, but that is evolving.

BAKN was created with the 2009 DPR reforms and is still establishing itself as a committee in the Parliament. With assistance from ProRep, BAKN's task of working with other committees, most notably BALEG, to establish itself has more credibility. This is reflected in the endorsement by eight of nine political parties in the DPR of BAKN's proposed amendments to MD3 legislation, which affect its longer term viability. With ProRep's support BAKN has:

- Produced and disseminated its first series of annual reports;
- Improved its oversight capacity of government expenditures;
- Expanded its budget oversight of eight provincial-level parliaments (DPRD) and four district-level parliaments;
- Met with Public Accounts Committees from the UK and the Netherlands;
- Drafted revision of the MD3 Law; and,
- Verified the audit findings by BPK (Supreme Audit Agency of the Government of Indonesia) related to five state-owned enterprises: PT PAL, PT Pelindo II (East Java); Bank Sumselbabel, PTBA, PDAM Palembang (South Sumatera).

Regarding the potential impact of JABAT, the evaluation team found that ProRep received enthusiastic support from interviewed MPs. The team saw that the first group of MPs participating in JABAT were instrumental in the recruitment of the second cohort of JABAT MPs. Together, 18 MPs will have participated in ProRep outreach activities before the 2014 elections. Though the number is modest, moving forward, the evaluation team encourages ProRep to assess the election outcomes in districts of JABAT participants by comparing success of MPs in the JABAT program with success of MPs not in the JABAT program to gauge whether the JABAT-supported MPs' outreach activities affected constituent perception of their effectiveness. A measurement of the impact ProRep engagement may have on future relations with the Parliament as a whole is somewhat more difficult to project.

Conclusions

According to those interviewed, ProRep activities reflect stakeholders' perceived needs and the delivery of those activities is on their own terms. Stakeholders recognize the value of ProRep activities and trainings and have been useful to training participants. The evaluation team believes ProRep's work is likely to have impact at the national level if more MPs believe that their own fates are tied to better relations with their constituencies at the local level.

ProRep's working relationship is with leadership just below the Speaker, committee chairs of two committees, and the Secretariat General and civil service staff. While the two committees with which ProRep primarily works provide excellent opportunities for engagement on some institutional reform and budget issues, neither committee controls the appropriation or authorization of social or economic policy. Therefore, the impact of ProRep's efforts through the work with CSOs and think tanks is not likely to have the immediate impact working with other committees might have. The two committees that ProRep works with are engaged with audit functions and rules for the institution itself.

The evaluation also found various examples of the timely/tactical use of the SAF. The Fund has been used to enhance ProRep relations with key MPs by providing funds, in a timely manner, to support of the institution's interest in playing a broader global and regional leadership role. Examples of such activities include: Indonesia Myanmar Caucus's peer-to-peer exchanges with Members of the Parliament of Myanmar, facilitating peer-to-peer exchanges between Members of Indonesia's Parliament with counterparts and staff from the United States, and hosting a delegation of Indonesian leaders to observe the 2012 US election. Further, if a correlation can be found between ProRep-affiliated MPs and their successful re-election in 2014 (particularly those MPs participating in the JABAT initiative), one can infer that those MPs would be more likely to take advantage of future ProRep programming. As Indonesia positions itself to play an ever increasing regional and global role, ProRep's SAF has assisted the Parliament to engage while quietly forging important relationships with the body complimenting other components of the project.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO LOCAL PARTNERS (QUESTION 5)

Evaluation Question 5: To what extent has ProRep's work with local partners strengthened local capacity to represent membership and constituent's interest, develop, and disseminate evidenced-based public policy research and engage in the legislative process?

Findings

TRAIPISE, a ProRep partner and a local service provider (SP), led the constituency building training. This training emphasized the need for CSOs to understand what "constituency" means and the importance of having a mandate from the people they claim to be representing. For many sub-grantees, it represented a radical revision to their operating model.

In surveys designed to measure participant satisfaction of trainings, workshops, and other TA provided by ProRep, participants gave high marks for the quality of information presented, new research methodologies introduced, and for the rigor with which ProRep engaged participants at every step of the way. Moreover, interviews revealed that several researchers and heads of research organizations complimented ProRep for helping to raise standards for internal management, improving their collaboration with peers, and facilitating new opportunities with MPs and civil society. Indeed, one senior manager at LPEM stated that ProRep "has increased project management, financial management, and the substantive research we do, improving skills up and down our institution." Another ProRep grantee remarked that, through their ProRep-funded research, they gained useful insights on: (a) the

institutional challenges lawmakers encountered with providing “administrative oversight” of laws and (b) how cumbersome the legislative process is even for the most dedicated of public servants.

As noted earlier, ProRep does not enjoy the support of the Speaker of the House, despite efforts by ProRep and USAID to work out differences. Nonetheless, the evaluation team found that ProRep had successfully developed working partnerships with several committees within the DPR, the Office of the Secretary General of the DPR and DPD, professional staff connected to the DPR, and with a small but growing number of individual MPs. The evaluation team met representatives from each of these offices and received positive feedback about ProRep’s contribution to their work. The team also found that ProRep’s low-profile and careful communications (primarily through former members) with the important DPR leaders was instrumental to their ability to work in the institution. During the evaluation team’s interviews, the lead BAKN expert staff member stated that had ProRep pushed its own agenda, BAKN would have rejected it. Rather, ProRep’s process of selecting TA consultants and training facilitators was completed in consultation with DPR-related personnel, signaling the importance of partnership.

Conclusions

ProRep’s analysis of the needs of the CSOs and the specific training required to improve the institution’s representational capacity is accurate and insightful. ProRep’s work has strengthened local partners and many beneficiaries value the added knowledge gained from ProRep trainings and TA.

ProRep’s strategy with Parliament, despite lack of support from the Speaker of the House, has been successful in allowing them to build partnerships with the local government. Furthermore, ProRep has pursued an effective partnership strategy that allows stakeholder involvement and buy-in. However, given the anticipated increased political hypersensitivity leading up to the 2014 elections by political parties, candidates, media, and the Parliament itself, ProRep should remain low key, non-partisan, and focused on concluding legislative action in the current Parliament and the administrative reforms underway. This may include:

On BAKN:

- Continue to support BAKN and BALEG with the revisions of MD3 Law;
- Support BAKN participation in the BPK Peer Review in 2014; and
- Support BAKN with the documentation and further development or refinement of systems and procedures, taking advantage of lessons gained during the work performed during this Parliament period. This could include a workshop involving staff of other committees (Komisi) and provision of TA. The next Parliament would benefit from this.

On JABAT:

- Commission a rigorous and comprehensive study to learn and document lessons to inform strategies for adoption and replication in the next DPR.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS RELATED TO GENDER (QUESTION 6)

Evaluation Question 6: How well have gender issues been addressed by ProRep?

Findings

Out of the 14 grantees of ProRep, 5¹⁷ can be classified as women's CSOs or CSOs dealing with women's issues. Three can be classified as CSOs dealing with issues important to gender (*Circle Indonesia* for organic agriculture, *Pergerakan* for fisherfolk, and *YSKK* for school operations budget).

The evaluation found that 3 of the 12 research grant topics were on gender-specific issues, i.e., the needs and interests of women and disadvantaged groups who are affected by mining and the management of natural resources, an analysis of the quota system for increasing the number of women in the DPR, and research on the role of female MPs and the Gender Equity Bill before the Parliament. Additionally, Policy Fellow training included a session on "An Introduction to Feminist Research Methods" which was presented by a senior researcher of the World Resources Institute (WRI). A session on "Gender Perspectives and Indicators in Drafting Laws and Regulations" was included in the Legislative Drafting Training (July and September 2012) for BALEG expert staff, DPR Secretariat legislative drafters, and DPR Commissions expert staff. More than half of participants in the trainings, workshops, and mentoring opportunities provided by ProRep are women.

Conclusions

Support to ProRep CSOs is designed to encourage greater representation of the constituency and pays particular attention to women and disadvantaged groups, e.g., fishermen, farmers, poor women, etc., primarily to the national legislature (DPR). ProRep has demonstrated responsiveness to gender issues by ensuring that women are represented not only as constituents, but also as direct beneficiaries in trainings, workshops, and mentoring.

¹⁷ *Aisyiyah* and *PRAKARSA* for maternity insurance (*Jampersal*), *ASPPUK* for Small and Micro Business Development for Poor Women, *HAPSARI* and *Muslimat*

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. Fund the membership function for CSOs in Component 1:** At this point, ProRep grants account for a small fraction of this core operational cost for CSOs. The membership function of any organization involves a significant operational and management cost, and ProRep should consider shifting emphasis from the number of CSOs it engages over the life of the project to the sustainability of those CSOs ProRep is already working with, particularly those who have better incorporated representation into their operational mode. By encouraging and supporting efforts for long-term sustainability and providing strategic financial support to high performing project partners, ProRep can enable these organizations to undertake the difficult task of strategically mapping a more independent future. ProRep should help them develop a more secure core membership base capable of sustaining the organization and incorporate this function into their overall operating budget. To accomplish this, ProRep will need to award additional resources to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy for membership management, new personnel systems, bylaws, and, most importantly, strategies for attracting new funding streams beyond project-specific opportunities. With regard to critical mass, the evaluators were told that the target of 16 to 20 CSOs was based on early projections of what the budget was able to support. Additionally, ProRep found that fewer CSOs than anticipated met ProRep criteria as national membership organizations. Thus, more resources were required to build awareness of the importance of membership and management responsibility related to the representation function within such organizations than anticipated. Providing further support to the membership function of current ProRep CSOs will require more resources to the grantees than originally envisioned and expansion of CSO networks to include like-minded organizations (including other USAID/Indonesia CSO partners). Within present resource and time constraints, providing more intensive support to a smaller number of CSOs would prove more effective than extending thinner support to a larger number of CSOs.
- 2. Evaluate application of skills enhanced through ProRep assistance:** ProRep provided considerable TA to their 14 CSO grantees in the development of their proposals, the implementation of their respective projects, and facilitation of opportunities for engagement with think tanks and MPs. ProRep also offered training on how to deepen CSOs' utilization of their membership as a vehicle for knowledge building and a source of institutional legitimacy to the Parliament. As part of its third year activities, we encourage ProRep to investigate the depth of the skills strengthened and how much their use has been incorporated at this juncture. At present, ProRep does not have a performance measure that gauges the way CSOs "use" representation in the development of their policies.
- 3. Expand Partners and Networks:** Many ProRep CSOs represent constituencies that are not typically well-represented in Parliament. One important advocacy service that ProRep CSOs may perform for those constituents is to increase their support among other organizations that may have direct or indirect interest in their issues. Forming partnerships with different organizations/constituencies whose interests, even if they are different, may be more compelling to the DPR as a whole. Such partnerships could serve to re-enforce a CSO's status as a national organization with broad support across

geographic and demographic populations. For example, there may be points in common that the Indonesian Bar Association would share with maternal health issues, or national media outlets may have an interest in “access to information” issues. Linking ProRep grantees to other organizations could serve to not only to expand their networks but also their own membership base.

4. **Support research of topics salient to a targeted audience for increased use of research:** ProRep selection criteria for research grants included sectors and topics that were relevant to other parts of the ProRep activities, i.e., access to information, gender, budget, etc. The evaluation team recommends that ProRep undertake its own research to determine which policy issues are the most salient for the largest number of Indonesians. It is likely that economic issues will register higher. If so, ProRep may respond by including economic impact to the social agenda that it has already undertaken. Linking ProRep research to issues with economic impact may provide entry to larger budget allocation issues which has the potential for more direct impact given that the national budget is the most basic and perhaps the only legislative action that is assured to take place each year.
5. **Increase awareness of the relevance of ProRep values and approaches to a broader array of organizations:** The role of national political parties in legislative affairs is ubiquitous. It is difficult to envision ProRep succeeding without at least tacit agreement from the political parties. ProRep has succeeded in part by keeping a low profile and working with pro-reform minded MPs and civil servants. Nonetheless, ProRep has assets that are also of interest to political parties. Research products, policy papers, and national constituents have long been allies of political parties worldwide. With the 2014 elections ahead, ProRep’s JABAT program will go into hiatus; however, this does not mean that ProRep-supported research and policy papers, editorials, and issue forums supported by CSO networks could not contribute in a positive way to advancing important public policy and building credibility for independent non-partisan voices to engage. USAID works with many other Indonesian organizations involved in consolidating democracy or who have sector-specific interest that may at some point be a matter before the Parliament. ProRep should look for opportunities to encourage core ProRep values and approaches to be shared with other organizations. Political parties play a central, even leading, role in virtually all aspects of political life in Indonesia. New electoral rules for the 2014 election cycle may serve to lower the number of political parties in Parliament by raising the threshold for inclusion on ballots and increasing the requirement such that political parties must exist in all provinces (compared to 2/3 in the 2009 election); within provinces, have a formal presence in 75% of districts (compared to 2/3 in 2009); and within districts, must be present in 50% of sub-districts (not required in 2009). The number of political parties participating in the 2014 elections will likely be smaller than the 44 that stood for election in 2009. Nonetheless, we were advised by several political experts that party leadership (both inside and outside the Parliament) will continue to be a driving force in setting the legislative agenda. Given the role parties play in the legislative process, we recommend increasing its party work focus on party activities in Parliament and further exploration of how political parties may utilize ProRep supported research, forums, and affiliations with CSOs to inform their processes.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK

Indonesia Program Representasi Scope of Work Mid-Term Evaluation

I. Summary

The ProRep Project requires the services of a team of three (3) consultants to: 1) conduct a mid-term evaluation of the Program Representasi (ProRep) Project and 2) make recommendations concerning the final year of the base project period and concerning the two optional years of the Project.

II. Project Overview

The primary objective of ProRep is to increase the effectiveness of representative groups and institutions in Indonesia and, in doing so, bolster both democracy and good governance in the country. The ProRep project seeks to strengthen representation in three important areas:

- First, it will build the capacity of member-and-constituency based civil society organizations (CSOs) so that they can better represent the interests of their members and constituents at the national and/or local level;
- Second, it will support independent analysis and public consideration of legislation and policies having a major impact on democratic governance and policy; and
- Third, it will work with Indonesia's key representative bodies – primarily the House of Representatives (*Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat*, or DPR) but possibly also the Regional Representative Council (*Dewan Perwakilan Daerah*, or DPD) – to help them become more effective, responsive, and transparent.

The principal anticipated project results are: 1) membership-based CSOs will be better able to represent the interests of their members; 2) Indonesian universities, think tanks, and CSOs will be better able to produce and disseminate policy-relevant research and analysis; and 3) the legislative process in the DPR will be more effective, responsive, and transparent. The project also provides USAID with a mechanism to allow it to respond rapidly and flexibly to unanticipated needs and opportunities that USAID believes are important to protecting or advancing democratic governance in Indonesia. These results will contribute to the achievement of IR 2 of USAID's 2009–2014 Democratic Governance (DG) strategy, which supports efforts at both the national and regional levels to make governance more representative, effective, and responsive to citizen needs.

III. Context and Objectives

Program Representasi will be completing its second year in April 2013, and the ProRep Contract requires that Chemonics conduct an independent performance evaluation:

F.7.9. Mid-Term Evaluation

The Contractor will conduct an independent mid-term evaluation of the project 24 months after contract award and prior to development of the Year 3 Workplan. The focus of the evaluation will include identifying which elements of the project are having impacts, which are not, and which aspects of project design need to be adjusted. The evaluation team is to be comprised of technical experts/evaluators who are independent of the Contractor and the Contractor's staff. USAID staff may also participate.

In compliance with Contract requirements, ProRep, in agreement with USAID and through subcontractor Social Impact, will conduct an independent mid-term evaluation of the ProRep Project. The objective of the evaluation, as stated in the Contract, will include identifying which elements of the project are having impacts, which are not, and which aspects of the project might need to be adjusted. The three person team (two expatriates and one Indonesian) will, among them, have sufficient expertise in ProRep's three main component areas (i.e., CSOs, research organizations/think tanks, parliament) to be able to assess program impacts and make recommendations regarding future program directions and adjustments.

The midterm evaluation will cover the areas listed below:

1. Review, analyze, and evaluate the effectiveness and relevance of the ProRep project at the 2-year mark. This should include analysis of project impact to date, at least qualitatively.
2. Identify the factors which are, or are not, contributing to the achievement of the project's objectives.
3. Detail lessons learned/best practices and describe their relevance to future project activities.
4. Determine if the current activities planned in each of ProRep's component areas are likely to achieve project objectives, expected results and Performance Management Plan (PMP) indicators within the life of the project (LOP), and if project activities and PMP indicators need to be adjusted to respond to available budget and USAID/Indonesia priorities.
5. Assess the project work implemented through local and international implementation partners (grantees and subcontractors) and in response to USAID priorities to strengthen local partners.
6. Make recommendations for the remaining year of the base period of the project and for the 2-year option period.

IV. Evaluation Questions

This Scope of Work (SOW) is for a mid-term evaluation of ProRep's performance from program initiation to date. The evaluation should review, analyze, and evaluate ProRep along the following criteria, and, where applicable, identify opportunities and recommendations for improvement. In answering these questions, the Evaluation Team should assess the performance of both USAID and its implementing partner(s).

A. Results

1. To what extent has ProRep, including work through all of its partners, been successful in achieving the program objectives?
2. How well did the activities of each of ProRep's three components contribute, in a coordinated way, to achieving program objectives?
3. What factors, including external factors, are contributing to (or inhibiting) significantly the achievement of program objectives?
4. What have been the project impacts (at least qualitatively)?

B. Working with partners

5. To what extent has ProRep's work with local partners strengthened local capacity?

C. Cross Cutting Issues

6. How well have gender issues addressed by ProRep?

For each question, the evaluation team shall present findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Recommendations should be actionable and specific and should focus on the following:

- Identifying best practices which should be continued or scaled up
- Suggesting adjustments to project activities, or new approaches, to maximize achievement of desired outcomes

V. Draft Methodology

The detailed methodology of this mid-term evaluation will be designed by the evaluation team in the work plan. Some illustrative methods (to be finalized by the evaluation team in coordination with the Mission), include:

- Conduct background reading and preparation prior to beginning work in Indonesia. ProRep will provide the team with electronic copies of all relevant project documents, including the contract, PMP, assessments, quarterly and annual reports, work plans, newsletters, etc.
- In-briefing with USAID/Indonesia detailing USAID's objectives and specific issues the team should address soon after the team arrives in Jakarta.
- Key informant interviews with USAID, ProRep staff, project counterparts (i.e., CSOs, research organizations, DPR Members and staff), and others to gather information on ProRep, its development, and its impacts.
- Focus groups or joint discussions with CSOs, journalists, public intellectuals, etc., informed of ProRep's program.

Data collection, including key informant interviews and focus group discussions, are expected to take place in Jakarta, Yogyakarta, and Palembang. The team is expected to spend approximately 2 days in Yogyakarta to meet with project partners and beneficiaries. The local evaluation team member is expected to spend approximately 2 days in Palembang to observe activities with Component 3. The remainder of time is expected to be spent in Jakarta.

To minimize potential bias in data collection, the evaluation team will select all respondents with the objective of ensuring that samples of interview sources are sufficient in number, scope, and diversity to qualitatively support evaluation findings. ProRep will provide the evaluation team with a list of recommended sources along with their level and nature of

interaction with the project. ProRep will also be available to support the team in arranging for interviews of selected sources.

Prior to travel, the evaluation team will review the proposed methodology and alternative methods in light of the evaluation questions, timeframe, budget, data collection requirements, quality of existing data sources, and potential biases. The team will build on the proposed methodology and provide more specific details on the evaluation methodology in the evaluation work plan (see Deliverables below). They will incorporate draft data collection guides into the work plan. Interview tools or checklists of about 10-12 items will be prepared for each type of interview or discussion. The tools will be shared with USAID at the in-briefing and as part of the evaluation report.

The evaluation team will complete a brief, preliminary report and present it to USAID prior to departing from Indonesia. The team members will then collaborate in drafting a more detailed report to USAID over the three weeks following their departing Indonesia.

VI. Deliverables

1. A work plan for the evaluation including design and time frame (**March 8**)
2. Presentation of findings to USAID/Indonesia (**March 22**)
3. A draft report on the evaluation, as described below (Date TBD)
4. Final Report (**within 7 business days of feedback from USAID on draft report, which is expected within 5 business days of receipt of the draft report**)

The final (and draft) report should meet the following criteria to ensure the quality of the report:

- The mid-term evaluation report should represent a thoughtful, well researched, and well organized effort to objectively evaluate what has worked in the project, what did not, and why.
- Evaluation reports shall address all evaluation questions included in the SOW.
- The evaluation report should include the SOW as an annex. All modifications to the SOW, whether in technical requirements, evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, methodology, or timeline need to be agreed upon in writing by the technical officer.
- Evaluation methodology shall be explained in detail and all tools used in conducting the evaluation such as questionnaires, checklists, and discussion guides will be included in an Annex in the final report.
- Evaluation findings will assess outcomes and impact on males and females.
- Limitations to the evaluation shall be disclosed in the report, with particular attention to the limitations associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, etc.).
- Evaluation findings should be presented as analyzed facts, evidence, and data, and not based on anecdotes, hearsay, or the compilation of people's opinions. Findings should be specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative or qualitative evidence.
- Sources of information need to be properly identified and listed in an annex.
- Recommendations need to be supported by a specific set of findings.

- Recommendations should be action-oriented, practical, and specific, with defined responsibility for the action.

The format of the final evaluation report should strike a balance between depth and length. The report will include a table of contents, table of figures (as appropriate), acronyms, executive summary, introduction, purpose of the evaluation, research design and methodology, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations. The report should include, in the annex, any substantially dissenting views by any team member or by USAID on any of the findings or recommendations. The report should not exceed 30 pages, excluding annexes. The report will be submitted electronically in English. The report will be disseminated within USAID. A second version of this report excluding any potentially procurement-sensitive information will be submitted (also electronically, in English) by Social Impact to USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) for dissemination among implementing partners and stakeholders.

VII. Team Composition

- Team Leader – a senior level specialist with experience designing and evaluating similar D&G programs, a proven track record supervising teams in the field and producing reports, and technical knowledge and expertise in at least one of ProRep's three main component areas (i.e., CSOs, think tanks/research organizations, and parliaments)

The team leader will:

- Finalize and negotiate with USAID/Indonesia the evaluation work plan;
 - Establish evaluation team roles, responsibilities and tasks;
 - Facilitate all necessary meetings;
 - Ensure that logistical arrangements in the field are complete;
 - Coordinate schedules to ensure timely production of deliverables;
 - Coordinate the process of assembling individual input/findings for the evaluation report and finalizing the evaluation report; and
 - Lead the oral and written preparation and presentation of key evaluation findings and recommendations to USAID/Indonesia.
- Team Member 2 – a senior-level expatriate with expertise in one or more of ProRep's three main component areas.
 - Team Member 3 – a senior-level Indonesian with expertise in one of more of ProRep's three main component areas.

Two of the three team members will have substantial expertise in Indonesia and D&G programs in Indonesia, and have good-to-excellent Indonesian language skills.

VIII. Logistical Support

The Evaluation Team is responsible for arranging all logistical support for this exercise. SI staff, in Jakarta and DC, will be available to support the team in all logistical matters, including arranging transportation and lodging. The ProRep Project and USAID will be available to provide logistical support, as needed, including scheduling requested interviews. The ProRep chief or party (COP) and staff will make themselves available to the team to answer questions and provide other support to the team, as needed. In addition, the ProRep

office will make working spaces, phones, and Internet access available to the team members, should they wish to use them.

IX. Oversight and Management

The Team Leader will liaise closely with USAID, which will be requested to provide input and feedback at periodic intervals during the evaluation process. All deliverables will be submitted by the evaluation team to Social Impact for final quality assurance review, formatting, and editing prior to submission to USAID. To ensure independence of the evaluation team, all recommended changes during the quality assurance review must be approved by the evaluation Team Leader. In the event of disagreement, the Team Leader will submit as an annex to the report any differences of opinion.

ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

Social Impact (SI) conducted a comprehensive mid-term evaluation of USAID/Indonesia's Program Representasi (ProRep) program implemented by Chemonics--Contract No. AID-497-C-11-00002. The evaluation provides a detailed examination of the extent to which Chemonics is achieving ProRep objectives to: (1) build capacity of selected Indonesian civil society organizations (CSOs) to better represent the interests of their members and constituents at the national and/or local level; (2) support independent analysis and public consideration of legislation and policies that have a major impact on democratic governance; and (3) work with Indonesia's key representative bodies --the House of Representatives (Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, (DPR) and the Regional Representative Council (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah, or DPD) -- to become more effective, responsive, and transparent. The three person evaluation team consisting of: Mr. Patrick Fn'Piere (Team Lead), Mr. Richard Holloway, and Mr. Irfani Darma:

- Reviewed, analyzed, and evaluated the effectiveness and relevance of the ProRep project at the 2-year mark. This included analysis of project impact to date, at least qualitatively.
- Identified the factors which are, or are not, contributing to the achievement of the project's objectives.
- Detailed lessons learned/best practices and described their relevance to future project activities. to ascertain if the current activities planned in each of ProRep's component areas are on track to achieve project objectives, expected results and PMP indicators within the life of the project (LOP), and if project activities and PMP indicators need to be adjusted to respond to available budget and USAID/Indonesia priorities.
- Further, the evaluation team assessed the project work implemented through local and international implementation partners (grantees and subcontractors) and if project activities were in response to USAID priorities to strengthen local partners.
- Finally the team made recommendations for the remaining year of the base period of the project, and for the 2-year option period.

The evaluation addressed the major questions raised in the scope of work as well as other questions that arose during the course of the evaluation not anticipated in the SOW but deemed consequential. The evaluation team's approach included: in-depth interviews with targeted stakeholders, review of relevant project documents, and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data to the extent that they were available and useful. Due to the absence of control group data the evaluation team did not have the capacity to rigorously analyze causality behind impacts but endeavored to aggregate readily available hard data provided by Chemonics to appraise project performance, provided available narrative to characterize potential or actual impact, and recommendations for future programming.

The evaluation was divided into three phases: (1) initial document review, (2) in-depth field interviews and data collection, and (3) analysis and development of recommendations.

Phase 1: Preparation and Initial Document Review

The first phase of the evaluation involved a desk review of key documents. This initial review helped the team gather comparative data and gain a practical understanding of the program

goals, implementation plans, performance monitoring efforts, and country context .During the document review, the team examined key ProRep materials: strategy and planning documents, work plans, progress reports, quarterly reports, annual reports, and performance monitoring plans. Additionally the team reviewed: ProRep’s SOW, first and second year Work Plan, first and second year Annual Reports, ProRep’s Component 1,2, and 3 assessments, ProRep Quarterly Reports, ProRep Monthly Newsletters, and ProRep’s PMP.

Phase 2: Fieldwork

The evaluation team met with representatives of USAID/Indonesia’s DG office and ProRep staff to define and clarify the approach, timelines, and evaluation activities to develop a more nuanced and detailed understanding of USAID’s goals for the mid-term evaluation.

While in country, the team collected and reviewed quantitative and qualitative data regarding implementer performance and beneficiary impact. The team analyzed ProRep’s program performance monitoring reports and compared them with available data related to project performance and outcomes. The team payed attention to gender, age, ethnicity, and program phase to the greatest extent possible.

In consultation with USAID and ProRep staff, the evaluation team selected interviewees who could provide substantive feedback on the program and its impact. Key informants include but were not limited to: ProRep staff, Members of Indonesian’s Parliament, ProRep program beneficiaries and grantees, U.S. Embassy staff, other donor representatives, civil society leaders, government officials, representatives from academia, journalism, and other domestic and international nongovernmental organizations.

The evaluation team used this qualitative yet structured approach to understand whether and how the project is contributing to the achievement of IR 2 of USAID/Indonesia’s 2009 – 2014 Democratic Governance (DG) strategy, which supports efforts at both the national and regional levels to make governance more representative, effective, and responsive to citizen needs.

Phase 3: Analysis and Development of Recommendations

During this phase, the evaluation team analyzed and reviewed the interview findings and data collected, reached consensus on key findings, develop strategic recommendations, and prepared a draft evaluation report. The evaluation team sought to ensure that findings, conclusions, and recommendations were based on accurate, objective, and reliable data that include the internal and external factors affecting the program’s ability to achieve its objectives. The team’s report presents results achieved to date, draws conclusions, and documents lessons learned. In instances where the evaluation team found the program lagging in meeting its objectives, the team proposed recommendations to assist Chemonics develop a set of short- and long-term course corrections to achieve overall program objectives.

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

Phase 1: Preparation and Initial Document Review

March 4 – March 12: Document review. Key documents that were reviewed included the following:

- ProRep Scope of Work (SOW), extracted from the contract

- ProRep Performance Management Plan (PMP)
- Year 1 & 2 ProRep Annual Work Plans: 2011/2012
- ProRep Annual Reports: 2011/2012
- ProRep Quarterly Reports
- ProRep Monthly Report: September 2012
- ProRep Monthly Report: October 2012
- ProRep Monthly Report: November 2012
- ProRep Monthly Report: December 2012
- ProRep Monthly Report: January 2013
- ProRep Newsletter: September 2012
- ProRep Newsletter: October 2012
- ProRep Newsletter: November 2012
- ProRep Newsletter: December 2012
- ProRep Newsletter: January 2013
- ProRep Component 1 Assessment: July 2011
- ProRep Component 2 Assessment: July 2011
- ProRep Component 3 Assessment: July 2011
- ProRep Gender Needs Assessment: July 2011

Phase 2: Fieldwork

March 11: In-brief with USAID

March 12 to March 20: In-depth interviews and data collection

March 22: Out-brief with USAID

April 26: Submit draft report to USAID/Indonesia

May: Submit final report (after receiving comments from USAID/Indonesia)

ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

The team asked a set of standard questions of all those interviewed along with varied questions targeted to those associated with the different components. Key informants included ProRep staff, members of Indonesia's Parliament, ProRep program beneficiaries and grantees, USAID, U.S. Embassy staff, other donor representatives, civil society leaders, government officials, and representatives from academia, journalism, and other domestic and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

INTERVIEW ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

GENERAL QUESTIONS

- What is the general consensus among CSOs on the functioning of the National Legislature? Have these views changed since the start of the ProRep program? What aspects of the program contributed to this shift?
- How do average citizens access decision making in the Parliament?
- Has gender been incorporated into each component-in management, activities/processes, and outcomes?
- Are there political, cultural, historical, or structural, barriers to women and other sub-groups participating in decision making?
- What other programs or donors are involved with helping citizens/CSOs gain access to decision making in the Parliament?
- Is there donor or project coordination with regard to CSO engagement on policy and political decision-making?
- What is the visibility and acceptance of the project?
- What have been the most difficult aspects of working with ProRep?
- What are your major accomplishments to date working with ProRep?
- How did you learn of ProRep?

CIVIL SOCIETY COMPONENT QUESTIONS

- Do CSOs engage the Parliament on behalf of their members/constituents?
- What types of CSOs are prevalent in engaging with the legislature?
- How has ProRep improved CSOs' advocacy capacity?
- Has the number and quality of CSOs' with the legislature changed since the start of ProRep?
- What, specifically, have been the results of training provided by ProRep?

- Has there been any resistance on the part of CSOs to conducting outreach to the legislature? What is the nature of this resistance? How did the program deal with it?
- Are Indonesian CSOs aware of their rights and responsibilities with respect to interacting with the Parliament?

RESEARCH COMPONENT QUESTIONS

- What kind of new data is being collected by ProRep supported organizations? Are Indonesian universities, think tanks and CSOs supported by ProRep better able to produce and disseminate policy-relevant research and analysis?
- What specific administrative/management improvements have been proposed for research oriented organizations during this project? Which of them have been approved in whole or in part? Which have been rejected?
- Have research or policy recommendations by ProRep supported organizations been implemented?
- Do MOP's seek guidance from research supported by ProRep?
- Have standing committees in Parliament sought support from ProRep research organizations?

PARLIAMENTARY SUPPORT COMPONENT QUESTIONS

- What activities have been undertaken to train legislative staff on reforming Parliament's interaction with constituents and CSOs?
- What percentage of MPs has participated in ProRep activities?
- What evidence exists to show that the training is being implemented on a regular, sustained basis? What has been the reaction by MPS and civil servant staff at Parliament to ProRep interventions? Are periodic performance evaluations made?
- What has been the response of the public to these outreach activities?
- Who have been the main beneficiaries of these activities?
- What outreach activities have the Parliament conducted?
 - o What topics have the outreach activities addressed?
 - o Are these the topics that needed addressed the most?
 - o How is this evident?
 - o Does any particular segment of the Indonesian public or CSO community supported by ProRep exhibit a greater awareness of the Parliament's outreach?
 - o What groups need more outreach?

TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

- What are ProRep's criteria for Effectiveness?
- Adequacy along input-process-output flow?

- Changes in institutional capacity in the advocating organizations?
- Quality and compactness of activities?
- Factors:
 - o Internal: institutional capacity and resources
 - o Project input: approaches/methodologies – positive advocacy?; method/technique; grant management; grant size
 - o External: institutional capacity and resources of target organizations; priorities; regulations; perception; internal processes
 - o Acceptance of ProRep and advocating organizations
 - o Local capacity building
 - o Internal organizational setting
 - o Dealing with USAID
 - o Relationship with sub-contractors

ANNEX IV: SOURCES CONSULTED

Government of Indonesia

Hon. Hetifah Sjaifudian, MPP, Member of Parliament

Hon. Malik Haramain, Member of Parliament

Hon. Sumarjati (Ms.), Director, BAKN, DPR

Hon. Yahya Sacawiria, Member of Parliament, Vice Chairman/BAKN, DPR

Hon. Nur Yasin, Member of Parliament P, BAKN Member,

Hon. Winantuningtyastiti (Ms.), Secretary General, DPR

Hon. Johnson Rajagukguk, Deputy of Legislation, Secretariat General DPR

Eddy Rasyidin Coordinator Expert staff of BAKN, DPR

Murdjito, Expert Staff of BAKN, DPR

Andrey, Expert Staff of BAKN, DPR

Setyo, Expert Staff of BAKN, DPR

Anis Mayangsari, DPD, Liaison with Donors (Jakarta)

USAID/Indonesia and US Embassy/Jakarta

Miles Toder, Director, Office of Democratic Governance, USAID

Zeric Smith, Office of Democratic Governance, USAID

Diman K. Simanjuntak, Project Development Specialist, Office of Democratic Governance, USAID, Jakarta

Maria Ining Nurani, Project Development Specialist, Office of Democratic Governance, USAID

Neil Helbraun, Second Secretary, Political Section, American Embassy, Jakarta

ProRep/Chemonics

John Johnson, Chief of Party

Farini Pane, Deputy Chief of Party

Yoenarsih Nazar, Civil Society Specialist

Agus Loekman, Public Policy Specialist

Noelle Veltze, Operations Manager

Trias Utomo, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist¹⁸

Alvin Lie, Legislative Affairs Specialist

Agus Wijayanto, Policy Research and Legislative Drafting Specialist

¹⁸ Trias Utomo is a full-time employee of Social Impact, implementing organization for this evaluation.

ProRep Partners

Agung Djojosoekarto, Program Director, Kemitraan, ProRep, (Jakarta, Palembang),

Setio W. Soemeri, Program, Manager, Democratic and State Governance Unit, Kemitraan

Ridaya Laodengkowe, Policy Research Development Specialist, Kemitraan

Wicaksono Sarosa, Executive Director, Kemitraan

Charles Cadwell, Director, Center on International Development & Governance, The Urban Institute, Washington, DC

Imam Sanjaya, Peneliti, Research and Political Consultant, Jaringan Suara Indonesia (Survey and Polling organisation), Jakarta

Sukanta, Manager Data Riset, Research, and Political Consultant, Jaringan Suara Indonesia, Jakarta

CSOs

Eva Danayanti, Program Manager, Aliansi Jurnalis Independent, Jakarta

Sebastian Eliyas Saragih, Program Manager, Circle Indonesia, Jogjakarta

Yani Lestari, Consultant, Circle Indonesia, Jogjakarta

Victoria Fanggidae, Program Manager, Prakarsa, Jarkata

Y.Ade Zendrato, Finance and Administration Manager, Prakarsa, Jarkarta

Rizal Malik, Senior Governance Specialist, Circle Indonesia, ProRep Collaborator, Yogjarkarta

Nordjannah Djohan, Aisyiyah, Jogjakarta

Khusunul Hidayah, Aisyiyah, Jogjakarta

Ari Pribadi, BKBBN, Aisyiyah, Jogjakarta

Alim Mohammed, BKBBN, Aisyiyah, Jogjakarta

Aisyiyah, Klaten, CSO ProRep Collaborator, Klaten

Suroto, Yayasan Satu Karsa, Solo

Ana Susi Y, Yayasan Satu Karsa, Solo

Sri Ekawati, Yayasan Satu Karsa

Nino Hitiraludin, JERAMI, Yayasan Satu Karsa, Solo

Andwi Joko M, Pattiro, Yayasan Satu Karsa, Solo

Agus Qosim, Komite Sekolah, Yayasan Satu Karsa, Solo

Research Institutions

Nana Adriana, Women's Research Institute, Jakarta

Wijayanto, Managing Director and Co-founder, Paramadina Public Policy Institute, Jakarta

Tedy Sitepu, Director, Paramadina Public Policy Institute, Jakarta

Junaidi, Legal Specialist, Paramadina Public Policy Institute, Jakarta

Muhamad Ikhsan, Researcher, Paramadina Public Policy Institute, Palembang

Phillips Vermonte, Director, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Jakarta

Inda Prasanti Loekman, Knowledge and Research Manager

Wicaksono Sarosa, Executive Director

Vid Adrison, Researcher and Lecturer, Institute for Economic and Social Research, Universitas Indonesia, ProRep Collaborator, Jakarta

Ifa Isfandiarni, Senior Associate, Institute for Economic and Social Research, Universitas Indonesia, ProRep Collaborator, Jakarta

M. Zainal Anwar, Researcher, Institute for Research and Empowerment (IRE), (Yogya)

Other Donors

Hans Antlov, Senior Social Development Specialist, World Bank, Independent Expert, Jakarta

Benjami K. Davis, Second Secretary (Senior Program Manager), Tertiary Education and Knowledge Sector, AusAID, Australian Embassy, Jakarta Donor in Democratic Governance

Maesy Angelina, Senior program Manager - Knowledge Sector Analyst, Tertiary Education and Knowledge Sector, AusAID,, Australian Embassy, Jakarta

Paul Nicoll, Executive Director, Performance Audit Services Group, Australian National Audit Office, Supreme Audit Agency of Indonesia, Independent Expert, Jakarta

Independent Experts

Paul Rowland, Associate, Centre for Democratic Institutions, The Australian National University

Taufik Anwari, Manager, Keuangan, Voice of Indonesia Networks

Ari Pribadi (BKBBN)

Alim Mohammed (BKBBN)

ANNEX V: CSO GRANTS AND TRAINING MATRICES

Names of CSOs, location of head offices, geographical focus, size of grant, topic or issue, and time for the execution of the grant. Organizations underlined are either women's organizations or are targeting women's issues:

CSO Grants

No.	Organization	Office Location	Geographical focus	Period of Grant (months)	Amount in US\$ (1 US\$ = IRP 9738)	Topic/issue
1.	Allians Jurnalis Independen	Jakarta	West Sumatra, Riau, Jambi, East Java, Central Java	6	49,251	Knowledge of budget
2.	Aisyiyah	Jogjakarta	Klaten, Kendal	9	55,180	Women's Health insurance
3.	ASPPUK	Jakarta	Klaten, Pontianak, Banda Aceh	9	64,034	Women's credit
4.	Circle Indonesia	Jogjakarta	Bogor	12	57,070	Budgets of organic agriculture
5.	HAPSARI	North Sumatra	North Sumatra, Central Java, East Kalimantan, West Sulawesi	9	73,819	Women's credit
6.	ISAI	Jakarta	Jakarta	9	49,439	Public information at Min. of Health
7.	ICEL	Jakarta	Jakarta	12	75,442	Environment
8.	Inprosula	Jogjakarta	Jogjakarta	7	53,876	Budgets for farmers
9.	Lakpesdam NU	Jakarta	Central Java	12	77,458	Religious tolerance
10.	Muslimat NU	Jakarta	Jakarta	7	45,906	Flood management
11.	Pergerakan	Bandung	?	9	54,672	Budget for fishermen
12.	Prakarsa	Jakarta	NTT	9	55,123	Women's health Insurance
13.	Seknas FITRA	Jakarta	Central Java	11	56,596	Women's Health insurance
14.	YSKK	Solo, Central Java	Central Java, Jogjakarta	8	58,010	Budget for education

CSO Training

No.	Name of course	No. of repetitions	No. of participants	No. of Organizations participating	Sex distribution
1.	Creative Advocacy	8	135	44	F 68/M 67
2.	Organizational Assessment and Development	1	20	7	F13/M7
3.	Social Media for Advocacy	1	19	8	F11/M8
4.	Constituency Building	2	40	18	F25/M15
5.	Strengthen Relations with Policy Makers	1	24	14	F15/M9

ANNEX VI: CIVIL SOCIETY OBJECTIVE INDICATORS

Civil Society Objective: Achievements in 7 Indicators through Year 2

Indicator Number	Indicator	Target until end Year 2	Achievement until end of Year 2	Notes
PO a.	Number of laws, legislative amendments or Parliamentary oversight proceedings influenced by CSO advocacy	4	0	Indicator needs revising. The process of influencing Parliament takes much longer.
PIR. A.	Extent of CSOs use of diverse mechanisms to receive information and opinions from their members	4	5 (125%) Twitter, Facebook (all), PSA (HAPSARI), Website (Aisyiyah, YSSK), comic book (FITRA)	Indicator needs revising. Diverse mechanisms are used to provide information to a wider audience, not all of whom are their members.
PIR 1 b	Percent of CSO members and constituents who feel that their interests have been effectively advanced by the CSO	30% (of which women 45%)	0	Reporting for this indicator is incomplete as the data will be captured through the Self-Assessment of Competence survey to be finalized in May 2013.
KRA 1.1.b	Number of CSOs experiencing with significantly expanded membership	6	2 (34%) (KPRI and HAPSARI)	Indicator needs revising. Many CSOs do not have members in a formal sense. They have a combination of alliances to networks, alliances to other CSOs, and beneficiaries.
KRA 1.2.a	Number of ProRep supported CSOs that participate in legislative proceedings	6	5 (84%) (Circle Indonesia, HAPSARI, ISAI, YSKK, PRAKARSA)	Indicator needs revising. Making representation to MPs (which is reported by ProRep) is valuable, but is not the same as participating in formal legislative proceedings.
KRA.1.2.b	Number of policy briefs brought to Parliament by CSOs and substantively reflected in responsive legislation, oversight or budget proceedings	5	2 (40%) Fitra, Prakarsa	CSOs have usually only been able to bring issues to the attention of MPs in public discussions.
KRA 1.3.b	Number of times CSO advocacy positions are featured in the media	8 (women related 2)	44 (550%) (women related 2 (100%) – Hapsari and YSSJK)	39 were for AJI. Women related also relates to issues important to women – in this case School Operational Fund.

ANNEX VII: RESEARCH INSTITUTION OBJECTIVE INDICATORS

Research Institutions: Achievements of Indicators through Year 2

Indicator Number	Indicator	Target until end Year 2	Achievement to date	Notes
PO b.	Number of bills, amendments or laws influenced by research, and analysis provided by a supported research institution	Cumulatively: Yr. 1: 2 (Women-related: 1) Target to be determined based on year 1 data	0	Indicator needs revising. The process of influencing Parliament takes much longer.
PIR 2.a.	PIR2.a. Level of selected MP or Parliament staff satisfaction with policy research	Yr. 1: 10% Yr. 2: 10%	0	To be collected through a survey with members of BALEG, BANGGAR, and Komisi.
KRA 2.1.a	Number of organizations in key areas achieve organizational improvements	Yr. 1: 3 Yr. 2: 6	0	Supposed to come from an Organizational Effectiveness Assessment.
KRA 2.2.a	KRA 2.2.a. Number of copies of written research products disseminated to Parliament members and policy makers	Yr. 1: 8 Yr. 2: 6 Total : 14	Year 1: 37 Year 2: 0 Total: 37 (264%)	Through QStaR grants.
KRA 2.2.b	Number of target Parliament Members and staff who report receipt of written research products and/ or verbal presentation from research institutions	Cumulatively: Yr. 1: 50 Yr. 2: 80	Year 1: 37 ¹⁹	To be collected through a survey with members of BALEG, BANGGAR, and Komisi.
KRA 2.3.a	Number of Parliament members reporting use of products of research institutions	Yr. 1: 15 Yr. 2: 15 Total : 30	Yr. 1: 18 Yr. 2: 0 Total: 18 (60%)	Data was gathered from reports by partners and were verified through interviews with selected MPs by ProRep.

¹⁹ Minimum achievement based on Indicator 2.2a. Thirty-seven MPs have confirmed receipt of written research products. The actual achievement will be measured in a survey, as indicated in the notes.

ANNEX VIII: LEGISLATIVE BODIES OBJECTIVE INDICATORS

Legislative Bodies: Achievements in 5 Indicators through Year 2

Indicator Number	Indicator	Target until end Year 2	Achievement until end of Year 2	Notes
PIR 3.a.	Number of pieces of legislation positively affecting democratic governance deliberated and passed	Yr. 1: Deliberated : 2 Passed : 1 Yr. 2: Deliberated: 2 Passed: 1	Deliberated: 1 (25%) Passed: 0	This is MD3 Law; the proposed amendments to the Law from BAKN have been submitted to BALEG.
KRA 3.1.a	Number of consultations with constituents held by ProRep-engaged DPR members	Yr. 1: 53 ; Yr. 2: 65 Total : 118	Yr. 1: 37 Yr. 2: 48 Total: 85 (72%)	This is from JABAT.
KRA 3.2.a	Linkages of ProRep-supported legislative amendments to the amendment process	Yr. 1: 2 Yr. 2: 5 Total: 7	Yr. 1: 2 Yr. 2: 3 Total: 5 (71%)	Yr. 1: Activities with BALEG (round table meeting for preparation of BALEG workshops on MD3 Law). Yr. 2: public hearings on amending MD3 Law in three provinces.
KRA.3.3.a	Number of U.S.-assisted actions contributing to better budget or program oversight undertaken by the DPR	Yr. 1: 1 Yr. 2: 2 Total : 3	Yr. 1: 5 Yr. 2: 8 Total : 13 (325%)	Yr. 1: BAKN annual report, investigative report and hearing with ministry of education. Yr. 2: hearing in three universities on higher education budget; verification of BPK audit findings and recommendations with five state-owned companies.
KRA 3.4.a	Number of DPR institutional reforms proposed, passed and implemented	Yr. 1: Deliberated : 1 Passed : 1 Yr. 2: Deliberated: 1 Passed: 1 Total : 2	Yr. 1: Deliberated: 0 Passed: 0 Yr. 2: Deliberated: 1 (50%) Passed: 0	This is related to the amendments of MD3 Law.

ANNEX IX: SUMMARY OF CONSTITUENCY OUTREACH ACTIVITIES BY MPS FROM THE FIRST TWO RECESS VISITS

District	1st Recess Visit	2nd Recess Visit	District	1st Recess Visit
Grobogan, Pati, and Blora Districts, Rembang Districts (Central Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public meeting with salt farmers, fishermen, students of Islamic boarding schools, and local journalists attended by a total of over 120 participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Community meeting - 2 seminars. Thematic focus: public health issues: maternal health, maternity insurance program, HIV and AIDS. Participant: total 523. · Training for 2 women's groups in 2 districts in producing micro businesses 	Grobogan, Pati, and Blora Districts, Rembang Districts (Central Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public meeting with salt farmers, fishermen, students of Islamic boarding schools, and local journalists attended by a total of over 120 participants
Brebes and Tegal Districts (Central Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public consultation forum – attended by 54 participants, including local CSOs and community members from a village facing problems related to abrasion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Seminar for youth – attended by 230 students (senior high schools and university) · Community meeting with salt producers – attended by 59 participants in the same two districts · Anti corruption talk at a community meeting 	Brebes and Tegal Districts (Central Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public consultation forum – attended by 54 participants, including local CSOs and community members from a village facing problems related to abrasion
Tasikmalaya and Garut Districts (West Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public consultation forum – attended by 40 participants representing different livelihood backgrounds: farmers, fishers, teachers, public transportation drivers · Discussion with local CSOs – attended by 26 participants · Media gathering with 12 local journalists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 6 community meetings in 2 districts with religious leaders, community leaders, and youth leaders – attended by 360 participants · Free health care service event in collaboration with district health agency · Radio talk shows, in 2 districts 	Tasikmalaya and Garut Districts (West Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public consultation forum – attended by 40 participants representing different livelihood backgrounds: farmers, fishers, teachers, public transportation drivers · Discussion with local CSOs – attended by 26 participants · Media gathering with 12 local journalists
Probolinggo and Pasuruan (East Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public hearings on bills being deliberated in DPR: on election of governor and mayor; mass organizations; and on village governance – attended by 239 participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · 2 workshops for farmers on improving farming practices and management – attended by 60 participants · Training on CSO advocacy for increased public participation on local policy making – attended by 60 representatives of CSOs and youth in each district · TV talk show at a local TV station on youth unemployment 	Probolinggo and Pasuruan (East Java)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Public hearings on bills being deliberated in DPR: on election of governor and mayor; mass organizations; and on village governance – attended by 239 participants