

17

PD. 1177 805
1512 - 46 100

116

YAYASAN INDONESIA SEJAHTERA (YIS):
ASSESSMENT OF AN INSTITUTION-BUILDING PROGRAM

by: Mary S. Zurbuchen
Program Officer
The Asia Foundation

December 1983 .

Table of Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Description of the Program
- III. Current State of YIS
- IV. YIS as a "Private Voluntary" and "Non-Government" Institution
- V. Internal Dynamics
- VI. The Issues of "Core Support"
- VII. The Asia Foundation's Role in YIS's Institutional Development
- VIII. Conclusion

Appendices

- A. List of YIS Consultancy Projects
- B. Report on Visit to YIS-Solo
- C. Samples of Terms of Reference for YIS Contracts
- D. Final Report from YIS to TAF on Overall Core Support Program
- E. Final YIS Quarterly Report to TAF
- F. Annual Program Profile--1982
- G. Report on YIS's Training Session for International Health Network Members
- H. Assessments of TAF-Supported YIS Projects
- I. Sample YIS Substantive Reports on TAF-Supported Projects
- J. Professional Papers by YIS Staff
- K. Report on Regional Development Seminar Organized by YIS

I. Introduction

The present evaluation is being written at the end of an arrangement between three organizations---Yayasan Indonesia Sejahtera (Foundation for the Well-Being of Indonesia, or YIS), The Asia Foundation (TAF), and USAID. During a period of 7 years funds were made available under a Specific Support Grant from USAID (AID/ASIA-G-1191) for TAF to establish a program to strengthen YIS in carrying out its activities in the spheres of health, nutrition, family planning and community development. The original grant period (30 September 1976 to 25 February 1980) was subsequently amended to continue with a second phase (1 October 1980 to 31 March 1983), with a final 3-month extension through 30 June 1983. The entire period of the SSG was 74 months.

Although a number of interim evaluations of this lengthy activity have been written over the years, both by TAF and outside parties, most of these are brief, or serve as periodic summaries of YIS's activities using support from TAF. Even the longer evaluations, while weighing the dynamics of YIS activity for an extended period, are largely limited to justification of YIS itself. Meanwhile, other interesting aspects of the grant process---the relations between the three organizations involved, the evolution of YIS in the context of development-pre-occupied Indonesia, the facets of YIS as these reflect the role of NGOs in Indonesia today---all these have not been touched on. Similarly, those aspects of YIS activity which most directly impinge upon local communities experiencing "development," have not been captured by the record.

In preparing this evaluation, then, I have tried to consider some other dimensions than the obviously central, but not context-free, growth and change of YIS. Yet I will not be attempting a detailed history of the 7-year grant. The factors to be considered are those related both to the terms of the original SSG itself, as well as those pertaining to the broader sphere of YIS's position within the worlds of the Indonesian communities it wants to serve, the international donor organizations, the national government, and other NGOs or PVOs working in Indonesia.

In evaluating the process and outcome of this grant activity, the orientations of the respective parties involved must be kept in mind. According to its own constitution, the purpose of YIS at the time of its founding in 1974 was:

'To increase the standard of living (welfare) of the communities in Indonesia through the implementation of programs in the field of community health, community development and population.'

These objectives were major premises of YIS's operations during the grant period.

In its own basic document (Letter of Agreement) of 8 November 1976 initiating the first phase of core support using USAID funds, TAF outlined the following goals for the grant activity:

'It is understood that during the period of this grant YIS will:
(1) expand its programs in the areas of family planning, community health, nutrition, and general community development; (2) offer consulting services to other organizations with similar concerns and project interests; (3) strengthen the administrative base for existing YIS programs financed by other donors; (4) evaluate and

improve YIS field programs through systematic research; (5) share the results of all these efforts with the National Family Planning Coordinating Board (BKKBN) and other concerned public and private agencies active in these fields, and (6) develop additional means of financial support to assure continuation of YIS after this grant terminates.....'

On its own part, USAID-Jakarta stated in the Program Description for the original grant that:

'The purpose of this grant is to assist the Grantee with its program to develop the institutional capability of the Foundation for a Prosperous Indonesia (YIS), an Indonesian private voluntary organization, to plan, design, direct and evaluate health, nutrition, family planning and community development projects for the rural and urban poor in Indonesia.'

When the grant from USAID to TAF and YIS was extended in 1980, USAID emphasized the particular importance to be placed on TAF's statement in its proposal that:

'one of TAF's principal roles in its dealings with YIS during the next three years will be to help YIS adjust its administrative and accounting systems so that it can become increasingly capable of meeting its core support requirements from other sources.'

Indeed, the then director of AID/Jakarta emphasized that this commitment would be considered fundamental in USAID's assessment of YIS's development.

Because of the length of time covered by this co-financed project, and because the responsible actors on the donor side have changed several times during the life of the project, it is impossible for one individual to reach a satisfactory vantage point from which to evaluate the continuous processes involved in the growth of YIS. However, using the reports, records and various personal memories available, I have tried to analyze aspects of YIS's organization and programs that will hopefully provide some sense of the uniqueness of the institution in the context of current Indonesian local and national development.

II. Description of the Program

Under AID/ASIA-G-1191, the substance of TAF's funding went to YIS in the form of core support---the salaries and administrative expenses associated with running the Jakarta headquarters. These funds were intended, in general, to strengthen YIS's organizational structure so that YIS as a whole, both in Solo and Jakarta, could operate its programs with sufficient staff and overhead support. TAF's grant was made to promote institution-building within YIS, and to enable growth, continuity, skills development and program expansion over time.

During the initial period of TAF's assistance to YIS under the SSG (1976-79), support was in the form of a grant numbered INDO-7025; during the subsequent phase the TAF grant number was INDO-0026. According to the Letters of Agreement between TAF and YIS, support was given in the following categories:

Staff Salaries (Administrative and Professional)
Medical Benefits
Office Utilities
Supplies and Incidentals
Vehicle Operation and Maintenance
Domestic Travel and Per Diem
Office Equipment and Furniture

Periodic audits and evaluations of accounting procedures were conducted, and both YIS and TAF adhered to schedules of financial and narrative reporting to TAF-Jakarta and USAID as well as TAF's headquarters in San Francisco. SSG funds were utilized by TAF to support both short and long-term consultancies and staff-development projects which were consonant with the objectives of the core support theme.

In addition to its core support commitments using AID-SSG, TAF made grants from its regular program budget funds for other discrete projects. These half-dozen grants were, over the years, an additional component of the institutional support provided to YIS during the grant period. Final assessments of these TAF grants to YIS can be found in Appendix H.

III. Current State of YIS

Instead of a chronological outline of the growth and change in YIS under the grant period being considered, at this point I would like to put forward brief descriptions of YIS's current situation in the areas of offices, staff, program activities and funding sources. I will be making comparative judgments between the current state of affairs and past stages of institutional development, and will keep in mind the purposes, goals and commitments cited on page 2 above.

A. Offices

When core support from AID/ASIA-G-1191 began to be provided to YIS, the organization's major base was its training and fieldwork center in Solo. The Jakarta office was located in borrowed quarters, and had only three paid staff, with leadership working on a volunteer basis. Thus, part of the aim of the core support grant from TAF was to strengthen the Jakarta operations in the areas of program development and management, and also in attracting financial support to sustain future operations.

Looking at the YIS office in 1983, one sees a striking change in the Jakarta headquarters, which has ample new facilities in a building of its own, provided by a foreign donor, and now has 21 staff members. The Solo office, with 27 staff (up from 11 in 1976), is still in its old, cramped quarters (although plans have been made to construct a new field office/training center in Solo, if funds can be located). The increased size and profile of YIS-Jakarta have had important implications for the self-image, orientation and activities of the organization as a whole. Basically, the augmentation of YIS's Jakarta base has facilitated relations with GOI, other NGO and foreign donor organizations, has helped YIS make contacts and gain contracts in the sphere of development activities, and generally has enabled the strong national and international image and firmer financial footing of the organization today.

B. Staff

As YIS has grown both in size and in the variety of its activities, its staff composition has changed as well. Both professional and administrative staffs have incorporated individuals with prior experience in non-medical community development; in some cases staff members have left government positions to join YIS, convinced that YIS represented a sounder path toward solution of community problems than the ongoing government programs in which they had participated. Such staff members are particularly reminiscent of the YIS founding leadership, which established YIS partly as an alternative to the large-scale, top-down development which is typical of government activities. In general, all YIS staff show a strong commitment to and appreciation of the goals and the locally-based participatory strategies which within the organization are referred to loosely as "the mission of YIS" (misi YIS).

In characterizing the staffs of both Jakarta and Solo offices, it is clear that a large proportion maintain a "generalist" orientation, being able to work on a wide variety of programs and specific tasks depending on the manpower needs within the organization at a given moment. This pattern of staff utilization proved effective for the fledgling YIS of the late 1970s, when project demands tended to keep ahead of personnel available. The "non-specialist" tendency among staff was also useful for an organization emphasizing innovation and flexibility, and where program management proceeded according to experimental, feedback-seeking principles rather than adhering to strict planning and rigid implementation procedures. Further, given the intersectoral nature of many of its programs, YIS personnel need to maintain a broadly-focused orientation.

For the YIS of the 1980s, however, some new staffing needs have emerged. Recently more staff have become identified as specialists, who have less wide-ranging duties and are less likely to be moved from project to project involving diverse responsibilities. This newer situation, with staff developing or bringing to the organization their specific professional skills, is true more of the Jakarta than the Solo staff, and concerns more administrative than program personnel. YIS has realized that as the organization works outside of the health/nutrition/family planning sphere where its approaches originated, and enters the newer (to YIS) technical fields of appropriate technology, communications, income generation and the like, that it must strengthen the abilities of its staff to work with groups whose needs fall into these fields. To date YIS has not made as much progress in building specialized program expertise, as it has in training staff members for administrative specializations, such as personnel manager, accountant, etc.

One of the salient organizational characteristics of YIS, and one that has been remarked upon with some concern by TAF and USAID at times during the period of the SSG, is the dependence of the organization on a charismatic leadership. Without the director's drive and vision, would YIS be able to sustain its momentum?---this has been a question puzzling outside observers. While there is probably truth in the assertion that YIS's programs are "sparked" by a few dominant figures, including the director, assistant director and one or two other leading staff with long experience in the organization, it is also undeniable that these persons have through their example and commitment enabled a consistency of purpose and clarity of focus within YIS. What to outsiders might stand out as an overdependency on leadership, from inside YIS appears as a source of stability during the last 7 years of rapid growth and diversification. Still, the need for a smooth system of delegating authority, and less centralized decision-making channels, is now acknowledged by YIS leadership.

There are currently a number of other issues confronting YIS in the area of staffing. One is the question of the division of functional responsibilities under the new project management system (see section V. below). The second issue concerns the need to recruit younger persons as long-term personnel resources. Although YIS is aware of the desirability of recruiting staff with technical skills, the present "seller's market" in Indonesia is such that the most talented younger people with advanced Indonesian or foreign-university degrees may have several offers to choose from. The private sector can absorb many bright graduates; for example, someone with training in communications may go into advertising, while someone with socio-economic training might join a private consulting firm. Academic research centers absorb other young graduates. According to some YIS staff, the types of idealism which might prompt highly-trained young people to work in community development is on the wane. According to others, there is still, within YIS, a lack of commitment to hiring and utilizing staff on basis of clearly-defined technical qualifications and professional abilities. Certainly, YIS cannot at present offer salaries competitive with those in the private business sector.

Another staff-related question, and one that seems to be on the way to finding a resolution, regards the issue of YIS's self-financing capabilities. There still seems to be some difference of opinion between staff members who are reluctant to "sell" their expertise for the going market rate, and those who maintain that YIS must have clearly defined and applied, though flexible, fee schedules for services rendered.

All of the above issues will prove to be important during the next few years of YIS's development, and it is hoped that open discussion and problem-identification and solution strategies, which YIS knows how to apply as well as any organization at work in Indonesia, will assist in the resolution of personnel issues.

C. Program Activities

It is worth recalling that in 1976 YIS was cited as representing the first attempt in Indonesia:

"that embraces the widely advocated new approach through programs that integrate family planning, rural community development, health services delivery and nutrition." (from TAF's 1976 Grant Agreement with USAID)

Viewed from within the current context of wider NGO as well as GOI commitment to integrated-style programs, it is easy to overlook the significance of YIS's early innovativeness. YIS's early programs in Central Java combining preventive health care and nutrition concerns were established before the integration of approaches under the PHC (primary health care) rubric came into world-wide focus. The "comprehensive approach" to community development is nowadays an often-heard call to work more closely with local groups not reached by government programs, and to create inter-sectoral programs such as government ministries do not seem able to coordinate. In YIS's early days, the call sounded bolder, and indeed, TAF's and USAID's support of the young organization involved a certain degree of uncertainty as to the risks involved.

In going ahead with its institution-building program for YIS, the donors felt that YIS should continue to serve two functions:

'The first is to explore, develop, and test new ideas in the fields of community health, community development and population within its own structure in Solo and other project areas, especially off Java. The second function is to assist other agencies, both government and private, to introduce within their own programs YIS-type tried-and-proven approaches to development. (from Proposal to USAID/INDONESIA, Development Program Grant)'. . .

This dual-function basis has prompted YIS to develop several types of program activities, which can be grouped under the general headings of training, field programs, publications and consulting services.

In 1976, YIS programs were considerably more limited in scope and quantity than they are today. Then, the organization focused primarily on its cadre-training sessions, and health-oriented village organizing activities in Central Java. There had been only a few consultancy-type projects, of which the USAID-funded condom-marketing campaign was the best-known example. YIS was known as a promising, independent but fledgling development organization specializing in health and family planning issues.

In 1983, the situation looks dramatically different. YIS has become both internationally famous and nationally recognized as a leading proponent and spokesman for community-based development in Indonesia. Its director and leading staff are listened to in worldwide circles of health and nutrition experts (see the articles by L. Hendrata and M. Johnston in Appendix J.). The organization's activities have moved beyond the 1976 focus both geographically and in terms of substance. While maintaining its Central Java training and village organizing components, YIS has become influential in policy formation and program implementation at the regional and national levels of government. Its relationships with and contributions to the efforts of foreign-donor agencies reveal a similar prominence, and a reputation for sensitivity, innovation and quality. YIS has trained cadres and officials from regions throughout Indonesia, and has through this effort strengthened its working relationships with regional government authorities. Ties to a variety of regional NGOs are also growing.

Aside from the original core of activities based on local cadre-training, the training activities themselves have grown to include training for trainers and project managers, and specially-designed training for government officials. Moving outward in orientation, too, YIS has recently completed a two-week training session in participatory techniques for some 17 members of the Asian Community Health Action (ACHAN) from countries throughout South and Southeast Asia (see Appendix G).

Moving beyond the health, nutrition and family planning content of its programs in the early days, YIS has carried out field projects in other areas such as education and literacy, agriculture, cooperatives, women's activities, income generation, handicrafts, drinking water and appropriate technology. This list is not exhaustive; a more detailed picture of YIS activities over the years can be gained from the quarterly narrative reports submitted to TAF over the course of the grant period (see the final report of this series in Appendix E.).

Meanwhile, aside from involvement in the roster of field programs noted above, YIS has greatly expanded the number and the range of its consulting activities. These fall under the rubrics of (a) conceptualization, design and evaluation of projects, (b) development of communication strategies and materials, (c) development

of monitoring and evaluation systems, and (d) specialized training program development. Whereas in 1979 YIS's consulting activities brought in only about 10% of its overhead costs, in 1983 YIS has generated 30-35% of its overhead from consulting projects. As enumerated in its March 1983 List of Consultancy Projects (Appendix A.), which gives an idea of YIS's contacts as well as the range of its capabilities, the budget for some 20 completed and ongoing consultancies totals over half a million dollars.

In carrying out its training, program and consulting activities, YIS has adhered to a set of principles for community development that were articulated in its 1979 "Final Report" on the initial core support period:

- a). Development, first and foremost, implies human development.
- b). Behaviour change is developed through education, by providing tools to the community for heightening awareness of the nature of their problems and their capacity to solve them.
- c). Community participation and a sense of community responsibility are central to the planning and implementation of the program.
- d). Development must not create further dependence, but must increase the community's capacity of self-reliance.
- e). Those most able to act as agents of development in the long-term are those people who live within the community itself; hence, our emphasis on training village-level field workers, cadres and local officials.

In the years since 1979 there have been additional themes incorporated into the YIS approach. Development is seen as a more comprehensive and intersectoral process. Further, YIS is now committed to the notion that program activity in any area should be based on that area's (or, presumably, that group's) own assessment of its most critical needs.

As a result of the shift in focus to increasingly comprehensive and community-based programs, YIS has been challenged to undertake efforts in fields quite different from its original skill-base in health and health-related issues. YIS staff have had to acquire some working knowledge of strategies in income generation, cooperative formation, marketing, agricultural innovation, drinking-supply engineering, and so forth. When resources in these areas are not found within the organization, YIS by necessity must identify external organizations and individuals to work with communities targeted by its programs. As a result, a network of technical contacts has developed on which YIS can rely in handling new projects.

Regarding the management of its program load, YIS feels that important achievements have taken place in program planning and implementation. It points to new systems of planning programs with clear and realistic goals; to the incorporation of baseline study techniques into the planning stage; to the setting up of built-in monitoring systems for each program.

One of the most valuable assets of YIS, undoubtedly, is its ability to review its activities, and develop new strategies that are both self-corrective and future-oriented. In YIS's own terms, continual effort is given to "self-assessment" (mawas diri). Thus, in regard to its training programs, the organization is involved with a review of current activities with an eye toward altering or updating these in order to expand the potential of training as an income-generating, as well as a working, component of the overall YIS program. Whether or not to focus more on

the development of regional training capabilities (a Regional Training Center is beginning to operate in Maros, South Sulawesi) or to seek expansion of the Central Solo training headquarters, is another aspect of the assessment process.

In terms of its field programs, YIS hopes that the management procedures and information-processing systems currently being implemented within the organization will enable better reporting and research capabilities. A computer has recently been installed in the Jakarta office to assist in accounting and administration. The newly-designed "Prosedur Pengelolaan Proyek" (P3) is intended, in addition, to help professionalize YIS personnel as members of a growing team capable of carrying out varied contract services.

D. Funding Sources

As noted above, YIS has managed to reduce its dependency on core support during the second phase of the USAID/TAF funding, gradually decreasing from 90% core funding in 1979 to 60% in 1983. Currently the organization is negotiating a number of new contracts; the variety of clients with whom YIS has already worked is evident in Appendix A. That YIS has been able to secure such contracts is indicative of its credibility and reputation in development circles.

During the second phase of core support funding from USAID/TAF, YIS has attempted to build up the potential of its publications and other communication materials to serve as sources of revenue. These materials represent a considerable body of "how-to" manuals, games, slides and slide/sound presentations, posters, and so forth. They have been developed both as a result of YIS staff desire to capture the essentials of community development in concrete form, and also in response to client requests.

The present weaknesses in the use of YIS communications materials to derive organizational income are related to the lack of a workable and effective marketing strategy. Currently, materials stockpiled in the Solo headquarters are purchased through mail orders by readers of YIS's community development bulletin Bergetar; the materials are also available to YIS's trainees and others visiting the Solo or Jakarta offices. YIS has been responsible for designing a number of communications materials for use in development programs carried out by the GOI; the government has also commissioned large editions (5,000 - 10,000 copies) of several titles.

However, there may be specialized markets within the development or educational communities in Indonesia which have not been explored, and it indeed appears that many people working in community development in Indonesia are unaware of the existence and variety of the YIS publications and materials. While YIS staff members themselves have sought input from villagers in designing and modifying their communications materials, the quality of some of the posters and pamphlets could probably be further enhanced by more consultation with professional designers and publishers. And certainly, the distribution of YIS publications in regional bookstores, markets or other locations where the target audience would be more exposed to them is a necessity if greater income is to be derived from this activity.

Another aspect of YIS's current funding situation which deserves mention here concerns the organization's ties with the GOI. Since its earliest days YIS has had close working relationships with both BKKBN and the Ministry of Health; over the

years there have been both field projects and consultancies in which these agencies were clients. Other YIS--GOI cooperation has occurred in the context of training, where YIS has designed and put on training sessions for regional staff of bodies such as the Ministries of Agriculture and Transmigration.

While YIS interaction and influence at the national level of policy and planning have affected some programs in the health and family planning sectors, there now appears to be interest at the ministerial level in the Department of Home Affairs in the YIS experience and philosophy. YIS has been requested by the ministry to participate in policy discussions, in efforts to formulate more effective national strategies for regional development. A seminar was recently held, organized by YIS, to begin to articulate some of the concerns in this area (see letter and report on this seminar, Appendix K.).

Just what form YIS participation in this process may eventually take, or to what degree such participation will lead to work assignments from the GOI, is still unclear, but YIS is prepared to take on a bigger role in national development management planning. What is evident is that YIS, through a reputation for effectiveness and innovation, has achieved considerable credibility in the eyes of GOI, in addition to the reputation it already enjoys in the international donor community. Such links are good indicators of funding possibilities in the future, even as "core-support" type funding is lessened.

IV. YIS as a "Private Voluntary" and "Non-Government" Institution

In this section I would like to discuss YIS as a private voluntary organization, and as a non-government organization in Indonesia. In looking at YIS as a PVO we will be considering some of its characteristics as a private welfare-and-development organization; in surveying YIS's role as an NGO, we will look more at its qualities in the Indonesian context. For both roles, that of NGO as well as PVO, we will be dealing with YIS in its interactions with various spheres: that of the local communities YIS wants to serve, that of the national and regional Indonesian government authorities, and that of the foreign donor community.

A. YIS as PVO

In a recent AID program evaluation discussion paper (Tendler 1982), there are several characteristics commonly ascribed to PVOs which are scrutinized in detail:

"...private voluntary organizations (PVOs) describe themselves as being good at reaching the poor, as using participatory processes of project implementation, as being innovative and experimental, and as carrying out their projects at low cost."

In line with the PVO community in general, YIS emphasizes its commitment to participatory processes. Also frequently cited are its non-bureaucratic nature allowing flexibility and innovation, and its special achievements in being in direct touch with needs at the village level. If these claims by YIS are indeed valid, then it would be a matter of interest to know just how the organization has achieved such effectiveness.

Unfortunately, there is relatively little written information available to an outside evaluator to indicate the extent to which the above claims by YIS are justified, and also the degree to which YIS has been able to meet its original goal (see p.1. above) of improving village welfare, especially among the poorest groups. This is not, however, to say that YIS has made invalid claims about itself, or that it has not had impact on village welfare through its programs.

The lack of information on these subjects is an indication, rather, of the complexity of determining things like "participation" or "impact" on the one hand, and the possible need for additional or improved strategies for research and documentation within YIS, on the other.

We can begin by looking at the issue of the "participatory" approach to community development. From talking with participants in YIS-Solo's training for community development workers and also its training for trainers, it is clear that these programs have been important in providing community-based organizers with many of the techniques, strategies and the confidence to carry out decentralized-type activities in their communities. Similarly, YIS's own field programs, carried out over a several-year period with increasing intensity, have resulted in an impressive array of cadres and self-reliant group activity in Karangobar district of Banjarnegara regency in Central Java. But whether or not these approaches are the equivalent of "participatory development" in the field is another question. For, as Tandler notes, very often what PVOs characterize as participatory processes do not involve entirely representative decisionmaking, but rather some degree of control by local elites or the PVOs themselves. This less than "genuinely participatory" aspect of some PVO activity seems to have enhanced the effectiveness of the activity in many of the cases Tandler studied. Finding that the slogans of "bottom-up" and "participatory" were not accurate enough to reflect the actual dynamics of these development cases, Tandler suggests the application of additional categories such as "outside-in" or "enlightened, sensitive top-down" decisionmaking.

In YIS's case, we find that in actual field work in Central Java, a wide range of approaches combining the above categories seems to have been utilized. A 1979 YIS evaluation of community development programs in cooperation with LP3ES found that local leaders in Banjarnegara, both official and informal, and government officials of various sectors played important roles in the initiation and implementation of community development programs. These roles, furthermore, differed from one location to another. In other words, a variety of strategies and approaches in community-level organizing seems to be characteristic of YIS's own history of field involvement. It is this variation, along with a considerable ability to reflect upon and its own philosophies, which perhaps is more accurate in characterizing the YIS approach than the blanket term "participatory."

It would be unfair in this context to underrate YIS's contributions to whatever it is that is termed "participatory" development in Indonesia, however. There are currently growing numbers of NGOs which carry out cadre training and field programs in comparable fashion, but YIS must be acknowledged as the earliest achiever and innovator in many areas. YIS's own publications suggest the depth and significance of its approaches as these have spread to outlying areas of Indonesia (see, for example, Membina Masyarakat Membangun: Kumpulan Kasus-Kasus Pengembangan Masyarakat). Staff members have acquired masses of knowledge about local conditions and the application of development strategies, in the form of experience with multitudes of localized cases. The question that must now be addressed is: What about the accessibility of all this information stored in the heads of YIS staff? Very little

of it gets written up in the normal course of project execution. Very little has been done to make detailed reports on YIS field programs using a case-study format, and making such reports available to the public and relevant institutions. Likewise, as past evaluations have noted, there has been no centralized collection of data on the progress of YIS-sponsored community development activities in the areas of Central Java where it has long been active. Thus, there is still a paucity of evidence demonstrating effects on the welfare of YIS's targeted communities, especially such results as can be identified through systematic recording of information and impact-assessment research. In its stature as an Indonesian PVO of considerable achievements, then, YIS must still be judged as falling short in careful documentation of those achievements (however, obvious these may seem in an observer's personal, informal approaches).

Of course, it is a long-term task for YIS and many other small PVOs to develop the institutional capacity to engage in extensive research. The individual project assessments in the 1982 Laporan Program YIS (summed up in shorter form in Profile Program Yayasan Indonesia Sejahtera Tahun 1982, see Appendix F.) mention insufficient reporting as a significant problem. YIS itself readily acknowledges the need to step up the development of a data bank regarding past experience which could assist and streamline future projects.

Another aspect of YIS-as-PVO which I would like to discuss briefly is its nature as a welfare-and-development organization. In recent years, many PVOs world-wide seem to have moved from a specialized, single-focus delivery of social welfare services (or "relief") to a more generalized, multiform approach to broadly-defined issues of "development." (cf. Tandler 1982: 50-51). YIS has also undergone change over the years in this regard. From an organization which originally tried to bring information and change to villages in the areas of health, nutrition and family planning only, YIS now has defined its role to involve comprehensive and inter-sectoral local development, whether this involves basic social services or more technical programs in the economic sphere.

This shift in YIS's perception of its appropriate function has emerged gradually out of its work in field programs. According to YIS staff, efforts to activate local development have proven more successful when people have seen results of programs in an area where they feel definite need than when development, however well-conceived, occurs in areas where people have no clear and defined felt needs. Accordingly, YIS has undertaken projects in drinking-water supply or income generation (eg. handicrafts cooperatives or small-credit schemes), where these have been identified as reflecting community-defined problems.

Other programs, such as development of a prototype solar drier, have been efforts on YIS's part to explore the possibilities of appropriate technological additions to its field programs. Still other programs, such as the design of environmental awareness communication materials, or the development of video presentations on issues such as village nutrition, represent efforts by YIS to transmit important messages to diverse audience, both rural and urban. (See Appendix II, , where TAF reports on several of these activities appear).

All of the above types of programs represent departures from the original tasks YIS-set-for-itself, and all of them must necessarily draw on skills other than those in the health and health-related fields which were YIS's original areas of expertise. It is still unclear whether YIS feels itself to be as competent in working with communities in, say, the introduction of new plowing techniques, as

it is in creating awareness of issues and solutions in nutrition, for example. The move from a more "specialist" orientation to development to the "generalist" stance has been bolstered by YIS's confidence in its experience and resources in training, guidance and support of community-run programs. Further, YIS recognizes the need to respond to community initiatives in areas outside its own base of expertise by coordination with other members of the growing networks of community development agencies, universities and donors, any of which may possess the needed expertise or technology. In this way, hopefully, YIS and other similar organizations will be able to avoid the parallel and competitive development of identical skills in some highly-specialized areas where a more efficient use of resources would call for cooperation and exchange.

Maintaining the comprehensive and generalist stance presents YIS with both advantages and disadvantages in the community development enterprise. One advantage of this approach is the opportunity for the organization to develop new reserves of more specialized expertise, for example in agricultural techniques. Another advantage is that YIS, in being able to run programs in a variety of fields besides health, can be more flexible in responding to the needs of project-focused donors in an atmosphere where types of projects and fields of activity may go in or out "fashion." Among the disadvantages, YIS has to face the inevitability of more mistakes or failed projects in areas where it has few professional skills. It may also be harder to target programs for the neediest groups, or to evaluate the success of one's efforts, in these less familiar fields. (See Tendler 1982: 60-67 for a discussion of some dimensions of PVO performance as "integrated" development agencies.) The last, and in some ways most far-reaching, implications of the generalist approach as this pertains to YIS involves the

"growth and sophistication that has been thrust upon PVOs in their new role as development entities. The greater bureaucratization that has accompanied such growth may be diminishing the flexibility and experimental qualities that are characteristic of small organizations with circumscribed responsibilities" (Tendler, pp. 70-71).

Thus, the full extent to which generalization of its mission might eventually threaten proven YIS capabilities in the health and health-related fields, is a vital question awaiting an answer. Finally, the very qualities which make YIS a viable channel for large-donor funds (the ability to write proposals, reports and maintain acceptable accounts) are not necessarily identical to, and may even detract from, the characteristics which make it most effective as a change-agency in Indonesia's villages.

B. YIS as NGO

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, non-government organizations in Indonesia have acquired a much higher profile than was previously the case. Indonesian government ministries, especially those concerned with social services and the environment, have been at least concessionary, if not always vocal, about the role NGOs can appropriately play. Government concerns about NGOs perhaps center more on the extent to which "non-government" is coextensive with "anti-government." Thus recent GOI formulations of community development dynamics include prescriptions for the role of "self-reliant" institutions (swadaya is the commonly-found term)

alongside governmental programs, avoiding the loaded term "non-government."

Within the NGO community, meanwhile, new groups have continually sprung up, in the context of the slowness, ineffectiveness or downright absence of government-program activity at the local or regional level. Impatience with Indonesia's bureaucratic tradition has been another stimulus to NGO evolution. Currently Indonesian NGOs appear as a vaguely-tiered configuration of local or national groups working on limited issues, of technically-oriented R&D groups, of organizations specializing in training and the organization of swadaya groups in a variety of fields, or "umbrella" organizations helping to consolidate and coordinate the work of independent small local groups involved in similar issues. (There are also multitudes of NGOs whose impetus, whether religious or political or social, is unclear, and others not actually involved in community development at all.)

Against this background of diverse non-governmental efforts, YIS is by any account one of the foremost NGOs at work in Indonesia. Having begun with a well-defined image of its goals and strategies, YIS became regarded as effective and responsible in working with communities to solve health-related problems. YIS's leadership has been one of the most eloquent voices arguing for decentralized and bottom-up development. (In this connection see the essay by Dr. Lukas Mendrata in the April 1983 issue of Prisma, included in Appendix J.)

Interestingly, YIS has not ended up at odds with the high levels of government as its prestige as an NGO has grown. In fact, YIS philosophy and programs seem to have been granted a place alongside the national health and family planning institutions. The carefully-balanced way in which YIS has expressed the need for "cooperation" with government agencies, even while contrasting its own approaches favorably, has enabled it to be a particularly influential NGO within the national framework. The adoption of health and family planning strategies at the national level, by the Ministry of Health and BKKBN, which originated from YIS's conceptualizations, proves the organization's ability to pursue its own goals in radically different contexts. YIS is adept at simultaneously contemplating localized needs of diverse communities, the micro-level concerns of government power-centers, and the requirements of the international donor community. The balancing of such divergent interests is a convincing measure of YIS's institutional soundness.

In considering what particular qualities of YIS have enabled the largely smooth relations with government authority at different levels, another feature might be YIS's finesse in downplaying conflicts and avoiding institutional upstaging. Certainly YIS activities have encountered suspicion and obstruction at the local and regional levels of government. Yet whether in the villages of Karangkojar or the national ministries, YIS seems willing to share credit for achievements with the government, and does not exploit local sociopolitical tensions in order to make a place for itself. The YIS community development process focus can pervade a local area, without the organization as such assuming a high profile. Indeed, it is probably politically imperative for YIS to work this way.

YIS has, obviously, also been able to forge strong working relationships with government because of professional ties between its own and GOI leadership in the fields of health and family planning. Indeed, whether or not YIS's relations with other GOI bureaucracies will be as productive as those with BKKBN and MOH is a valid question.

Currently, as mentioned above, YIS may have opportunities to make inputs to national planning through the Ministry of Home Affairs. The extent to which this type of link with GOI will demand the attention of YIS leadership and absorb the skills and energies of top staff is still unclear. Whether or not YIS will become increasingly dependent upon GOI or GOI/foreign donor contracts, as compared with alternative methods of generating income, and what effects increased ties with GOI would have on the organization's operations and abilities in the non-government sphere, are other significant issues.

Another aspect of YIS which must be mentioned here concerns the current proliferation of NGO groups in Indonesia. There is a growing number of entities seeking legal status as "foundations," and an as-yet uncounted number of quasi-official groups. At the same time, YIS's approach in moving outside of its Central Java heartland, as it has forged links with South Sulawesi, North Sumatra, Eastern Indonesia and Nias, for example, has emphasized the establishment of independent "bodies" which plan and coordinate locally-conceived activities, and (hopefully) remove community development out of the control of one or another local vested interest.

While it is indeed necessary to have appropriate independent groups at local and regional levels, the danger lies in non-productive propagation of institutions and offices. There is a need for YIS to look more closely, perhaps, at the areas into which it is currently moving, with an eye to identifying strong, cohesive, localized institutions, which may be quite traditional in nature yet still viable as the "vessels" into which the "new wine" of participatory development may be poured. The seka of Bali, for example, is a traditional "voluntary association" of individuals whose form and function have in some notable cases proved effective in implementing local initiatives in community development fields. It is up to YIS to be sure that its staff remains as open as possible to regional cultural variation, so that opportunities to identify appropriate traditional institutions may be utilized, thus avoiding needless bureaucratization of the NGO community.

The issue of YIS's sensitivity to local concerns as an NGO has other ramifications. While achieving national prominence and high levels of funding, YIS may also have lost some of its solidarity with local communities. There is sometimes a tendency for villagers to perceive visiting YIS staff as important "official" authorities; some provincial community development workers have felt that YIS staff gave the impression of being directive and "self-important" during local consulting tours, and have asked for unreasonable budgets and facilities while in the field. Likewise, there has been some feeling from government workers receiving training by YIS that certain staff members "felt superior" by virtue of their involvement in the non-governmental arena. These sorts of feedback raise serious issues reflecting on both individual staff attitudes and overall organizational sensitivity.

In closing this section, I would like to mention that YIS, along with the varied range of other NGO groups in Indonesia, has actually not received as much attention from outside agencies as it warrants. While many people experienced in the dynamics of development in Indonesia see NGOs as somehow the "best hope" for improvements in the interest of the disadvantaged majority, there is surprisingly little known about how NGOs actually work, which ones are the most successful and effective, and how they really do achieve their successes in the areas of planning, organizing, training, implementing and assessing community development. There is a pressing need for more effort to display and document the successes

and failures of NGOs---not just as justification for foreign donors or GOI edification, but in order that the entire NGO effort in Indonesia be as informed and mutually-supportive as possible in carrying out diverse and widely-dispersed activities.

Another reason it is so important to improve the substance and channeling of information on and from Indonesian NGOs is the need to document as far as possible how the poorest groups are being reached and affected by NGO efforts. In a recent ONFAM-sponsored seminar on "Thinking about the Poorest", in which YIS participated, NGO groups working in Central Java and Yogyakarta areas were able to come up with interesting formulations of their common experiences, problems and successful strategies. Further dissemination and discussion of the material produced by research, analysis and write-up of NGO experience would be of great value to many parties.

V. Internal Dynamics

In this section I would like to point out some of the salient features supporting the organizational and program strategies of YIS, as well as a few of the problems and challenges faced by this institution which has continually re-evaluated its procedural and operational effectiveness during the past 7 years of rapid evolution.

Early evaluators' comments on YIS pointed out its unusual character as a community development group emphasizing decentralized planning and village-level initiative---a "grass-roots" orientation remarkable in its dissimilarity to the official development planning community. With training and most field programs based in its Solo office, and national planning/policy activity as well as overall administration and communications handled largely by YIS-Jakarta, the organization has had an admirable and unique dual base. It can thus broaden the impact of disparate, localized activities by bringing them into focus at the central level, and at the same time render its field activities accessible to wider attention and donor support, through its contacts in the centralized and international Jakarta community.

YIS is an organization with two faces, one turned towards generalized and issue-oriented development planning and implementation spearheaded by the GOI and large donor groups, and the other toward the highly specific complexes of needs in the many communities YIS hopes to serve. The "Jakarta-Solo axis," the two separate offices with differing functions, is thus fundamental to YIS's identity.

It cannot always be easy to maintain a smooth balance under the "two offices, but one YIS" rubric, however. Communications and continuity can suffer disruptions between the two headquarters, and inter-office working relationships may be harder to forge than in a more localized institution. The different natures of field and urban headquarters can result in divergent perspectives, to some extent, between Solo and Jakarta staff as to what the YIS mission really consists of. An example of this type of challenge is the continuing debate over the "private contractor" and the "social welfare" aspects of the organization. It is easier for Jakarta staff to accept arguments for charging higher consulting fees for staff services than it is for the Solo staff, who are more isolated from "international rate" consulting practices as these are commonly structured in Jakarta. At the same time, Solo personnel may chide their Jakarta colleagues for becoming less familiar

with the "field conditions" which determine the outcomes of real development-plan implementation.

The above sorts of issues certainly reflect the complexity of "doing" community development in Indonesia, and can probably be handled well given YIS's strong tradition of problem-solving and identification of weaknesses. A more serious challenge under the dual-base system, perhaps, comes under the rubric of management. Given YIS's innovative style and expanding scope of activities, maintaining the communication and coordination of two differently-styled offices, both of which may need to work closely on a single project activity, is extremely difficult. The tendency under such circumstances, especially when time is short and the project load heavy, is to look to the "top" for guidance and decisions. Sometimes a bottleneck can develop for YIS's directorate; charted organizational divisions and hierarchy can become blurred, as staff of two offices strive to keep a unified image and objectives in sight.

YIS's leadership has for some time been exploring new ways for dealing with its management challenges, and in 1983 has decided to implement thoroughly overhauled "Project Management Procedures". This new system, the result of months of in-house discussions combined with the consulting services of a Jakarta management firm, is aimed toward standardization of administrative work and delegation of as much authority as possible.

At the heart of the new management system is the need to have efficient delegation and administration in an organization that is more project-oriented today than in its early phases. Thus it has been decided to abolish the structural designations of staff according to "divisions," and to establish a more function-based model which treats all YIS activities as one or another type of project. Staff will be broken down into a 3-tiered configuration consisting of:

- a) Working Partners: staff assigned to work on a particular project, responsible to Project Officer
- b) Project Officers: in charge of a particular project, responsible to Group Manager
- c) Group Managers: in charge of several projects, responsible to the Directorate.

In concert with the above restructuring of activities and personnel, YIS together with its management consultant have drawn up new information systems to make for smoother reporting and the compilation of a central "data bank". All of the drafted new procedures were presented to the relevant YIS staff from both Solo and Jakarta offices in June 1983 (see Appendices H and I, with YIS's report and TAF's evaluation of this activity). A six-month transition period to the new system was proposed, and thus YIS hopes to be operating fully under the new procedures as of 1 January 1984.

While it is still too early to tell how the new management system will affect YIS's operations and programs, some indications of its results have emerged during the initiation/transition period. Under the new system, Group Managers have a great deal of responsibility for formulation and implementation of projects; it now is necessary for the 4 designated Group Managers to develop confidence in planning

and decision-making, and for the Directorate firmly to resist further handling of authority which is delegated to the GMs under the new procedures. Whether or not the GMs have perhaps too much responsibility relative to the Project Officers is a question that will have to be answered as experience with the system grows. Other personnel issues emerging at present include the need to re-assess salary levels, and the process of rotation of personnel in and out of assignments as the YIS portfolio changes over time.

Further implications of the management procedures above relate to the threat of "bureaucratization" under a large load of paperwork, first, and second, to the ways in which new procedures will enhance or impede coordination and communication between Solo and Jakarta. To the extent that the new system treats all activities according to the same format, as projects, there remains a residue of YIS activities ---negotiation of contracts, public relations work and many miscellaneous administrative duties---whose execution is still unclarified. And finally, the new procedures do not explain details of how the work of research and evaluation regarding projects will be conceived, carried out and recorded. The emphasis of the new management system seems to be more on the formulation and execution of projects, with less attention being given to how the "feedback" process of experience and careful evaluation can be integrated into future program and personnel development.

VI. The Issue of "Core Support"

With funding from USAID and TAF in the form of salaries and other basic overhead costs, YIS has completed a period of institutional growth and consolidation. It indeed seems that the institution-building objectives of the donors and YIS have been well-served by this pattern of support. With basic elements of overhead taken care of, YIS has been able to focus its energies on the skills of its personnel, the quality of its field programs and the expansion of its consulting services. At the close of the AID/ASIA-G-1191 funding period, there have been no great tremors felt nor fiscal alarms sounded. A roster of potential and already-secured projects during 1984 is being developed, and a number of field programs have received new or extended funding.

When YIS supports localized development efforts, it always tries to identify and minimize the tendency for katergantungan or 'dependency', whether fiscal or organizational, in the small NGOs or communities with which it works. Similarly, both USAID and TAF, as donors co-financing some of the endeavors of YIS, seem to have felt strongly that prolonged overhead support of YIS might encourage a sort of "dependency" which would not be healthy for YIS and which would certainly be out of line with the objectives of TAF and the Mission themselves. As YIS gains more experience and organizational stability, it was felt, a larger measure of its overhead expenses should be generated by its activities. The donors seem to have had an eye for a self-sufficient, self-financing, YIS administrative structure in the not-distant future.

The above sketch of donor intentions to phase out "core support" for YIS reflects a concern for that organization's abilities to plan rationally and manage its affairs efficiently. It also reflects a "stand on your own two feet", marketplace view of financial endeavors which is grounded in a particularly American appreciation of energetic capitalist enterprise. The underlying assumption in such a view toward YIS is that, if YIS's skills or products are really appropriate and useful in the

enterprise of Indonesian development, YIS should be able to market them effectively and prosper through its own profits. Continuation of "core support" might only suppress initiative and cushion a bureaucracy.

The problem with the above view of core support is that it places institutional costs at the "core" of things, treating programmatic concerns as rather peripheral. The soundness of an organization is determined by the character of its fiscal arrangements, rather than by the quality of its actual programs. However, it is also possible to view core support-type funding apart from the context of administrative structures, as a strategy to support innovation and creativity in the areas of programs, as a method of developing staff (i.e., human) potential and not just purchase of paper clips. As Rohde and Singarimbun stated in their 1979 evaluation of YIS, to equate core funding with strictly administrative support is to miss the many ways in which such funding, directly or indirectly, is put into project-related efforts.

The tendency for a "project-focus" attitude among donor groups, where funding is formulated to support specific actions, may lead to a situation where so many resources are centered on project activities that there is little left for the exploration, innovation and skill-building that help to shape effective organizations. In the case of YIS, of course, it also must not be forgotten that the organization has an important role in certain government planning and policy efforts, and does not only implement projects in the field.

Another argument against the tendency not to favor core support is, of course, the severely limited resource base--namely, village Indonesia--which has been the prime ground where YIS and other like NGOs have tried to plant their community development seeds. To the extent to which YIS must concentrate on the profitability of the projects it undertakes, and to the extent it can only undertake profitable projects in order to remain fiscally sound, its flexibility and opportunity to respond to the village-level concerns it feels best qualified to handle will become increasingly limited. And if YIS can only rarely or not at all work with communities or organizations who cannot pay for its services, in the long run YIS will lose its cutting edge in dealing with such groups at all. It will become an urban-based consulting firm whose responses are determined by donor-set project requests, and may lose an invaluable aspect of its character as a proponent and exemplar of certain "bottom-up" development ideals. At present, YIS is still poised between finding funding to implement its own program designs, and deriving income by carrying out other agencies' project or research requests, but the momentum seems to be in favor of the latter pattern.

In considering the extent to which YIS's activities might become thoroughly dominated by donor-determined priorities in a future free of "core support," the donor agencies themselves must consider whether there is sufficient justification for running YIS along "project mentality" lines. Is it true that money spent for overhead support is less well-spent than money given in the form of particular project budgets? Is it worthwhile to allow YIS, by virtue of contributions to its overhead costs, to determine a greater share of its program activities, since in that way it does not have to focus on generating fixed-costs revenues from every undertaking? It seems a bit patronizing to assume that overhead support for YIS indicates a lack of sufficient institutional soundness or development, when there are organizations in the west which are considered to be performing important roles in developing countries (the Agricultural Development Council is one) which are given long-term overhead support by large donors. In some cases, it may be appropriate to acknowledge that the type of work being done by an organization is

not such as to lead to total institutional self-sufficiency.

Certainly, the issue of core support vs. project funding is complex and difficult to assess, since it requires a careful evaluation of each case and its conditions of operation. My final point here is just that, in the current atmosphere of Indonesian community development, when donors must often search hard for the qualified individuals and workable organizations through whom to channel the great resources at their disposal, YIS has been widely judged to be committed, responsible and comparatively effective. In such a case, a changed funding pattern based on project-derived overhead instead of substantial core support may not reinforce the same organizational characteristics for which YIS has earned much credit.

VII. The Asia Foundation's Role in YIS's Institutional Development

When the institution-building activities represented by the grant under discussion here were begun in 1976, there was a consensus among officials from all three organizations involved that The Asia Foundation could play a significant part in enabling the achievement of project objectives. Both YIS and USAID felt a need for an intermediary organization to handle administering and overseeing functions relating to the grant funds, the former because of the complex nature of the administrative responsibilities involved, and the latter because of a lack of staff to keep close enough contact with YIS itself. In addition, because initially the SSG (then called a DPG) funding involved not just USAID/Indonesia but also USAID/Washington, TAF was seen as an appropriate PVO which, by virtue of its experience working with USAID, could perform the administrator-channel role effectively.

On its part, TAF had programmatic interest in the nature of YIS's work, and felt that alignment of its own priorities with YIS's goals was appropriate. Thus, the following list of TAF's functions vis-a-vis YIS and USAID was drawn up:

1. Technical assistance to the headquarters staff in the form of part-time services of two American specialists in material development-production and private-sector program development.
2. Monitoring relations with AID/Washington and USAID/Indonesia.
3. As a private institution itself, with long experience in assistance to Asian private institutions, The Asia Foundation would provide relevant overall guidance in managing AID funds and effective program direction.
4. Provide a "public relations" link between YIS and foreign donors, observers and reporters.
5. Assist in evaluation and reporting related to the DPG.

In general, this list of priority functions of TAF is reflected in the history of this institution-building project. Technical services of consultants have repeatedly been provided, most recently with the management-technique consultancies of Dr. R. O'Connor in 1982 and Ir. Abdul Hakim in 1983. Monitoring, evaluation and

reporting in line with both USAID and TAF requirements has consistently been carried out. TAF has been able to assist with YIS's "public relations" efforts both through its own network of institutional affiliations and also by drawing YIS's attention to opportunities and resources available in support of its institutional development.

As to the "overall guidance" and "effective program direction" components of TAF's role, it appears from the record that TAF's direct consulting with YIS regarding its program activities has taken a continuous, largely informal, shape. There have not generally been on the TAF staff persons who could be considered as experts in YIS's major program fields of community development, health-related issues or participant training. TAF has attempted to keep in close touch with YIS whenever specific needs for consultation have arisen, and to point out areas of YIS's leadership and operations which have seemed problematic. TAF has also been able, repeatedly, to respond relatively quickly to YIS's needs for specific project support. Among the non-SSG-funded activities which have taken place are staff training outside of Indonesia, the development of appropriate technology prototypes, the design and production of education and communication materials, and technical aid in the form of drinking water supply and irrigation improvement for communities with which YIS has worked (see Appendix H.).

With regard to the objectives of SSG support to YIS as it was originally conceived, there are certain types of guidance and direction which TAF may have been able to provide to a greater degree. Specifically, the conceptualization and research processes which provide "evidence of strengthened institutional capability" should have been an area where TAF and YIS worked more closely. The original "Proposal to USAID/INDONESIA" for a Development Program Grant discussed expected outcomes of such support as follows:

'More broadly, the evidence of strengthened institutional capability will be found in the quality and output of the various projects, present and future, undertaken by YIS. It is difficult to predict quantified program outcomes, because of the diversity and number of activities that are being undertaken. In general, YIS is aiming for significantly improved public welfare in the project areas to be covered. More specifically, YIS hopes to isolate and measure in some degree (1) lowered birth rates, (2) lowered infant mortality, (3) improved health and nutrition, and (4) public adoption of community improvement measures. Another gauge of the effectiveness of the headquarters will be the development of new projects and success in attracting further support, domestic and foreign, both for projects and for the infrastructure after this proposed DPG expires.'

While the infrastructural indicators of YIS's attainments are clear enough, the methods for determining "quality and output" of YIS's projects over the past 7 years remain less so. Statistical measurement of the sort enumerated above has not been forthcoming as this directly relates to specific YIS program achievement. In part, the absence of clearcut, measurable verification reflects the complex, over-determined nature of entities such as "improved health conditions." Nevertheless, an early, well thought-out strategy for collecting and assessing certain key sources of information, designed by a collaborative TAF/YIS effort, might have enabled more specific indication of particular program attainment and, even more important, the reasons behind observed successes or failures.

Certainly one of the most significant outcomes of the cooperation between TAF and YIS during the period of SSG support has been the enhancement of TAF's own awareness and appreciation of the activities of Indonesian NGOs. Through contact with YIS staff and monitoring of training, field projects, research and consulting services, TAF has been able to be more abreast of NGOs philosophies, goals and actions, and to develop a network of contacts with other actors in the variegated NGO/PVO realm.

As a result of its association with YIS, furthermore, TAF has felt it important to strengthen other such ties with NGOs in the interest of the "democratic pluralism" it hopes to promote in Asian societies. YIS has been crucial in helping demonstrate to TAF (not to mention other donors) the potential impacts of decentralized, comprehensive community development. TAF's current SSG-funded activities under the rubric of "Strengthening Indonesian NGOs," as well as its programs with NGOs in Java and Eastern Indonesia, can thus be seen as a natural and direct outgrowth of the concerns and opportunities TAF has identified in the administrator-channel role during the past 7 years of YIS's institutional development.

VIII. Conclusion

There are many dimensions to an organization such as YIS, and many questions regarding its activities, that cannot be fully treated in this assessment. Nevertheless, I hope I have indicated some of the important issues to be addressed at the conclusion of a program of support such as the recently-ended co-financed funding of YIS by USAID and TAF.

One conclusion that has emerged in the process of writing this evaluation is that YIS has fulfilled most of the objectives envisioned by its leadership and the donor agencies when the assistance program was first planned (see Introduction, p. 1). That is, YIS has expanded its programs, offered a variety of consulting services, strengthened its administrative base for carrying out donor-financed programs, shared the results of its efforts within government circles, and developed additional means of financial support to help assure its own continuation.

In my view, though, an area where more results should have been evident was that of systematic research and evaluation. In order that as much information as possible be generated in order to clarify the specific relationships between YIS's organization, programs and impacts in the field, more useful studies regarding YIS programs need to be conducted, using not just quantitative but also case study approaches. One thinks of the long-running Dana Sehat activities in Solo---what is the community health profile of the regions affected by these programs? In villages where YIS has worked with income-generating projects, how much income has been generated, and by whom? Is it possible to gather evidence that mothers participating in baby-weighing groups derive a greater awareness of health and nutrition-related indicators in their under-five children? The types of questions which could be researched are often complex, and perhaps not readily captured through statistical methodologies; the above sampling is only a start. Furthermore, YIS itself is able to help the government and donor agencies find better ways of asking such questions, and of proceeding to find the answers.

Among Indonesian agencies active in community development, YIS is certainly among the very few with the proximity and capabilities needed to articulate fundamental choices and directions. Almost obliquely in some YIS reports one finds mention of issues that seem to be basic in determining project effectiveness in a particular context. The decline in authority of traditional, autonomous village institutions and their displacement by centralized bureaucratic power is a compelling sociopolitical theme underlying current village development in Indonesia. This is just one example of areas where YIS seems to be in close touch with a problem that needs its own specialized effort to be understood and incorporated in more effective organizing and planning.

Of course, in the case of the grant under discussion here, the responsibility for determining research and evaluation priorities lies primarily, though not solely, with YIS. In the day-to-day round of individual project design, implementation and reporting, YIS has to accommodate the requirements of many agencies. To the extent to which those agencies are able to work with YIS in ensuring that research and evaluation needs are well thought-out, relevant, planned well in advance and supported with adequate resources, both YIS and its clients will be able to derive many more insights into the nature of YIS's effectiveness.

I suspect that within the wide-ranging realm of Indonesian NGO activity, YIS stands out in part because it is an exemplar and proponent of what is often called the "learning-process" approach to development. This philosophy emphasizes the dynamics of leadership and teamwork in the context of community action, and appears to involve a stage-by-stage emergence of effectiveness, efficiency and the capacity for expansion. An organization's "skills in building capacities for action through action" do not develop through dependence on large-scale, "blueprint," project design and implementation, but rather are enhanced by "adaptive, bottom-up" strategies (as David Korten found in an in-depth study of development assistance programs in Asia; see "Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach," in Public Administration Review, 1980).

This sounds, in fact, much like a paraphrase of the YIS philosophy. What is needed is for YIS further to nurture the "learning process" features already prevalent in its approach, and focus of analysis on its projects in terms of their contexts, outcomes, lessons learned and broader implications. This level of analysis lies above that of individual project information-gathering requirements, and represents a more systematic incorporation of the mawas diri (self-assessment) principle. In this way, client-determined priorities could be executed without threatening perpetuation of the YIS commitment to village welfare in Indonesia. It is crucial for that commitment to remain strong and clearly articulated, even as the organization continues to build its capacity to manage a diverse portfolio of client interests.

NZ: man

CID: JOS