

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE NORTHERN SUMATRA REGIONAL PLANNING			2. PROJECT NUMBER 497 - 0246	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE INDONESIA
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 81-6	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 1977	B. First Obligation Expected FY 1979	C. Final Input Delivery FY 1981	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>June 1979</u> To (month/yr.) <u>May 1981</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>July 6, 1981</u>	
			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ <u>2,255,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>1,560,000</u>	

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SFAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION		
<u>Required Project Follow-on Actions:</u>		
1. Continue working with Dir. Gen. BANGDA, Ministry of Home Affairs, to explore possible inclusion of Riau Province in PDP III for appropriate follow-on assistance.	Karl A. Baldwin Project Officer NSRP	
	Carl Dutto, Project Officer PDP	
2. Continue efforts to facilitate provision of follow-on assistance for Provinces of Aceh, North Sumatra and West Sumatra through inclusion of LTA-12 Continuation project in BAPPENAS Bluebook for utilization of other donor assistance.	Karl A. Baldwin Project Officer NSRP	
	Mr. Ruslan Diwiryo, Dir. of TK & TD.	

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A.	<input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B.	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Karl A. Baldwin,
USAID Project Officer | 3. Ir. Ruslan Diwiryo
Director Tata Kota &
Tata Daerah, Min. of
Public Works. |
| 2. Drs. Atar Sibero,
Dir. Gen of BANGDA
Min. of Home Affairs | |

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature	<i>Robert C. Simpson</i>
Type Name	Robert C. Simpson - A/DIR
Date	<i>Oct 25, 1981</i>

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

13. Summary

The NSRP Project has been a joint GOI/USAID effort to respond to the development planning needs of a four-province region using a planning approach that differed markedly from the pattern established by earlier planning projects undertaken for the other development regions. The project was designed to produce a "Long-Range Regional Planning and Development Strategy and Framework", a broad outline guidance for regional development in the four-province region, as opposed to the far more voluminous comprehensive plans developed by other regional planning projects.

The Project got underway in mid 1978, and almost from the start, it encountered problems in establishing the planning organization envisioned by the initial plan. By late 1979, it was apparent that the rate of progress was such that some shift in project strategy was needed. Subsequently, in March of 1980, a redirection of project implementation was decided upon and project efforts were refocused on a single pilot province, Riau. In the process, the broader multi-province regional emphasis was significantly reduced in favor of concentrating on the province as the planning region. At the same time, the scope of the major project outputs was narrowed and emphasis was given to planning in the short and intermediate range 1 to 10 year period as opposed to the longer 20 to 25 year period.

Implementation work under the refocused approach moved rapidly ahead in Riau Province. As the project nears its conclusion in June of 1981, it is producing highly useful results under each of its major output headings. It is developing for the pilot province a solid planning base, and it is going as far as time and resources permit to extend the results to the other provinces. A major concern has been to identify possible follow-on approaches which could assist the provinces in carrying to completion planning work already begun.

In conclusion the NSRP Project represents an innovative approach to regional planning that did not fully attain its original purpose. Nonetheless, a great deal of valuable planning and staff development work was accomplished, not only for the four-province region and its four BAPPEDA staffs, but also for the pilot province of Riau, where concentrated planning efforts have proven to be highly productive. Follow-on efforts, now being pursued, should insure that the work of the project will continue to be advanced and additional long-term results achieved.

14. Evaluation Methodology

This is an End-of-Project Evaluation. Its purpose is to describe and assess what the NSRP has accomplished during its three-year life, as measured against the goal, purpose and output statements in the original project design.

Most of this evaluation was conducted on-site at the project's Medan headquarters, and was based on: (1) a review of project reports,

publications, statistics and basic documents; and (2) conversations with Project Team members, including assigned staff representatives of the Ministry of Public Works, technicians from the BAPPEDAS of the four participating provinces and members of the PADCO consulting team. The evaluation field work and summarization were carried out by the USAID Evaluation Officer, the NSRP Project Officer and the Project Assistant.

15. External Factors

Several external factors influenced the project and its implementation. They included:

a. Change of perception of planning region and regional planning mechanism.

The original project concept was that NSRP would respond to the need for comprehensive development planning of a single region composed of four inter-related provinces. Not long after project work commenced, questions were raised as to the validity and economic significance of the planning region. It was suggested that the planning region was a region on paper only, and did not constitute a single logical area for planning purposes. It was pointed out that the four provinces had relatively little in common in terms of the flow of economic goods or processes, that with the exception of a few national projects and activities of a truly inter-provincial nature, there was very little to plan or coordinate in an inter-provincial context, and that in reality, each of the four provinces was a development region in itself with its own characteristics, including the overriding need for planning by and within the province, a need felt to overshadow any broader multi-province planning requirements. Inevitably, the questions and concerns affected the implementation of the project, and ultimately, they contributed to the mid-project redirection of the total planning effort to focus on a single pilot province which would then serve as a model for similar follow-on efforts in the remaining provinces of the region. Because of the questions and concerns mentioned above, the regional coordinating mechanism in the form of a functioning Regional Coordinating Committee also did not materialize.

b. Level of commitment of provincial planning personnel to project effort.

- (1) The original project design provided that each of the four participating provinces would make available to the Project Team three qualified BAPPEDA technicians whose respective areas of specialization would contribute to the building of a balanced total team. The assumption that this pooling of appropriately skilled manpower could be accomplished did not prove valid. The reality was that trained technical manpower, adequate to meet the needs of the project, was not available from the four BAPPEDAs. Each of the provinces did, in fact, provide two technicians, some of whom had applicable training

and experience, others of whom had need for considerable on-project training and experience before they could make substantial contributions. The result was that the consultants, particularly during the earlier stages of the project, had to devote considerable time and effort to further training the technicians in various areas of project activity. The impact of this was that the consultants found themselves more heavily involved in training activities than was originally anticipated, and also assuming a greater share of direct project implementation work than had been envisioned

- (2) The original project design also called for establishing in each of the four provinces a Project Support Team composed of technicians from BAPPEDAs and selected Dinases. This team was to provide backup for project efforts and to serve as the focal point for in-province project development training. It was determined by the National Technical Committee early in the life of the project that these teams would not be established and that instead, the respective provincial BAPPEDAs would provide necessary province level project backup. To compensate for this change, several central ministry technicians would be assigned to the project to provide field assistance in project implementation. Neither of these supplementary support measures proved to be fully successful. The resulting lack of an effective coordinating and participatory link at province level added to the tasks of the Project Team.

16. Inputs

(See Exhibit 1 - NSRP Project Team Members and BAPPEDA Riau Project Participants; and Exhibit 2 - NSRP Project Consultants)

In general, project inputs were provided in accordance with the original plans. Training, commodity and consultant support inputs, including housing and transportation, did not present major problems. Some difficulties and delays did result when annual GOI budget appropriations for clerical and translation support proved inadequate and project consultants had to recruit outside assistance to meet immediate project needs. Part of the difficulty here was attributable to the mid-project physical shift of activities from Medan to Pekanbaru, a labor shortage area.

As indicated in 15 above, the project was handicapped in its earlier stages by lack of appropriately skilled and experienced counterpart BAPPEDA technicians assigned to the Project Team. The result was a shifting of limited consultant time from substantive project work to an unplanned level of individual and specialized team training not foreseen in the project design.

The shift in project strategy to a more highly concentrated pilot province effort made necessary the use of a broader spread of consultant expertise than that incorporated in the original plans. The relatively small three-member long-term consultant team did not have the specialized

skills required to cover the more extensive array required to provide the full range of specific development proposals. Consequently, the consultant team composition was modified and project contingency funds were used for engaging a substantially larger group of short-term expatriate and Indonesian specialists during the latter phase of the project in Riau Province. While these short-term consultants brought needed expertise to the project, their efforts to produce the best results were in some cases hampered by the short duration of their assignments and lack of language competence and familiarity with the culture.

17. Outputs

Work on the main project outputs got underway late in 1978 following the arrival of the consultants and organization of the Project Team. Not long after implementation efforts had begun the changes discussed earlier under "External Factors" materialized and exerted an influence on implementation efforts then in progress. Nonetheless, the Project Team moved ahead on the three main and two supporting project thrusts (outputs) throughout 1979 and into 1980, including work on data base development, third country and in-country training and intermediate range planning through assistance to the provinces on their Repelita III and annual planning/budgeting. However, by early 1980, it had become apparent that a reassessment of objectives and strategy was called for since real progress in attaining the original objectives was below expected levels.

Following field assessment and a review of progress with the Project Team and with the Director of City and Regional Planning, Ministry of Public Works, it was determined that the design concept of bringing to each of the four provinces an equal level of planning/programming activities, coupled with parallel staff development work, was proving to be beyond the project, and its limited consultant staffing, to achieve. Accordingly, in March 1980, project focus was retargeted on a single pilot province (Riau) in order to maximize the opportunity for attaining basic objectives there, and to build the base for subsequent transfer of development planning processes to the other three project provinces. At the same time, an adjustment was made in basic project outputs, consolidating the long-range and intermediate-range outputs under the Strategic Development Framework heading. Following is a summary of changes made in planned project outputs at the time of the above retargeting.

Original Outputs

- a. A system for Repelita III and intermediate range provincial development programming. •
- b. A system for one-year provincial action programming.

Modified Outputs

- a. A near and medium-term Strategic Development Framework at provincial level.
- b. Annual planning at the provincial level.

- c. A long-range regional planning and development strategy and framework (Incorporated into a. above)
- d. Provincial/regional planning information system
- e. A comprehensive manpower development program in provincial/regional planning, providing on-the-job trainings and skills development.
- c. An information system to support work on annual planning and the Strategic Development Framework in one province plus assistance in other province.
- d. Manpower development through direct participation in pilot project work and participation in workshops at key stages as activities progress.

The following sections describe each planned output, as modified, and the expected end-of-project status. (See Exhibit 4-NSRP Project Publications)

a. A Near and Medium-Term Strategic Development Framework (SDF) at Province Level.

(1) Description of planned output, as modified.

- A written Strategic Development Framework, including associated annexes, reports and manuals, setting forth a comprehensive strategy for development of Riau Province, primarily in the one-year to five-year time frame, conditioned by and taking into account longer-term planning considerations.
- Focused on strategic sectors, strategic areas and specific development targets given highest Repelita III priority.
- Concerned with intersectoral and inter-area linkages and impacts.
- Designed to take into account both national and sub-national needs and capacities.

(2) End-of-Project Status

- A series of studies was completed pertaining to the characteristics of the Riau provincial (regional) planning/development base, including natural resources, population, labor force and basic economic factors.
- Basic development policies and development objectives were formulated, including identification of strategic development sectors, strategic development areas and selected strategic development projects, together with proposals for planning, administering and financing the processes of development, as well as the development projects themselves.

- A detailed final SDF report was completed, summarizing the SDF approach, relating studies, policies, objectives, proposals and projects to the total SDF process and containing recommendations for future SDF action in relation to annual planning/budgeting, preparation of Repelita IV and steps needed for completion of a comprehensive, ongoing SDF.

- Additional work, beyond the capacity of the project to produce, will be needed to complete the Riau Province SDF and to proceed further with transfer of the SDF process to the other three NSRP provinces. For Riau Province, it is planned to provide at least some of this assistance through the USAID PDP III Project. For the other 3 provinces, the Director of City and Regional Planning is seeking to tap other donor assistance.

b. An Annual Planning, Programming and Budgeting System at Provincial Level.

(1) Description of planned outputs, as modified.

- Provision of technical support to Riau Province during the preparation and implementation of its annual plan, program and budget, including:

- assistance in an annual review of provincial development and the preparation of guidelines for developing the 1981/82 plan;

- assistance to selected sectoral agencies in project identification;

- assistance to the BAPPEDA, Bureau for Development, Bureau for Finance, and Dinas for Revenue Collection;

- limited consultation in the preparation of DUP/DIP forms; and

- selective support in the monitoring and evaluation of 1980/1981 programs and projects.

- provision of limited advisory support to the other three NSRP Provinces in annual planning/budgeting, including their participation in technical workshops.

(2) End-of-project status

- An Annual Economic and Social Review (AESR) process was developed and is in use in Riau province as a pilot effort.

- An improved annual planning and budgeting process (six-stage process) was developed and is partially operational for IFY 81/82. Follow-on technical assistance is beyond the scope of the present project, but is required to insure that the process is fully implemented in Riau Province for IFY 82/83.

- Strengthened Riau Province guidelines for Annual Plan and Budget preparation were developed by the project and promulgated by the Acting Governor. Follow-on technical assistance is beyond the scope of present project, but needed to support further strengthening the process.

- A "Guidelines for Planning and Budgeting" was developed and was used as the basis for workshop training of Riau Province technicians and those of other NSRP provinces.

- A detailed final Annual Planning, Programming and Budgeting Report was completed, incorporating workshop findings (see above), setting forth the basic approach and making specific recommendations for needed changes required for full implementation.

- Additional advisory assistance, beyond the capacity of the project to produce, will be needed to take follow-on steps required for transfer of improved planning, programming and budgeting process to the other three NSRP provinces. This requirement is being addressed by the Director of City and Regional Planning who is seeking to identify other donor assistance.

c. An Information System for Provincial Planning and Development

(1) Description of planned output, as modified.

- Development of an operating information system for support of the Riau provincial annual planning, programming and budgeting system, and of the Riau provincial Strategic Development Framework process, including development of a guidance manual incorporating the basic development information sub-systems.

- Extension of information system development assistance to Aceh Province.

- Provision of limited advisory support in Information System development to BAPPEDA personnel of the other NSRP provinces, including their participation in technical workshops.

(2) End-of-project status

- Riau provincial development information library system is in operation with initial library staff trained to use project developed library sub-systems.

- Basic library sub-systems were developed and incorporated in a guidance manual for the information library.

- Development information training was extended to Aceh Province information specialists, and information specialists

of all four NSRP provinces were given workshop training in data evaluation.

d. Manpower Development (See Exhibit 3 - Manpower Development Output - Training Summary)

(1) Description of planned output, as modified.

- Development of a BAPPEDA Riau technical staff trained in the basic techniques and procedures of annual planning, in the planning and preparation of a Strategic Development Framework and in the development of a basic provincial information system.

- Provision of training in each of the project's major thrusts for the BAPPEDA staff members of the other three NSRP provinces.

(2) End-of-project status.

- Twenty BAPPEDA staff members of NSRP provinces and sixty non-BAPPEDA staff members received project training (See Exhibit 3).

- Comprehensive Report on Manpower Development for the Northern Sumatra Region completed, including recommendations for further strengthening of BAPPEDAs Tingkat I/II and other development related personnel in the Bureaus and Dinas2.

18. Purpose

The approved project purpose was to "Assist in the establishment of a coordinated provincial and regional planning program for Major Development Region A."

For reasons summarized under Section 15, "External Factors", the multi-province region did not become the real focus of the project. Instead, emphasis was increasingly given to working with the individual provinces within the planning region. It was this reality that overtaxed the Project Team and the Project's consultants. They could not meet the overall planning needs of four separate provinces. This was an important factor leading to adoption of a pilot approach in a single province-Riau.

Compensating in part for the narrowing of the project's geographic focus was the fact that the project was able to go into much greater depth in dealing with the planning and development of the single province. A number of planning and development studies and analyses, both sectoral and procedural, were completed for Riau, representing valuable contributions in terms of establishing a better factual base for planning, developing improved planning/programming/budgeting techniques and introducing and strengthening more effective inter-sectoral coordination and communications. In these areas, the project made significant contributions that may not only be transferred to the other three NSRP provinces, but will be useful as well to the LGT II and PDP projects.

Concerning the stated purpose of establishing a coordinated provincial and regional planning program, it is concluded that the project fell short on the regional planning side, but produced significant results in terms of provincial planning. At a time when it was becoming apparent that the regional approach was not going to prove feasible, a correct decision was made to redirect implementation efforts to the pilot province approach.

A second major emphasis of the original project design and purpose was upgrading of BAPPEDA staff capabilities throughout the planning region. Use of a Project Team approach involving BAPPEDA technicians from each of the provinces was one of the key means for attaining this end. Upon completion of the project, there will in fact be a group of BAPPEDA staff members from each of the four NSRP provinces that is much better equipped to undertake development planning work. The project has also brought numerous other provincial officials and technicians directly into the planning process, has broadened their understanding and knowledge of development planning and has equipped them to participate more effectively in coordinated development planning. It is concluded that the NSRP Project succeeded in attaining the project purpose of building and adding significantly to the planning capabilities of BAPPEDA planning staffs and other key personnel, both in the pilot province of Riau and in the other three NSRP provinces.

21. Unplanned Effects

The project did not cause any unexpected results or impacts on the general socio-economic environment in which it operated. It was, however, affected by a number of unexpected developments as summarized under Section 15.

22. Lessons Learned

Probably the single most important lesson learned in the course of NSRP implementation is that of not being overly ambitious at the project design stage. Development in general, and development planning projects in particular, are complex processes that often must proceed at their own pace. To expect to attain far-reaching objectives in a relatively short period of time has, in the case of NSRP, proven to be unrealistic. To expect all of the pieces of a multi-jurisdictional implementing structure to fall neatly together and to hold together throughout the life of a project is expecting a great deal. Review of what has and has not been accomplished during the life of NSRP leads to the conclusion that more time and more resources in the form of long-term consultants were needed to accomplish the work expected within the three-year life of the project.

Another lesson learned points up the need to expect the unexpected, to immediately assess the probable short and long-term effects of changes in direction, structure or support and to be prepared to make appropriate adjustments or to redirect planned courses of implementation action if changes so dictate. NSRP did make a necessary mid-project adjustment which aided greatly in realizing the best end-of-project results.

attainable under the circumstances, despite a number of unanticipated implementation developments.

Use of short-term consultants to supplement the skills and sectoral specializations of long-term consultants makes good sense, within limits. However, there are also problems inherent in the use of short-term consultancies, including lack of familiarization with the project, the language, the culture and the current state of the art in the country; time pressures that preclude working effectively with counterparts; and a frequent overriding emphasis on production of the consultant's final report, as opposed to the sharing and transfer of knowledge, particularly with counterpart personnel.

The need for good project organization and a clear delineation of project implementation responsibilities represents a worthwhile lesson learned. The designed NSRP Project organization was quite complicated, in itself a potential problem-in-the-making. As might have been expected, not everything worked out as planned, compromises were made and some implementation responsibilities were neither clearly delegated nor accepted. Inevitably, problems arose that could have been avoided or minimized if a simpler organizational structure had been used and if more determined efforts had been made to nail down functions and relationships.

Finally, the difficulties of developing and maintaining a harmonious, long-term and productive inter-cultural relationship between consultants and Indonesian counterparts represents a valuable learning experience. The NSRP project was the setting for many good working relationships between consultants and counterparts, and the basis for some warm and friendly associations, both on and off the job. But it was also the setting for frustrations and disappointments, particularly on the part of the counterparts. The most obvious cause of difficulties here had to do with language communication and the fact that some consultants, particularly those here on short-term assignments, and their counterparts could not freely and easily express their thoughts and ideas to one another. The burden here is properly on the shoulders of the consultants, as it is their responsibility (and that of USAID as well) to insure that they are able to converse effectively in Bahasa Indonesia.

A consultant that must work under tight deadlines is not in the best position to share time and knowledge with counterparts. Sometimes the latter are brushed aside or given makework assignments while the consultant tackles the main issues. It is always a challenge to develop a shared, productive relationship in this area, and some consultants succeeded admirably in doing so.

NSRP PROJECT TEAM MEMBER

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>Man-months on project working time</u>
1. Ir. Badia Ginting	Project Officer	Dept. of Public Works	36
2. Ir. Obing Sambas	Team Coordinator	DG of Cipta Karya	36
3. Ir. A. Barli	Team Member	Dir. Tata Kota dan Daerah	36
4. Ir. Daniel Azhar	Team Member	Dir. Tata Kota dan Daerah	36
5. Nurhasyim SH	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I Riau	36
6. Ir. Yok Suhaya	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I Riau	36
7. Drs. Khairanis	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I West Sumatra	24
8. Ir. Maimunah Madjid	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I West Sumatra	24
9. Drs. Ramlan Ilyas	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I Aceh	21
10. Drs. Zubaidah Umar	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I Aceh	21
11. Ir. Dameris P.	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I North Sumatra	20
12. Ir. Bintara Thahir	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I North Sumatra	20
13. Ir. Amurhud Ahmad	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I West Sumatra	12
14. Ir. Arsyad Nurdin	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I West Sumatra	9
15. Drs. Azhar Amin	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I Aceh	15
16. Drs. Nanafiah Sabli	Team Member	BAPPEDA Dati I Aceh	15
17. Ir. Hilderia Silalahi	Team Member	DG of Irrigation	12
18. Ir. Benjamin Obadyah	Team Member	PUSDATIK	12
19. Ir. Warga Kartadisastra	Member	Biro of Planning DDN	12

BAPPEDA Riau Personnel
Participating in Project

% of Time Devoted to
Work on Project Outputs

1. Drs. Subagyo	- 40%
2. Radja Roesli BA	- 40%
3. Makka Hamid SH	- 20%
4. Drs. Helmy	- 20%
5. I. Zulkifli	- 20%
6. Drs. Burhan Siregar	- 20%
7. Drs. Yulifar	- 20%
8. Drs. Azwar Yacob	- 20%

NSRP PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS

<u>N a m e</u>	<u>T i t l e</u>	<u>Man-months Life of Project</u>
1. Robert Rice	Reg. Dev. Economist and PADCO Team Leader	30
2. Berqueist	Rural Infrastructure Engineer	23.17
3. Deuster	Agricultural Economist	14.21
4. Cooper	Information System Specialist	19
5. Ray	Regional Planner	16
6. Holle	Training Specialist and PADCO Team Leader after Jan. 1981	12
7. Herbert	Senior Regional Planner	15.5
8. Van Huyck	PADCO Home Office Principal	2
9. Zulkifli	Sectoral Analyst	8
10. Richards	Administrative Systems Specialist	6.30
11. Grossman	Public Finance Specialist	6.39
12. Rogers	Transport Economist	1.20
13. Landskroner	Estate Crops & Livestock Specialist	3.0
14. Hadfield	Regional Accounts/Economic Specialist (Urban-Regional Economist)	2.37
15. Murad	Demographer	1.12
16. Duncan	Fisheries Specialist	1.10
17. Gilbert	Transport Economist	1.5
18. Wiggin	Agricultural Economist	2.11
19. Anderson	Forestry Specialist	-
20. Jaffe	Finance Specialist	1.25
21. Hidayat	Survey Agro Economic Team	6.0
22. Imtiah Basah	Survey Agro Economic Team	6.0
23. Victor Manurung	Survey Agro Economic Team	6.0
24. Suryana Effendi	Survey Agro Economic Team	6.0
25. Abdul Kadir Prawiraatmadja	Public Admin. Specialist	.50
Total man-months per Project Paper		144
Total Actual man-months		<u>190.72</u>

Exhibit 3

Training Summary

<u>P l a n n e d</u>	<u>No. Trained</u>		<u>When Implemented</u>
	<u>BAPPEDA</u>	<u>NON-BAPPEDA</u>	
1. 4 BAPPEDA Chairmen and 3 ministry representatives given participant overview of regional planning in US and 3rd countries	4	4	April 1978
2. 12 BAPPEDA and Dinas Technicians and Project Team Leader given extensive work experience and On-the-job training in techniques of provincial/regional planning	20	7	Throughout Life of Project
3. 12 BAPPEDA personnel and Dinas Service Technicians and Project Team Leader given participant overview of regional development in nearby third countries	8	9	September 1979
4. Special Training Seminars:			
a. Information System Seminar)			June 1979
b. AESR Workshop)			April 1980
c. Data Evaluation Workshop)			October 1980
d. Information System Training))	20	50	December 1980
Workshop)			
e. Seminar in Management of)			March 1980
Non-Construction Activities)			
f. Special Video-tape Training))			
seminar relating to project)			
thrusts)			

Exhibit 4

NSRP Project Publications
Chronologically by Project Output

A. Output No. 1: Near and Medium-term Strategic Development Framework at Provincial Level

1. "Steps for Adding One Year to Provincial Intermediate Range Program" - December 1978.
2. "Proposed Long Range Regional Planning and Development Strategy and Framework Tasks" - December 1978
3. "Technical Note on the Purpose and Content of the Long-Term Development Framework for the Northern Sumatra Region" - John Herbert - November 1979.
4. "Technical Memorandum on Proposed SDF Criteria for Project Selection" - Project Team - May 1980.
5. "The Development Strategy - Outline of Proposed Report on the Strategic Development Framework" - Dr. Robert Rice/PADCO - March 1980.
6. "The Development of Riau Province 1982/83 - 1988/89 - Tentative Outline of the SDF for Riau, Main Report" - John Herbert - October 1980.
7. "Notes on Presentation of the Long-Range Framework (LRF)" - Paul Deuster and Robert Rice - August 1979.
8. "Sumatra Regional Planning Study Work Program - August 1980 through June 1981" - John Herbert - October 1980.
9. "Estate Crops Report" -Zulkifli - October 1980
10. "A Hypothetical Development Pattern for Coconut Plantations and Coconut-Oil Mills" - Drs. Moh. Zulkifli - December 1980.
11. SDF Report "Strategic Development Framework, Tree Crop Sub-Sector, Riau" - Drs. Moh. Zulkifli - April 1981.

B. Output No. 2: Annual Planning Programming Budgeting System at Provincial Level

1. Technical Memorandum: "The Need for An Annual Economic and Social Review, General Guidelines for the Formulation of the Provincial Annual Development Program Report and Suggested Outline for the Report" - PADCO - August 1979.

Exhibit 4
page 2

2. Technical Memorandum: "General Rule for Determining Priority of Development Projects" - PADCO - July 1979.
3. "LTA-12 Annual Planning Outputs - Summary Statement" - Richards - November 1979.
4. "Project Paper: Directives for Annual Plan and Budget Preparation for 1981/82" - M. Grossman - August 1980.
5. Annual Planning, Programming and Budgeting/Financing forms entitled: (Robert Rice)
 - a. "Functional Adequacy Assessment of Programs/Project Forms 1981/82".
 - b. "Program and Project Appraisal Criteria Form 1981/82".
 - c. "Recommended Program/Project Changes Form 1981/82".
 - d. "DUP/DUPDA Summary Form 1981/1982".
6. "Guidelines for Information to be obtained from each KANWIL/DINAS" - Project Team - August 1980.

C. Output No. 3: Information System for Provincial Planning and Development

1. Summary: "Seminar on Information System for Regional Planning" - (2 volumes in bahasa Indonesia) - Project Team - April 1980.
2. "Information system design for Development Planning Agencies of the Four Northern Sumatra Province" - Richard Cooper - July 1980.
3. "Acquisitions Procedures Manual" - Richard Cooper - August, 1980
4. "Technical Memorandum of Information Systems" - Richard Cooper - August 1980.
5. "Riau: Economic Development 1973 to 1977" - M. Hadfield.

D. Output No. 4: Manpower Development

1. Paper: "Lingkungan Hidup, Pelestarian dan Penataan Penduduk" Ir. Daniel Azhar, Ir. Obing Sambas, Ir. R.J. Berquist.
2. "Evaluation of Completed Projects" - Robert Rice - May 1980.
3. "Recommendation for Kecamatan Miskin Program" (Riau) - Stuart Holle, October 1980.
4. "Manpower Development Recommendations for Key Development Agencies Functioning at the Provincial and Secondary Levels of Government in the Northern Sumatra Region of Indonesia" - Stuart Holle - April 1981.